LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 24 October 1989

The PRESIDENT (Hon. G.L. Bruce) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Port Augusta-Port Wakefield Road realignment—5.3 km Merriton section,

Salisbury Highway extension.

OMBUDSMAN'S REPORT

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the report of the Ombudsman for 1988-89.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner):

Attorney-General's Department—Report, 1988-89.
Court Services Department—Report, 1988-89.
Electoral Department—Report of Operations, 1988-89.
Legal Services Commission—Report, 1988-89.
South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust—Report, 1988-89.
Legal Practitioners Act 1981—Regulations—
Certificate Fee.
Indemnity Insurance Scheme.

By the Minister of Corporate Affairs (Hon. C.J. Sumner):

Corporate Affairs Commission—Report, 1988-89.

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

Department for Community Welfare—Report, 1988-89.

By the Minister of State Services (Hon. Barbara Wiese):

State Supply Board—Report, 1988-89.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. Anne Levy):

Bookmakers Licensing Board—Report, 1988-89.
Children's Services Office—Report, 1988-89.
Racecourses Development Board—Report, 1988-89.
Motor Vehicles Act 1959—Regulations—Graduated drivers licences.
Summary Offences Act 1953—Regulations—Infringement Notices.
District Council of Warooka—By-laws—
No. 1—Permits and Penalties.
No. 8—Caravans.
No. 11—Camping Reserves.

QUESTIONS

ST JOHN AMBULANCE

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the harassment of St John Ambulance volunteers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: During the past few weeks the Opposition has received numerous complaints from St John Ambulance volunteers of harassment and intimidation by career ambulance staff. I have a copy of a letter written by a young female volunteer to the Superintendent of the Hindmarsh Ambulance Division, Mr J. Lamprell, dated 15 May 1989.

In the letter the female volunteer claims that she was subjected to a range of verbal sexual advances by a senior training officer with the Ambulance Training School. She says the suggestive remarks, made during a lifting assessment test on 12 May, included offers to have sex with her. I am advised that the training officer holds a very influential position within the ambulance service, and on his word and signature depends the success or failure of any new volunteer. To quote from the young woman's letter:

> I arrived at the Ambulance Service Training School at approximately 18.40 hours for a 1900 hours appointment to undertake my lifting assessment for the EC&T course. Mr X was the person carrying out the assessment. While Mr X—

I am quite deliberately not using the name, because these are allegations contained in a letter—

> was explaining to me the various aspects of the tests I told him I had been practising these tests but had been doing them backwards. He exclaimed, 'I hope you don't do that when you are having sex.' Although I was a little taken back by his remark, I brushed it aside.
>
> When lifting the manikin from the chair to the stretcher I was carrying the lower end and he the upper end, and as we placed the manikin on the stretcher he exclaimed, 'Now we're practically holding hands.' Again, I felt uncomfortable with this remark but as I was being assessed I did not make any comment.
>
> At the completion of the tests I sat down with [the gentleman] in one of the classrooms while he completed the paperwork for my assessment. While he was marking the sheets he said to me, 'You know you're a very attractive girl. Can I kiss you all over?'
>
> I replied 'Shut up' and attempted to change the conversation. Shortly afterwards he told me that he had some beer on the premises and invited me to come back after the assessments were completed.

The young woman continues in her letter of complaint by saying she declined his offer, and shortly afterwards the person who was to be assessed after her rang to say he would be late. The letter continues:

> Soon after that [this gentleman] said to me, 'We have 15-20 minutes alone, can I make love to you?' I was quite shocked at this remark and tightly closed my eyes and started talking about another subject. I got up to leave and he followed me and said. 'Are you sure you won't make love to me?' I ignored the comment and kept walking towards the door. He walked up alongside me and put his arm around me. Just then the person (who was next for assessment) came into sight, walking down the corridor. Mr X continued walking alongside me to where my car was parked and kept touching my shoulder, back and waist, all of which I responded to by saying 'Nick off, stop being a pain.'
>
> When I got to the car I was so nervous that I dropped my keys and had to carefully get down on the ground to find them, hoping to avoid any contact from Mr X. When I found my keys I unlocked the car, got in, locked the door, nervously fumbled to find the ignition key while Mr X stood outside the driver's door. I finally started my car and drove away. I am very concerned about this incident which is why I have reported it to you, and hope that in doing so nothing happens to me by way of prejudice towards gaining my EC&T certificate.

I am advised that although Mr Lamprell subsequently reported the young woman's complaint to St John's management, and although it has had details of this incident for about nine weeks, it is refusing to do anything about it.

I am advised that this training officer has a reputation for this kind of behaviour with other female volunteers, and it poses the question of how many potential recruits he might have dissuaded. In view of recent claims of harassment and intimidation of St John Ambulance volunteers by career staff—claims which brigade commissioner Dr Brian Fotheringham said this morning are 'absolutely true'—will the Attorney-General ask the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity to immediately investigate why serious com-

plaints of sexual harassment lodged by a female volunteer last May have not been investigated or acted upon?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: There are two issues. First, there are the allegations of harassment and intimidation by career staff towards volunteers in the ambulance service generally, and they have been aired in the media. Suffice to say the Government clearly does not find harassment of that kind acceptable and it ought not occur. The second issue is the matter that the honourable member has relayed to the Council this afternoon. It deals with a specific instance of what is alleged to be, in the honourable member's explanation, sexual harassment. I do not think that should be confused with the first issue I raised. Quite clearly, the individual case of alleged sexual harassment, if established to be correct, is unacceptable. As members know it was this Government, through the equal opportunity legislation, that made sexual harassment an act of discrimination. Therefore, the capacity to invoke the jurisdiction of the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity exists, provided that volunteers are covered in this situation.

The question of whether volunteers should be covered by the equal opportunity legislation was dealt with in Parliament last week. It was made clear last week that unpaid workers are covered by that Bill, which is still to be passed by the House of Assembly. So there may be some question as to whether this particular volunteer has standing to take the matter to the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity.

However, if the matters raised by the honourable member are true, they constitute serious allegations of sexual harassment that ought not to be tolerated. I will certainly refer the honourable member's question to the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity to have inquiries made about the allegations.

BUILDING LEGISLATION

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government a question about building legislation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: In November 1981 the Liberal Government commenced the task of rationalising and consolidating building regulations by establishing a working party. The working party published its report in April 1982. Following that, a steering committee and several other working parties were established to pursue the matter further. Nothing much happened after the Bannon Government came to office at the end of 1982 until the working parties were reconstituted in December 1986.

In June 1987, the Attorney-General wrote to the Minister of Local Government seeking information about the delay. A reply in November 1987 from the Minister gave some reasons, including the intention to take up the Building Code of Australia in 1988. That code was proposed to be adopted across Australia on a uniform basis. However, that adoption has not occurred.

On 1 May 1989 the Department of Local Government issued a discussion paper on building controls, but no green paper has been issued even though it is acknowledged that building controls have contributed significantly to the escalation of housing costs. It appears that no progress has been made on the initiatives taken eight years ago by the Liberal Government and that the process is being started afresh by the Department of Local Government after an expenditure of several hundred thousand dollars in taxpayers' money in the review commenced in 1981. My questions to the Minister are as follows:

1. Is it the Government's intention to adopt the Building Code of Australia and, if so, when will that occur?

2. If it does not so intend, what steps is the Minister proposing to overcome a mass of building regulations bogging down the industry and adding significantly to costs of home building?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: It is proposed to pick up the considerable degree of work done at a national level with South Australian involvement for the National Building Code of Australia. I am sorry that I cannot recall the exact date on which it is to become operative, but all councils and building inspectors have been advised. A series of seminars is being conducted for the relevant council workers so that they are fully familiar with the requirements of the new building code. Certainly, a date has been set for its adoption with a phasing in period for building work which may have commenced prior to the final adoption of the code. Work is well under way and a series of seminars and consultations is taking place. A couple of months ago I opened a conference of building inspectors convened specifically to discuss the matter of the uniform building code and its implications for local government in this State.

I will refresh my memory as to the exact date on which it is to become operative. I am not sure whether it is 1 January or 1 July next year but certainly a date has been set. I will bring back the information for the honourable member.

MORTLOCK LIBRARY

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the Arts a question about the Mortlock Library.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I refer to the Mortlock Library of South Australiana, which is the history collection of the State held by the State Library. Members will recollect that this section of the library was refurbished before the sesquicentenary. It is a visual delight. It is an important primary source of written history and photographs. I have referred recently to the fact that it is extraordinarily badly signposted from North Terrace; one would not know it was there.

I refer now to another matter of concern, namely, that during the Estimates Committee the Opposition sought information from the Minister about the opening hours of the Mortlock Library. In her written reply, a considered reply, the Minister claimed that the library is open for 37 hours a week. In fact, this is not correct. The Minister's list of opening hours for the Mortlock Library included the hours of 9.30 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturdays, but since 10 July, which was well before the Estimates Committee and before the written information was provided by the Minister, the library has been opening only between 1 p.m. and 5 p.m. on Saturdays. For the Minister's information, I have a copy of an advertisement which includes these new hours. The Minister for the Arts may be interested to have a copy of that advertisement of one of the institutions which falls directly under her domain.

In fact, the opening hours are Monday, Thursday and Friday 9.30 a.m. to 5 p.m., on Wednesday it is closed, on Sunday it is closed, and on Tuesday it is open between 1 p.m. and 8 p.m. and, on Saturdays, between 1 p.m. and 5 p.m.

That means that the Mortlock Library is open only for 33.5 hours each week. This compares with the following total weekly opening hours for the history collections of

other State libraries: Victoria—The La Trobe Library—65 hours; New South Wales—Mitchell Library—68 hours; and Western Australia—Battye Library—61.75 hours. So the comparable libraries of Victoria, New South Wales and Western Australia are open almost double the time of the Mortlock Library of South Australiana. In Queensland, the John Oxley Library is open 42 hours, and in Tasmania the equivalent library is open 38.5 hours. The Minister will see from these figures that South Australians have less access to the history collection of their State Library than people in any other State. Research into our history can only suffer as a result.

Can the Minister explain why she gave incorrect information to the Estimates Committee on the opening hours of the Mortlock Library? In view of the opening hours of the history collections of the other State libraries, and in view of the repeated publicity given to this fact by the Opposition in recent years, is she prepared to review the decision to restrict the opening hours of the Mortlock Library from July this year?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I am very happy to answer that question, but I would point out that I do so not in my capacity as Minister for the Arts but as Minister of Local Government. The Mortlock Library is a division of the State Library in South Australia, and the State Library is not the responsibility of the Minister for the Arts but the responsibility—

The Hon. L.H. Davis: I am aware of that.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The honourable member says he is aware of this fact, but he did specifically address the question to the Minister for the Arts, who has no responsibility whatever for the Mortlock Library, or any other library. I very much regret if incorrect information was given in the response to the question asked in the Estimates Committee.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: There was probably no-one available to give the information.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The State Librarian was present at the Estimates Committee, as were other people from the library service. It may be that the wrong piece of paper was looked at. If a written reply was provided—and I certainly recall information was requested regarding the other State libraries—the information which the honourable member has quoted would have come to him in the same reply, because that information was asked for and was certainly supplied as a result of the question asked in the Estimates Committee. I apologise if the wrong information was provided by the State Library, because I can assure the honourable member that the written responses to questions asked in the Estimates Committee are prepared by the division concerned.

An honourable member interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I do not read them out; they are written responses. I regret it if a wrong figure was given. However, the hours which the honourable member has quoted for other States were likewise provided in the same written response.

The decision to change the hours of the Mortlock Library was taken by the Libraries Board to enable a better service to be provided for users of that library over the weekend. A large number of people are unable to avail themselves of the services provided by the Mortlock Library between Monday and Friday because of their other commitments. Previously, the Mortlock Library was open on a Saturday—although it was from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., but it did not provide a full service. There was not the same degree of professional staff available to provide the assistance which people required and, while the doors were open, very little help indeed could be provided to anyone wishing to do any genealogical research.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: It is because of requests for the full service to be available during the weekends that a reorganisation of staff rosters has occurred, and the times were changed, enabling the full service of the library to be available between 1 p.m. and 5 p.m. on a Saturday. I have been told that this change has been much appreciated by many users of the Mortlock Library. There have been many expressions of gratitude for the availability of a full service on a Saturday, and no complaints whatsoever have been received by the State Library regarding the change in hours.

I have specifically inquired whether the change of hours had resulted in inconvenience to the public, and I was informed that no member of the public had complained. On the contrary, there had been expressions of appreciation that with the change the resources were now available to provide complete assistance and service at the weekends and that this was much appreciated by users of the Mortlock Library.

WATER CONTAMINATION

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Water Resources, a question relating to water contamination.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: On a couple of occasions in this place I have asked questions in relation to contamination of underground water in the South-East of the State. In responding to increasing concern about what was happening in the South-East, the Minister set up a Citizens Liaison Advisory Committee, which as far as I can tell has met twice in the past four months. It has made reports on eight minor contaminations that have occurred, but another 14, identified through the phone-in that was held by the E&WS on one day, have not yet been made public. Therefore, details of a number of possibly major contaminations have not been released publicly. I am informed that the Woods and Forests Department has been responsible for tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of litres of copper chrome arsenate going down into the groundwater at one of its mills and that it is currently busy pumping it back out—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: In the South-East: Mount Gambier. It is busy trying to recover what has been lost over quite a few years, trying to draw the groundwater back and disposing of the waste by putting it into the sewerage system. It is also reported that a privately owned timber mill in the South-East has large quantities of material—copper chrome arsenate—dumped on site which is now being removed, although I am uncertain where it is going.

The Minister made clear that any illegal dumping would lead to prosecutions. To this point there has been no information of any prosecutions occurring, nor has there been any public information about any Government officers getting into trouble over what may have happened in Government departments. I am further informed that the position of Senior Technical Officer (Environment) in the Mount Gambier E&WS branch was left vacant for five years until earlier this year, when the issue started to blow.

I have also been informed that the committee set up by the Minister to look at these things was nothing new, because one already existed but had not met for a number of years. When will the public be fully informed as to what breaches have already been confirmed and what breaches have been found to be false? It is only in that way that people will know whether or not anything further needs to be reported. Will any prosecutions be made and, if so, when? What has happened within the Government departments that are responsible for any pollution that has occurred?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I will be pleased to refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

NOARLUNGA HOSPITAL

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Last Thursday during the Appropriation Bill debate, the Hon. Mr Cameron asked questions relating to the Noarlunga Hospital and hospital staff numbers to which I was not able to provide immediate answers. The honourable member having asked that the replies be made available by today I undertook to expedite the matter. I seek leave to have the reply inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

In relation to the Noarlunga Hospital, financial arrangements have been constructed in such a way as to minimise both the capital and operating costs as follows:

Structured Financing

Noarlunga Hospital is being built as part of the State's capital works program. The Noarlunga Hospital has been used as collateral in the borrowing process by way of a structured financial package. Three investors have combined to provide the funds to SAFA by way of a trust. SAFA can purchase the units in the trust, thereby controlling the ownership of the hospital on behalf of Government, in future years.

Lease Arrangements

The South Australian Health Commission has leased the completed hospital to the investors' trustee, Palantir Pty Ltd. Palantir Pty Ltd has sub-let the public hospital beds, and most of the joint service facility (theatres etc), to Noarlunga Health Service. Palantir Pty Ltd plans to sub-let other parts of the development to private operators, e.g. radiology suite.

Management Arrangements

Noarlunga Health Service will manage the public beds, and most of the joint service facility, on behalf of the Government. Noarlunga Health Service will manage the private beds on behalf of Palantir Pty Ltd. Actual cost plus a management fee will be charged to Palantir by Noarlunga Health Service.

The Hon. Mr Cameron also sought a breakdown of hospital staff numbers for June 1988. I incorporate the following table in *Hansard*:

Breakdown of hospital staff numbers for June 1988:

	Medical		Nursing		Admin		Other Categories		Total	
	1988	1989	1988	1989	1988	1989	1988	1989	1988	1989
RAH	383.7	436.7	1 653.6	1 665.5	462.1	452.1	1 141.6	1 109.6	3 641.0	3 663.9
FMC	251.2	303.3	920.8	920.5	327.9	328.1	784.1	767.0	2 284.0	2 318.9
TQEH	217.6	224.4	1 160.1	1 153.6	323.2	338.2	865.5	866.7	2 566.4	2 582.9
AMCWC										
ACH	120.8	132.4	428.2	458.4	238.1	228.2	535.0	494.3	1 322.1	1 313.3
QVH	29.4	43.4	375.6	339.1	74.1	92.0	143.0	137.0	622.1	611.5
LMHS	60.7	70.4	331.9	316.8	83.3	83.1	194.3	190.8	670.2	661.1
MOD	90.7	94.2	400.9	410.1	105.6	98.0	250.1	250.7	847.3	853.0

The figures include overtime and other persons such as agency nursing staff. Data from the Royal Adelaide Hospital excludes staff employed at Hampstead Centre.

Answers to the honourable member's other questions are as follows: The 'actual' is the number of employees of a particular hospital, expressed in full-time equivalents (FTE), who were paid in the last pay period of June in any particular year. The figure includes overtime and other persons such as agency nursing staff.

The 'target' is an estimate by a particular hospital of the number of employees who will be paid in the last pay period of June in any particular year. The figure includes overtime and other persons such as agency nursing staff. The target is estimated by hospitals at the beginning of the financial year in order to comply with Treasury requirements to forecast end of year workforce levels. There is no intention to reduce the number of medical staff at the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

In preparing its work force targets for medical staff for June 1989, the Royal Adelaide Hospital omitted to include an estimate for overtime, with the result that the actual number of medical staff employed at 30 June 1989 was well above the hospital's original estimate.

HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT PERMITS

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Transport, a question about Highways Department permits.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I have been contacted by one of my constituents who held a road train and B train permit, which expired in early September this year. He applied for, and received, a renewal—but for only three weeks. In the past, there had been no charge for such a permit, but on 1 October this year a charge of $1 000 per annum was imposed. He was told that he could obtain a permit for only three weeks and on 1 October he would have to pay $1 000.

At the time that he was told this, he had presented his vehicle for inspection where it was passed. He has no complaint with the fee being imposed in the future and he expected to pay the fee of $1 000 when he reapplied in September next year, but in the past he always received a 12-month permit when his previous permit had expired and he expected the same conditions to apply on this occasion.

He complained to the Highways Department, to the Ombudsman and to the Premier's office, but he received no kind of satisfaction at all on any of those occasions. My questions are: why was the 1 October fee of $1 000 pre-empted by three weeks? Why did he not receive a 12-month permit, as had been past practice, and what does the Minister propose to do about it?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I will refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

FRIGATE CONTRACT

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: Has the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of State Development and Technology, an answer to my question of 15 August about frigate contracts?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: It is not possible to go into the detail requested in the honourable member's question at this stage. Amecon is still in final contract negotiation with the Commonwealth Government and, in turn, has still to finalise contracts with its major vendors. Some of these contracts may take up to 12 moths to finalise. Nevertheless, at this stage, broad information is available from Amecon as to the likely work that will flow to South Australia as a result of the contract award and it is clear that South Australian companies will gain significant work on the Anzac ship project.

Foremost will be the establishment in South Australia of BEAB Pacific, This new company, which will be located at Technology Park, will be established by Bofors Electronic Industries AB of Sweden. It will be established in South Australia to produce the command and control system, fire control system and be involved in combat system integration. CSA, at Technology Park, will be subcontracted to perform much of this work, particularly software development and systems integration. This company would be expected to create approximately 100 new jobs in South Australia. More importantly, it will lead to the establishment of a new industry with substantial potential for export sales into the South East Asian and Pacific region.

AWA Defence Industries based at Holden Hill and Salisbury is likely to gain work in the following areas: design engineering and manufacturing work as a subcontractor to BEAB; manufacture of sub-systems for radars; assembly and test of ESM systems; test and trials assistance to Amecon; manufacture of digital interface units for ships data-bus; and manufacture of sub-systems for missile launch systems. The value of this work is estimated to be of the order of $200 million and would mean considerable additional enployment. British Aerospace Australia is also likely to win major work in the following areas: sonar electronic subsystems; digital interface units for the ships' data-bus; and manufacture of various electronic packages.

Substantial fabrication work will also be undertaken in South Australia. Eglo Engineering at Osborne will be involved in the manufacture of specialised modules for the Anzac ship, while Transfield Whyalla will be involved in the manufacture of at least $20 million worth of sub-assemblies and sections for incorporation in these modules.

Perry Engineering is also likely to gain significant work. It will be subcontracting to Michell Bearings for the manufacture of thrust bearings and will also be involved in other heavy precision machining work, including manufacture of stabilisers and other mechanical components. The overall value of the engineering and fabrication work in South Australia, we believe, would amount to approximately $150 million.

In addition to these, there are still significant opportunities for subcontractors to contract to supply various small items involved with the fitting-out of the vessels. The exact requirements have yet to be defined explicitly by Amecon and it would not be in a position to do so until early in the new year. These contracts will be let progressively as the requirements are identified and it will be up to individual interested companies to make known their capability and interest to the Amecon contracting office. The Department of State Development and Technology and the Industrial Supplies will provide assistance and support in this regard.

The total value of the work estimated to flow to South Australia is $500 million, or 16 per cent of the Australian content. In total, this should create around 1 400 new jobs in South Australia and, importantly, provide opportunities from industry to capture up to $2 billion of additional work in through life support and updates of the ships over their 30 year life.

PUBLIC EXAMINATIONS

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Education, a question about public examinations.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Last week the Minister of Education stated in Parliament:

> Students entering year 11 will begin an integrated course over two years leading to a new South Australian Certificate of Education. So, more than double the current number of students will be facing the public examination system in this State.

I have contacted spokespersons for the Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia (SSABSA) and the Minister of Education's own department about the Minister's statement. Both bodies (the Minister's own department and the Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia) say that the Minister's statement is incorrect: there is no intention under the Gilding report or the recommendations as to the South Australian Certificate of Education that the year 11 students would face public examinations as indicated in Parliament last week by the Minister of Education.

It is clear that the Minister of Education either has not understood his own proposal for a South Australian Certificate of Education, or that, more seriously, has deliberately misled Parliament on this issue. Will the Minister immediately issue a clarifying statement as to the Government's intentions in this area and does the Minister intend to overturn the recommendations of the Gilding report in relation to the South Australian Certificate of Education?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Although the honourable member addressed the question to the Minister of Tourism, I represent the Minister of Education in this Chamber, and I will be very happy to refer that question to our colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMISSION

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: Has the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister for Environment and Planning, an answer to the question that I asked on 26 September about the Waste Management Commission?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: My colleague the Minister for Environment and Planning has advised that the Waste Management Commission has recommended to the District Council of Millicent that the following conditions should apply if the burning of waste continues at the Canunda depot:

1. Burning shall be conducted on a controlled basis (that is, on a regular basis and in localised areas) and shall be supervised at all times.

2. No burning shall be conducted when the depot is open to the public.

3. The CFS fire protection recommendations shall be implemented and maintained to reduce the likelihood of fire escaping from the depot.

4. No burning shall be conducted in the depot during each fire danger season.

These conditions will be incorporated in a management plan which will be considered by the commission shortly.

MOTHER BASHING

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Community Welfare, a question about mother bashing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: A report released yesterday by the Southern Community Health Services Research Unit of the Health Commission highlighted that significant numbers of women are being beaten by their teenage sons. I note that this report reinforces comments of a similar nature made at least some two years ago by the South Australian Domestic Violence Service. The report released yesterday highlighted that church and community social workers believe that teenagers who hit their mohers may have been helpful and supportive as children but as they get older their needs and attitudes change, together with their behaviour towards their parents. When they do not get what they want, they bash their mothers.

During the unit's research it was discovered that many mothers were scared to mention such violence to Government agencies through fear of their child being declared uncontrollable and taken away from them. I ask the Minister responsible for both the Domestic Violence Service in this State and the Domestic Violence Prevention Unit within the Department for Community Welfare: what are those agencies doing to address this issue of mother bashing, an issue that has clearly been on the agenda of concern with respect to community violence for some two or three years now? Also, does the Minister agree that, unless mothers feel confident that they can approach the Department for Community Welfare and/or the police in the belief that they will receive support services both to stop the violence and avoid irretrievable family breakdown, mothers in such circumstances have little option but to continue to live in fear and intimidation?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply as soon as possible.

SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN SCHOOLS

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: Has the Minister of Local Government a reply to the question I asked on 7 September about sexual harassment in schools?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The Minister of Education has advised me that the Education Department developed its sexual harassment policy and grievance procedures in 1983. Since that time, extensive training and development programs for school-based personnel have been undertaken to assist them in fulfilling their responsibilities with respect to sexual harassment.

In 1988, a supplement to the *Education Gazette* was produced to assist school personnel to develop adequate and workable grievance procedures. Additional support for teachers has also been provided by the development of curriculum materials to teach girls and boys about sexual harassment in primary schools.

During the first half of 1989 a comprehensive training manual was produced for all personnel with responsibilities with respect to sexual harassment grievance procedures and, in addition, pamphlets which summarise those procedures have been developed for parents, students and employees. The parents' pamphlet has been translated into nine languages other than English, including one Aboriginal language. These pamphlets will be distributed to schools during term 4, 1989.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES OFFICERS AND PRISON OFFICERS

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Correctional Services, replies to the questions I asked on 17 August and 6 September about correctional services officers and prison officers?

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

1. No. (question 17 August 1989).

2. The information relating to 1986-87 could not be supplied from the Government Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Office or the Department of Correctional Services. In 1987-88 there were 19 cases reported. There were 73 claims received in 1988-89 for stress related illness. (question 17 August 1989).

3. The Department of Correctional Services is aware of the increase in the incidence of workers compensation and has developed a number of proposed strategies that address the problem. These are currently being implemented and further researched. Programs being investigated include:

- Review of the selection/induction procedures for custodial officers;
- Employee fitness and health programs;
- Accident investigation, analysis and reporting;
- Management education and awareness programs;
- Development of an information system to provide essential statistical data to monitor the incidence of workers compensation; and
- Review of the role of correctional officers. (question 17 August 1989).

4. No. (question 2, 6 September 1989).

O-BAHN

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked on 10 August about the O-Bahn?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Minister of Transport has provided me with the following answer:

The announcement regarding free public transport on 20 August 1989 did not take the State Transport Authority by surprise. It was fully aware that an announcement was to be made.

STATE BANK

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the State Bank.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: Members will recall that on 5 September I asked a detailed question of the Attorney-General specifically relating to the State Bank's involvement with the Remm Myer proposal. I itemised various areas of State Bank involvement in South Australia and the Attor-

ney-General indicated that he would refer my question to the appropriate Minister and bring back a reply. I am still awaiting that reply. Members will also be aware that I have a detailed question on notice in respect of specific investments, operation and financial arrangements of the State Bank group, including the Beneficial Finance Group. My question covers the National Safety Council, the Hooker Corporation building, the East End Market, Equiticorp, the Chase Corporation and a rewording of the question relating to Remm.

The day I asked that question—and members will recall that my explanation implied potential loss and exposure by the State Bank in the central business district of Adelaide and other matters—I released a very limited distribution media statement. I was somewhat surprised to hear that the State Bank was to sue me for libel for releasing that limited media statement unless I was prepared to withdraw and take other abject steps which were totally unacceptable.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Hear, hear!

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I do not intend to canvass that matter; suffice to say, it has been concluded. It is interesting that there was a call of 'hear, hear' from the Attorney-General, because I was doubly surprised to find that the Leader of the Opposition, Mr John Olsen, was aware that the State Bank was suing me for libel almost at the same time that I was. I was approached by a close adviser of the Premier, Mr Geoff Anderson, who asked me whether I had been sued yet.

It became clearly apparent that the State Government knew almost immediately what measures were being taken to silence the impudent questioning of a member of Parliament on these matters. It would still be in members' minds that the Bank of Adelaide struck a rather unfortunate termination through its over-exposure in FCA in Victoria. Without making any implication that the State Bank is in that situation, I make the point that the questions asked—the one on 5 September and the ones on notice—are reasonable questions in light of the State Bank being the vehicle of the State Government in this Parliament which is the ultimate body in the State.

Does the Attorney believe that the issues raised, both in my original question and in more detail in the Questions on Notice, are properly of concern and interest to the Government and the Parliament of South Australia and, if not, why not? Will the Attorney-General seek information in response to these questions and put that information before the Council before the conclusion of this session and, if not, why not? Finally, since in certain instances a bank's confidentiality does preclude certain information being made available in detail, will the Attorney provide, if not specific information, general information on the degree of exposure or risk that the State Bank has in the areas I have raised, in particular in the building sector of the central business district?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member is entitled to ask questions in this Parliament about the State Bank. I assume that members would agree that he is not entitled to defame the State Bank or its managing director, board or anyone else connected with it.

The Hon. I. Gilfillan: Who did?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member says that he was sued for distributing material about the State Bank, so I assume that the originator of the writ against the honourable member took the view that the honourable member had defamed him. I do not know enough about the matter to comment. Obviously if the honourable member raises the matter in the Parliament he is entitled to parliamentary privilege. If, however, he distributes a document outside the Parliament and it contains defamatory material, it may be that the person aggrieved by such defamatory material has recourse against him. It sounds, from what the honourable member has said, as though certain proceedings were taken against him. The honourable member is entitled to ask questions. I do not think he is entitled to defame the State Bank, its General Manager or others outside this place. Although technically he may be entitled to within this place—

The Hon. I. Gilfillan: How do you know I made comment about the General Manager?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Well, I didn't know whether you were talking about State Bank, the General Manager—

The Hon. I. Gilfillan: I think you have been well briefed.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I have not been briefed. I was referring to the State Bank, the General Manager, the board or other officials of the State Bank. If the honourable member defames these people outside the Chamber they are entitled to take whatever action they think appropriate in the circumstances.

I also suggest to the honourable member that the State Bank is a respectable and responsible instrumentality which, to my knowledge, does a very good job for South Australia. Even within the Council one should take care about defaming the reputation of the State Bank or any of its officials. However, the honourable member is entitled to ask questions. The bank has to consider the questions and, certainly, if those questions can be answered within the constraints that the honourable member has already outlined, namely, commercial confidentiality, they will be answered. Clearly, however, the charter which the Government and the Parliament has given to the State Bank is to operate independently and in a commercial environment. That means that the bank must be able to operate competitively with other banks and financial institutions in the private sector. However, the shareholders of the bank through the Government are the people of South Australia, and obviously the honourable member is entitled to ask questions about its operation. Whether or not these specific questions can be answered, I will have to refer to the Minister responsible and bring back a reply.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: My second question was whether the Attorney would undertake to bring back answers before the conclusion of this session. Will he give an undertaking to do that and, if not, why not?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will refer the questions, including that part, to the Premier and bring back a reply in due course. I will draw that matter to the attention of the Premier, but obviously I do not know how long it will take to get the information together. Questions were put on the Notice Paper a month ago.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member should not be so testy. I can only assume that his polling results have not been so good in the past week or so. I will refer the honourable member's questions to the Premier today and ascertain whether a reply can be brought back within the constraints of time imposed by the honourable member. I obviously cannot give such a guarantee.

NATURAL DISASTER FUNDS

The Hon. PETER DUNN: Has the Minister of Tourism a reply to my question of 13 April on natural disaster funds?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The Minister of State Development and Technology has supplied the following information in response to this question:

1. A press release from the Minister of Finance, Senator Walsh, of 12 April 1989 says, *inter alia*, that:

> The Commonwealth will continue through the existing NDRA (Natural Disaster Relief Arrangements) framework to meet the unpredictable and sometimes large costs involved in providing relief and restoration measures associated with bush fires, cyclones, earthquakes, floods and storms.

It is the drought component of NDRA which is under review. A press release issued by the Minister for Primary Industries and Energy, Mr John Kerin, of 12 April 1989, outlined the establishment of an independent task force to conduct a comprehensive review of drought policy. The task force visited South Australia on 26 and 27 May 1989 when its task and its conception of the problem were explained at meetings with interested bodies and submissions were invited. An interim report by the task force, required prior to the 1989-90 Commonwealth budget to enable inclusion in the budget of proposed initial measures, was released on 27 July 1989. The final report is due by 31 March 1990.

2. The Minister of Agriculture considered that the Finance Minister's announcement that drought assistance will no longer be available under NDRA and that the provision of drought relief will be reviewed with a view to being addressed in the August budget, provided the State Government with an opportunity to suggest more responsible guidelines for the provision by the Federal Government of drought aid. To this end a special Department of Agriculture committee was established to prepare submissions to the task force. The Committee's interim report was submitted in June 1989 and its final submission will be forwarded shortly.

3. Prior to the interim report of the task force, assistance to farmers affected by drought in this State was handled by the Rural Assistance Branch under the Commonwealth-State Agreement of the Rural Adjustment Scheme (as part A assistance). The content of the Government's package under this scheme is well known.

4. In its interim report 'Managing for Drought', the task force has recommended that carry-on funding be provided, for severe drought circumstances arising over the next 12 months, under part B of the Rural Adjustment Scheme (RAS).

I seek leave to have the remainder of this reply inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Part B funding, which is shared equally between the Commonwealth and States, is to be on application from a State Government and where the Commonwealth and State Governments agree that necessary and sufficient conditions exist for additional government funding. The task force also recommended that adequate funding be available during 1989-90 to cover the likely requirements for drought under Parts A and B of the RAS.

5. In the event of a natural disaster other than drought, the State would be able to take advantage of remaining provisions under the natural disaster relief arrangements should the Government choose to do so.

DISCUSSION

On Section 1 above

During its visit to South Australia on 26 and 27 May, the task force met the Minister of Agriculture, the Director-General and officers of the Department of Agriculture, bankers, United Farmers and Stockowners (UF&S) personnel and representatives of statutory authorities and agribusinesses in Adelaide on 26 May. On 27 May, at the invitation of the UF&S, some members of the task force journeyed to Port Lincoln and thence to Wudinna to obtain a first-hand impression of the situation on Eyre Peninsula.

On Sections 3 and 4 above

The overall purpose of the RAS is to improve the efficiency of Australian rural industry through the provision of assistance and services to help farmers adjust to changing technical, economic, institutional and environmental circumstances. The scheme is divided into three parts (Parts A, B and C) which have different but supporting roles.

Part A

Part A of the RAS provides concessional finance in the form of interest subsidies, loans or grants to help farmers:

- restructure their capital (to provide a more secure financial base);
- upgrade their financial and technical skills;
- adopt improved or more appropriate technologies;
- increase their farm size or capital intensity;
- gain access to information on their needs and opportunities in each of these areas.

Under Part A, assistance is provided to cover up to 50 per cent of the total interest on the loan(s) being subsidised.

Part B

Part B provides carry-on assistance to farmers in industries or regions which are experiencing a short-term downturn. Funding for Part B is provided on a dollar-for-dollar basis between the Commonwealth and the States with assistance being provided as interest subsidies on the same basis as for Part A assistance (that is up to 50 per cent of the total interest on the loan(s) being subsidised).

Initiation of Part B arrangements is dependent upon a State or Territory submitting a proposal to the Commonwealth for consideration, with funding arrangements and terms and conditions of assistance being determined by the Commonwealth following consultations with the State/Territory concerned. Unlike the situation in past schemes, for the current Rural Adjustment Scheme Part B assistance can be used to provide carry-on assistance to enable farmers to overcome the effects of drought.

Part C

Part C of the RAS provides household support and re-establishment assistance to: alleviate the personal hardship of farm families; to assist farmers to realise farm assets in an orderly manner; and to assist farmers to re-establish themselves post-farming.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 October. Page 1307.)

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: As I rise to conclude my remarks in support of this Bill, I would like to refer to some of the matters which have been raised by the Government when dealing with ethnic affairs. In November 1983, almost six years ago, following the review of the South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission, the Hon. Mr Sumner introduced a Bill amending the South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission Act. He indicated that the Bill sought to strengthen the role of the commission to influence Government agencies in the appropriate design and delivery of services which served the needs of all ethnic groups.

Part of the thrust of the 1983 amendments was the need for the South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission to consult with public authorities responsible for the services and the ethnic groups which are the recipients of those services to ensure that the so-called obligation that was contained in the Bill for each Government department to develop an appropriate ethnic affairs policy was discharged.

With its latest rhetoric the Government would have us believe that the work and responsibility of all Government departments and agencies to develop appropriate ethnic affairs policies and services that recognise the diverse nature of our society has been completed. It therefore suggests that the focus should now shift, so that public policies give proper weight to the diversity of the population and to the need to manage the consequences of that diversity. This is an extraordinary statement, because it really plays around with words and delivers little action, leading the community to believe that this is stage 2 of Labor's ethnic affairs plan.

The facts are that since 1983 very slow progress has been achieved within a few departments through the hard work of the South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission, its Chairmen, both present and past, the commissioners and its staff. The undeniable facts, however, remain that the ethnic diversity of multicultural Australia is under-represented in all senior decision-making positions in Government departments, whilst people in private enterprise have achieved a great deal more in all spheres of work and professional occupations. This fact has recently been confirmed in a report prepared by the Workforce Planning Unit of the Department of Industrial Relations. It has also been expressed as a concern by the South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission in its latest report, when it said:

We have one major concern in relation to equal employment opportunity activities. Apart from once-only voluntary surveys which have been conducted in a few departments, there is no service-wide data collection on work force participation by public servants of non-English speaking background. Without data, we cannot be sure that we are able to utilise the full potential talents and skills of our community.

Another comment in the commission's 1988 annual report refers to the difficulty it has experienced in dealing with the organisational culture which still prevails in the public sector.

It is obvious from these comments, the loss of senior staff positions and the severe reduction in funding experienced by the commission that it has not been able to achieve a better result in this area during the past six years because the Labor Government did not want it to achieve its task.

The Government, on the eve of an election, has now chosen to ignore the real problems which exist within its own bureaucratic structures and talks about giving proper weight and the need to manage the consequences of diversity. What sort of bureaucratic nonsense is that? The Government has never been prepared to take the hard decisions. It has failed to deliver over 20 years of rhetoric and fancy words, and has been without commitment and action in this vital area of responsibility affecting the whole South Australian community. It is all very well for the Minister in another place to talk in fancy terms about migrant discrimination and hardships, about the sudden need for trade exchange with their countries of origin and the recognition of their overseas skills and qualifications. The Minister talks about the newly discovered importance of our diverse population, their individual contributions and the great potential which each South Australian can offer to the economic growth of our State.

When I hear these statements, I would like to know where on earth the Minister has been for the last 40 years. What has the Labor Government done during the past 20 years that it has governed South Australia? The Labor Government has done little about anything and has delivered words with little action. The ethnic communities have expressed their strong dissatisfaction at the way in which the Government has responded to the recommendations of the Totaro review. In fact, some of the promises which the Government made after the review have never been honoured.

The final point which has been raised with me by a number of organisations which I support is the open discrimination that the Labor Government undertakes in favour of the unions, by insisting to appoint by definition, and not necessarily by merit or ability, to boards, commissions and other statutory authorities a representative of the United Trades and Labor Council.

Whilst I have no difficulty with the appointment of any person regardless of his or her background, I tend to believe that the appropriate appointment should be on the ability to do the job, and I strongly oppose the notion which provides for a job for the boys as a square-off for services rendered to the ALP.

Finally, as I have already indicated, whilst the Opposition will support the Bill, no amount of new words or cosmetic changes to the Bill will substitute positive actions which the Liberal Party will deliver when we are next in Government. During the Committee stages, the Opposition will move certain amendments standing in my name. As previously indicated, I support the Bill.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): The Hon. Mr Stefani's contribution was, to say the least, extremely disappointing, and failed in any significant way to give recognition to what has been quite extraordinary progress in recent years under this Government in the area of multiculturalism and ethnic affairs. Although the honourable member may disagree with some of the things that have been done, I would have expected him to recognise that contribution for what it is. It has been a very significant one, and certainly there is no doubt that after the Government came into office in 1982 initiatives were taken which changed the direction of the Ethnic Affairs Commission, which did upgrade its activity and which did give it a higher profile as a prime mover in the public sector.

We introduced effectively ethnic affairs management commitments within Government departments and agencies—something that had not happened in the history of the commission prior to that—and task forces were established in a number of departments. Very significant documents were produced, such as that relating to education for cultural democracy in the Education Department chaired by Professor Smolenz. A similar situation applies within the Department of Health, the Department for Community Welfare and more recently in the Department of Labour. An ethnic arts officer was appointed dealing with the ethnic arts.

However, I believe it is extraordinarily disappointing that someone such as the Hon. Mr Stefani, who has had an involvement in this area over many years, could not bring himself to recognise those achievements which are, as I have said, significant. Obviously, in any area of human or governmental activity there can be areas of criticism; perhaps the pace of change is not as quick as some would like.

In my experience in this area since 1975, I know that the change has been enormous. The social changes, the changes in terms of equal opportunity for ethnic minority groups within the Government sector, as well as the reduction in discrimination in the community, have been significant. There is simply no denying that. The community now is a different community from what it was 15 or 20 years ago. It is a better community in relation to dealing with prejudice and discrimination.

I believe that, whatever else one might like to say about the Labor Government, that is one area in which its achievements have been significant. Although one cannot say that racism, bigotry and discrimination on the grounds of ethnic origin do not exist in our community, I believe that the approach we have adopted of developing a legislative framework through the Equal Opportunity laws, backing it up with a clear policy about what multiculturalism means to the community, has meant that in South Australia we have developed a more tolerant community that is more prepared now to accept diversity than it was 20 years ago. It is more prepared to accept the important economic, social and cultural contributions made by people of ethnic minority origin.

I do not want to go through the individual achievements; they are well on the record in reports of the Ethnic Affairs Commission and in a number of other documents. In fact, I have been involved in this area since 1975. I was the Minister directly responsible from 1982 and the world the honourable member has outlined to this Chamber in terms of lack of progress is certainly not a world that I know. The reality is, as he would know from discussions with his colleagues in this area, that I have made an enormous personal commitment to the area of ethnic affairs and multiculturalism. In my view, a significant change has occurred in South Australia—a greater change than in any other State in Australia—particularly in the development of a coherent philosophy of multiculturalism, one which I am now pleased to see has been taken up in the Agenda for Multicultural Australia announced by the Prime Minister.

The Government has been at the forefront in Australia in developing a policy giving effect to the multicultural nature of our society. That is not to say that there have not been significant contributions in some other States, particularly New South Wales in the late 1970s, and more recently in Victoria. Nevertheless, from the early 1970s, until now, the fact is that South Australia has taken a lead in many areas relating to multiculturalism and ethnic affairs. That has not only been the Government acting alone; it has also been the community supporting the Government in the articulation of policies, which in my view have produced significant changes to our society over the past 20 years. The Totaro review mentioned by the honourable member was substantially implemented. There may have been some recommendations which were not implemented completely, but in general terms the general thrust of the Totaro review of the Ethnic Affairs Commission 1983 was put into place and legislation introduced to give effect to it in this Chamber.

With respect to the honourable member's usual comments about the role of the United Trades and Labor Council, I can only say that, to suggest that putting on the Ethnic Affairs Commission someone from the United Trades and Labor Council is a job for the boys, is just ludicrous. To suggest that it is a well-paid job for the boys is rubbish. It is a position for the United Trades and Labor Council representative on the basis that many people of ethnic minority origin in the work force are represented by the trade union movement, and it is quite reasonable that there should be a position on the commission for them. In order to sustain the proposition that it is a job for the boys, one really has to indicate the amount of money that has been paid to the appointed person.

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: How many are on the board of ETSA and the Housing Trust?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: There has been one on the South Australian Housing Trust for a number of years. I do not have the list in front of me, but I understand that Mr Karidis is on the Housing Trust board and has been for a number of years. As the honourable member would know, people of ethnic origin have been members of a number of other boards. In any event, the reserve position is appropriate because of the large number of people of ethnic minority origin who are ordinary workers in the South Australian work force.

The honourable member then spoke of what the Liberal Party will deliver. The Liberal Party has never had a great deal of empathy for ethnic affairs or multiculturalism.

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: We established the Bill.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: You established the commission, and I know that the Hon. Murray Hill, the honourable member's predecessor, certainly made a contribution in this area.

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: You said we didn't have any empathy.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Liberal Party generally, I would say with some exceptions, has not had the same empathy.

The Hon. J.F. Stefani interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I have outlined what they have done.

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: We established the Bill, and we were only—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Stefani has had the chance to debate the Bill.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am sorry the honourable member is getting upset. His contribution was, to say the least, ungracious. It did not recognise what had been done and he knows—

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: You were the Minister. Wake up to yourself.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: What are you saying?

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: You heard.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member is interjecting, but I will not respond to him. As the honourable member knows—and he can be critical of the Labor Government in many areas if he wants to be—

The Hon. J.F. Stefani interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: You have every right to.

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: So have the ethnic community.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Indeed, and they are not critical in general terms.

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: Obviously, you are not speaking to the right people.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I can assure the honourable member that I have had an involvement in this area for almost the past 14 years. It is only since May of this year that I resigned my official responsibilities in this matter. I can assure the honourable member that I have kept, and will continue to keep, close contact with people of ethnic minority origin. I am proud of the contribution that I have made in this area as a Minister of the Labor Government. The Labor Government is proud of its achievements in this area, and the honourable member's contribution unfortunately did not, in my view, reflect the reality of the situation, nor did it reflect the achievements that have been made over the past few years.

As I said before, it is possible to be critical of certain things that have happened and to say that the pace of change has not been as great as it ought to have been, but I do not think one can attack the fundamental position: an enormous amount of work has gone into this area in the past 15 years, and the change in our society and in the structures of government over that period have been quite significant.

In conclusion, the honourable member has promised that the Liberal Party will deliver. We do not know what will be delivered that has not already been delivered by the present Government. We do know that, despite Mr Malcom Fraser's commitment to multiculturalism and despite the commitment of people like the Hon. Murray Hill, the Liberal Party generally does not have a great deal of empathy with the issues in this area. We do know that the Liberal Party—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I haven't seen it. We do know that the Liberal Party at the Federal level has not yet changed its policy, despite the new leader, Mr Andrew Peacock. The Liberal Party is still saddled with the words of the Howard proposition which wrote 'multiculturalism' out of the Liberal Party's policy at the national level.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable Attorney-General has the floor. Members will have their opportunity to enter the debate.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Hon. Dr Ritson says it is nonsense. He should read it: I have read it and the word 'multiculturalism' has been written out of the Federal Liberal Party's platform. Whether Mr Peacock has changed that or put it back, we do not know; we certainly have not heard anything from him in recent times. As far as I know officially—

The Hon. R.J. Ritson interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am sorry, it is not a deliberate misrepresentation, Dr Ritson.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable Attorney-General has the floor. Everybody else has the opportunity to enter the debate.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The fact is that it is not misrepresenting the Federal policy: the word 'multiculturalism' was deliberately written out of the ethnic affairs policy by Mr John Howard. As far as I know, that policy at the Federal level has not yet been changed. It may well be changed and, if it is, I will welcome that change; I will welcome the return to some bipartisanship in this area by Mr Peacock, and I hope—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, Mr Davis!

The Hon. L.H. Davis: It is also in our policy at the State level.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am not suggesting that—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Mr Davis will stop debating across the Chamber. The honourable Attorney-General has the floor. The honourable member will have his chance to make his contribution in debate.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am not suggesting that the issues are not addressed in the Liberal Party's State platform. What I am trying to suggest is that, at the Federal level, which I would have thought was important, particularly as in a lot of these areas—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Mr President, now that honourable members have ceased their interjections I will proceed. If they stopped interjecting, I would conclude very quickly. The point I am making, which is valid, is that support from the Federal Government in this area is critical and, if a Federal Government does not accept the basic principles of multiculturalism and ethnic affairs, State Governments, whatever their policy, are in difficulty. I accept what honourable members say about the State policy and the recognition of multiculturalism within it. I again appeal to honourable members opposite to use whatever influence they have with Mr Peacock to ensure that the Federal policy, written by John Howard, is rewritten and that the agenda for multiculturalism taken up by the Hawke Government is accepted by Liberals Australia wide.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 9 passed.

Clause 10—'Meetings of commission, etc.'

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I move:

Page 3—

Lines 17 and 18—Leave out all words in these lines and insert:

'Section 9 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by striking out subsections (1) and (2) and substituting the following subsections:'

After line 27—Insert:

'and

(b) by striking out subsection (5) and substituting the following subsection:

(5) A number of members equal to one more than half (disregarding any fraction) of the number of members for the time being appointed to the Commission constitutes a quorum at a meeting of the Commission, and no business may be transacted at a meeting unless a quorum is present.'

The Opposition has considered the position that, with the possibility of increased numbers of members on the commission, which will now have up to 15 members appointed to it, there should be a corresponding increase in the quorum of members present. Accordingly, I have moved this amendment to provide for half the members plus one as an appropriate quorum at meetings.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Government does not oppose these amendments.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 11 to 13 passed.

Clause 14—'Staff to assist Commission.'

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I move:

Page 4, after line 44—Insert subclause as follows:

(2) An appointment may not be made to the position of chief executive officer of an administrative unit of the Public Service established to assist the Commission unless the Minister has first consulted with the Commission in relation to the proposed appointment.

The Opposition has given some thought to the selection and the different role of the commission and the Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs. The Liberal Party has had considerable feedback on the matter, and it is considered that the appointment of the chief executive officer to the administrative unit (in this instance, the Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs), who is a public servant, should be appointed only after consultation with the commission. It is important that consultation occurs because the Chairman, who has to work with the unit and the commissioners, would have some appropriate comment to make to the Minister and could make some contribution towards the selection of the person concerned.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I do not have any objection in principle to this amendment, but I have not had an opportunity to talk to the Minister about it. I will not oppose the amendment at this stage, but I would like to check with the Minister in another place to establish whether or not he finds the amendment acceptable. If he does, the message can be dealt with in another place and the Bill agreed to but, if by chance he does not agree, the matter might be re-examined in another place.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 15 passed.

Schedule.

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: This amendment is consequential on my previous amendment, so I move:

Page 6—Leave out the items relating to section 9 (5).

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: We do not oppose this amendment.

Amendment carried; schedule as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WHEAT MARKETING BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 October. Page 1250.)

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Mr President, I draw your attention to the state of the Council.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. PETER DUNN: In the light of the fact that Federal Parliament has deregulated the internal marketing of wheat by the Australian Wheat Board, the Opposition supports this Bill. In June this year the Commonwealth moved that the Australian Wheat Board should not be the sole receiver and marketer of wheat within Australia. It still has the right to market wheat on the export market, but it does not have the right to market wheat within Australia and, therefore, farmers and merchants are now free to trade wheat and some other commodities within Australia.

At the outset, I must declare my interest. I suppose that at the moment I am the only wheat grower in this Chamber, and I have had a long interest in the wheat industry. In about 1839 my forebears, who were wheat growers in Devon, England, came to South Australia and established mills in Mount Barker and at Bridgewater. The Bridgewater Mill was built by one of my very distant relatives. Those early Dunns really did start an industry which became very important in South Australia, because in the late 1830s South Australia was the bread-bowl of Australia, and the Mid-North, with its red-brown soils, was a great producer of wheat.

This Bill changes a tradition that has existed in Australia since about 1948 when, under the leadership of Ben Chifley, it was decided that the wheat industry should have an orderly marketing system. The wheat industry had been in trouble. We were just recovering from the Depression and the merchants were unable to pay very good prices. They were not organised; they were not competing with markets in the rest of the world and I suppose that was mainly because of our distance from Europe and America. The fact that transport was not very rapid or efficient made it difficult to determine the export prices. I recall my father's saying to me that in about 1936 or 1937 he was carting bagged wheat into Cowell and the price offered by Southern Farmers, Bungeys, or whoever the merchant was at the time, was one shilling and sixpence farthing, or one shilling and sixpence halfpenny. They were the prices, and the merchants came out along the loads of wheat and offered their price, which you either took or left.

Quite obviously, things have improved since then. There is no doubt that the Australian wheat industry prospered under the orderly marketing system. I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* a chart from the Bureau of Statistics indicating the increase in wheat production in Australia from 1978 to 1988. It indicates the increase in wheat production on a per State basis, the area that is sown on a per State basis, and the wheat prices and returns during that same period.

Leave granted.

TABLE 1—AREA OF WHEAT
(000 Hectares)

Season[1]	New South Wales[2]	Victoria	South Australia	Western Australia	Queensland	Tasmania	Australia
1978-79	3 162	1 377	1 295	3 706	747	1	10 249
1979-80	3 416	1 457	1 424	4 121	733	2	11 153
1980-81	3 345	1 431	1 445	4 333	727	2	11 283
1981-82	3 600	1 322	1 427	4 593	941	1	11 885
1982-83	3 162	1 327	1 398	4 865	767	1	11 520
1983-84	3 999	1 614	1 564	4 746	1 006	2	12 931
1984-85	3 603	1 523	1 378	4 652	921	2	12 078
1985-86[1]	3 648	1 488	1 432	4 143	970	2	11 683
1986-87[2]	3 099	1 364	1 616	4 260	795	2	11 135
1987-88[3]	2 511	1 025	1 599	3 316	684	2	9 136
Ten Season Average	3 356	1 395	1 459	4 274	829	2	11 311

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics.
[1] Year ended 31 March.
[2] Including ACT.
[3] Excluded establishments with an estimated value of agricultural operations less than $20 000.

TABLE 2—PRODUCTION OF WHEAT
(000 Tonnes)

Season[1]	New South Wales[2]	Victoria	South Australia	Western Australia	Queensland	Tasmania	Australia
1978-79	6 640	2 998	2 086	4 400	1 962	3	18 090
1979-80	6 001	3 250	2 349	3 739	846	4	16 188
1980-81	2 865	2 538	1 650	3 315	485	3	10 856
1981-82	5 910	2 467	1 695	4 803	1 482	3	16 360
1982-83	1 500	394	692	5 534	755	1	8 876
1983-84	8 961	3 971	2 843	4 316	1 922	3	22 016
1984-85	5 805	2 666	2 031	6 580	1 579	4	18 666
1985-86[1]	5 898	2 316	1 781	4 313	1 686	4	15 999
1986-87[2]	4 855	2 795	2 255	5 377	833	5	16 119
1987-88[3]	4 103	1 920	1 885	3 897	758	4	12 568
Ten Season Average	5 256	2 534	1 943	4 632	1 231	3	15 600

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics.
[1] Year ended 31 March.
[2] Including ACT.
[3] Excluded establishments with an estimated value of agricultural operations less than $20 000.

Crop year	Gross value of production	Unit value	Guaranteed minimum price a	Human consumption price b	Average export return c
	$m	$/t	$/t	$/t	$/t
1975-76	1 249.2	104.26	76.55	99.32	110.13
1976-77	1 050.8	89.05	76.29	105.40	92.32
1977-78	934.2	99.70	80.94	111.16	103.22
1978-79	2 295.8	126.91	91.96	116.61	133.63
1979-80	2 478.0	153.08	114.71	130.78	161.97
1980-81	1 684.1	155.13	131.92	156.12	154.53
1981-82	2 559.4	156.44	141.55	187.20	157.65
1982-83	1 566.2	176.45	141.32	203.46	184.53
1983-84	3 605.6	163.77	150.00	219.41	170.56
1984-85	3 202.9	171.59	145.35	210.73	189.01
1985-86	2 719.4	168.21	149.87	213.89	179.97
1986-87	2 530.0	150.79	139.83	188.92	136.54
1987-88	2 035.0	163.56	144.29	193.46	156.70
1988-89	2 370.0	179.00	147.60	210.65	189.00

The Hon. PETER DUNN: That gives a very good indication of how much the wheat industry has become an important part of this nation's trading commodities. It is, and has been, the biggest export earner for Australia and indeed for South Australia. In fact, in South Australia it plays a more important part than do some of the other rural exports for the simple reason that we do not export coal or many other minerals from this State. At the moment wool is a higher export earner than wheat but in many cases, and certainly right through the 1970s, wheat was the biggest income earner for the State. It has served this State extremely well. Many of us owe our standard of living to the fact that wheat has been bringing into this State from the approximately two million tonnes that we grow each year a very large part of our export income.

It is interesting that very few farmers who grow wheat today can say that they reap the benefit of that income. Many of them are existing with very large debts, and that is very sad. Wheat has been a great employer in this State. Apart from the growers it also has employed people in ancillary industries: the fertiliser industry, the people who handle the grain through the grain bulk handling company, millers, bread manufacturers, and so on.

So other industries benefit, not least of all the machinery manufacturers of which South Australia was the principal manufacturer for wheat growing for many years. It tends to have faded away somewhat now. Under this Government's handling of industry in this State, machine manufacturing has fallen away. We have lost such long-standing names, people who led the industry and the Commonwealth. The Government is not able to encourage those people who led the industry, such as Horwood Bagshaw. They have kicked a number of primary producers and as a result there is not a very good home consumption market for the product made in South Australia. A lot of it has fallen over and we see the trouble experienced by John Shearer. We have lost David Shearer from Mannum who manufactures harvesting machinery for the wheat industry. It fell over under a Labor Government and so did Horwood Bagshaw. Its record is really quite remarkable when one goes back in history and looks at it and it is all to do with the wheat industry, which is still the State's biggest export income earner taking it over an average of 10 years. It just so happens that wool is biggest at the moment.

It is a pity that the Government has not been able to run the State better. As I have stated on many occasions, particularly during an interjection, I doubt whether the Government could run a kelpie dog show with much finesse and, if it did, it would probably finish up getting bitten. However, this Bill came into place after a royal commission by a South Australian, Jim McColl, who was the former Director of Agriculture in this State. A royal commission looked into grain handling in Australia and he determined, after a very long and exacting review of grain handling in Australia, that there could be some changes made and I agree with that, particularly in the Eastern States.

In South Australia it does not apply. South Australia has a relatively efficient handling and transporting industry and the reason for that is quite simply that nowhere else in Australia does wheat grow so close to the seaboard. If one looks in the Eastern States it is all grown inside the Blue Mountains. America has a similar problem and so has Europe. There is nowhere in America or in Europe where cereal grains are grown as close to the coast as in South Australia. In Yorke Peninsula and Eyre Peninsula cereal crops are grown right up to the cliff edge. Barley is grown in Yorke Peninsula and wheat in Eyre Peninsula. Therefore, our ports are very close to the source where wheat is grown, and the transport cost of that is relatively low. For example, the average price of transporting grain in South Australia is about $11. I have not checked on that figure recently but I know it is relatively accurate.

In New South Wales the average price is about $28. This gives some idea of how big an advantage South Australia has over the rest of the Commonwealth in growing grain. It does mean, however, that we have a number of ports that are shallow. Because of our coastline and big gulfs we do have relatively shallow ports such as Wallaroo, Port Pirie, Ardrossan and Port Adelaide. We only have one or two deep ports: Port Lincoln and Giles Point. This may have an effect later on but McColl made that point quite clear, that South Australia had an advantage. It was because of this report by McColl that the Federal Government stated that if we freed up the system we could expect farmers to choose how they sent their wheat to and from the ports.

They may wish to sell their wheat locally and therefore alleviate their responsibilities to pay for their wheat to be transported to the coast. It was because of that that the Federal Government decided to deregulate the industry and it is because of that that South Australia will gain much less from this deregulation of the wheat industry than other States. The reason is that we do not have to transfer it so far, and therefore there is not this saving. McColl indicated there was about a $6 saving by increasing efficiency, methods and systems of grain handling but that $6 is not available in South Australia. The Hon. Ron Roberts would know about the grain that goes into Port Pirie, being a member from Port Pirie. So there is not the advantage of deregulation in South Australia that there is in other States.

Another factor that indicates that there is not the advantage in South Australia of deregulation is that in the Eastern States there is a very well developed feed lot mechanism, that is, the feed lotting of beef, pigs, and poultry and it involves the use of high protein grains like wheat and all the other food grains, the other coarse grains, as they are called. The Eastern States, particularly Queensland around Toowoomba with its beef, the pig industry around Albury-Wodonga, and the poultry industry west of Sydney, take up considerable sums. In fact, about 10 per cent of the grain grown in South Australia goes into this mechanism. South Australia has not developed to this stage. We still have more free ranging beef and poultry. The pig industry is intensive in South Australia but it has not developed to the same degree as it has in the Eastern States, purely because we have fewer people.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: We were a free State and not convicts.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I guess that is true. This also has a compounding effect within the State particulary in Eyre Peninsula which is by far the biggest wheat producing area in this State. Its production per hectare is lower perhaps than anywhere in the State because of its low rainfall and low fertility but it certainly is the greatest producer of grain within the State, producing nearly 50 per cent in some years and certainly 40 per cent at other times.

In Eyre Peninsula there is not an intensive animal industry and because of that South Australia cannot make as much use of deregulation and the interchange of wheat between farmers and merchants and other producers as can the rest of Australia.

It is therefore reasonable to assume that we will gain less from deregulation of the internal wheat industry. I am not referring to the export industry as it is not under consideration in this Bill. The argument has been put quite clearly that it may in future lead to the export industry being looked at and consideration being given to whether the Wheat Board can become the sole distributor. It has the right to contract out the sale of wheat to other countries through whatever avenue it thinks is reasonable. In future that may happen.

That will be a sad day because we in South Australia suffer from the fact that we are further away from our export markets than any other State in the Commonwealth. Perth is some 1 500 nautical miles closer to its markets than is Adelaide, and so is Sydney. We will have to pay the extra freight, which can be up to $6 a tonne in today's prices, for ships to come to Port Lincoln or Port Adelaide and then go to Europe, America or the eastern countries. We have a disadvantage again. It would be sad for South Australia if the Australian Wheat Board lost its role of being able to spread the cost of its freight across Australia. We would suffer badly, and that is one of the greatest problems I see in the future.

The Hon. T.G. Roberts: What does John Elliott think?

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I have not spoken to Mr Elliott recently. The advantage of the Bill will be the flexibility that farmers and merchants will have and traders will be able to use within the State. As a farmer I will be able to sell my grain direct to a piggery or to somebody who wishes to use it within South Australia. That could be a miller or a merchant who might offer me a price which at the time might prove to be advantageous. For example, I may have a commitment to a bank at that time, whereas if I sell my wheat to the Wheat Board I am likely to be paid some months down the track.

In the early 1960s I can recall selling wheat and not being paid out until the early 1970s—up to 10 years after the wheat was delivered. This flexibility under the deregulated system would allow us to take cash, albeit at a discounted price. If one is paying a high interest rate on a pool of money, it may pay to take a lesser amount. Farmers will need to be more adept at reading world markets and determining whether grain prices will rise or fall, whether it will pay them to sell their grain today or hold it for six months. The bank manager may be on their back and need their money and may be hassling them. There is more flexibility with deregulation. That flexibility is countered by the arguments I have put, namely, that South Australia is at the greatest disadvantage in the Commonwealth.

The Wheat Board is changing its attitude and is indeed offering many payment options. Only a fortnight ago I received a letter from the Wheat Board giving me at least four or five options on how I wished to be paid out for the wheat. I could opt to have it paid out on delivery or within three or four weeks. I could opt to take half or to take nothing and be paid three or six months down the track or any other combination thereof. I have to determine whether I think that the Commonwealth bond rate interest is what I need in six months' time or whether I would be better to take the money and invest it in some other institution and get higher or lower interest.

Those commercial decisions fall back on the farmer, who will have to be more adept at reading the markets and understanding what is going on. Previously the Wheat Board did that. It pooled the wheat, sold it, got the maximum price, took out the costs and the return went to the grower. The grower had no choice on what price he received for his grain.

On a worldwide basis, Australia received very good value from the Wheat Board in the past. It will become a leaner Wheat Board because of this and will compete within the State as a seller of grain. It will compete with private merchants and have a lot of advantages purely because of its size. The receival of wheat for overseas export will be through the Cooperative Bulk Handling Company, owned by growers in this State. It has proved to be an excellent vehicle for handling grain. It was established in 1956. I delivered wheat to the first silos in my area in 1957 and have since been part owner in the operation. I give it the highest praise. It was the most efficient grain handling authority in Australia and that situation remains. It has upgraded its handling and holding facilities and indeed is a very good operation in this State. The Bill does not deal with that, but we should look at the Bulk Handling of Grain Act to allow it in future to become a trader in this State. I see no reason why it should not be a trader when the Wheat Board can become a trader, as can anybody who wishes to register and trade in wheat or coarse grain.

In conclusion, this matter has been brought forward and appears to be one-sided. I believe that the wharves need sorting out if we wheatgrowers have to take a cut and change our methods. It is time that the cost of handling this grain is looked at further afield. The wharves are where the rorts appear at first not to be. Certainly, the Bulk Handling Company has been very efficient, but I do not believe that the wharves have been. I refer to an article in the *Australian Rural Times*—a relatively new rural paper put out by Julian Cribb, a world renowned scribe in rural affairs in this country.

The article is by Greg Ansley and headed '$300 million bribe bid to get wharfies off the docks'. I will read the article into *Hansard* so that it is clear that we ought to be sorting out some of the costs over which farmers have had no control. They have been able to keep their bargain, but the wharves have not. The article states:

> Farm and other trading industries would be slugged $145 million to pay wharf labourers off the docks under water front reform proposals.
>
> Taxpayers would pay another $145 million in a deal that would give wharfies and average redundancy package of $160 000 each, see the immediate recruitment of 200 extra waterside workers and provide two pay rises in the next six months . . .

That is better than I get. In fact, I reckon that is better than the pilots are getting at the moment, or endeavouring to obtain. The article continues:

> A 55-year-old wharfie—

that is about my age—

> with 30 years' experience—

that is about the experience I have had—

would get 247 weeks redundancy pay, compared with an average for other industries of 13 weeks.

'It's bribing wharfies off the wharf!' said National Farmers Federation Executive Director, Mr Rick Farley.

The in-principle agreement by the Waterfront Industry Reform Authority was reached by stevedoring companies and unions. Exporters and importers who will pay the costs of the deal were excluded.

Mr Farley and NFP's director of Transport, Dr Peter Barnard, attacked 'cosy deals' between waterfront employers and unions.

The three-year agreement, which sprung from the inter-State commission's call for urgent waterside reform, still requires further negotiation in several areas, including a move to enterprise employment.

. . . It provides for site-by-site inspections of Australia's grain loading ports to determine such issues as separate manning levels and technologies, and maintains the Waterside Workers Federation monopoly on grain stevedoring.

What he is talking about is exactly the thing that I have been talking about. The article continues:

Mr Farley said the agreement and the earlier refusal to deregulate coastal shipping made him 'cynical and bitter' about the Government's commitment to micro-economic reform. 'The level playing field does not exist,' he said.

How right he is. They have deregulated the wheat industry, but they have not looked into the rorts that occur on the wharves, and wheat producers continue to pay for that.

However, for all the reasons to which I have referred, I think there is a case to proceed. I agree that South Australia will be the loser in the long term, but we cannot stand out in isolation. The argument has been won and lost Federally and because of that this State must allow the Australian Wheat Board to trade privately. It must be allowed to trade in competition with private grain resellers, and for that reason the Opposition supports the Bill.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT secured the adjournment of the debate.

DOG FENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 October. Page 1175.)

The Hon. PETER DUNN: This is a very small Bill. I will provide a brief history of the dog fence. The dog fence is almost 8 000 kilometres long and about 2 metres high, and I guess it is the longest, tallest barrier for animal or human activity within the Commonwealth. Years ago it comprised a series of fences, one inside the other. Today there is one main dog fence which is kept in relatively good condition, but it is a very expensive operation. The fence is designed to keep out, by its very name, wild dogs or, as they are more commonly known, dingoes, and that has a very unusual effect.

The fence allows farmers to run and range sheep in an area where there are very few dogs. It is interesting to note that a little property (the name of which escapes me at the moment) near Mount Willoughby, north of Coober Pedy, ran sheep and survived until a couple of years ago. It ran a couple of thousand sheep in an area outside the dog fence which traditionally was cattle country.

Cattle are less affected by dingoes. They do take some calves, but not very often. A strong cow can defend a calf quite easily, but sheep on their own cannot defend themselves. Consequently, dogs wreak havoc. It is known that one dog can kill up to 40 sheep in a night without much problem. Not only that, in many cases dingoes tear the wool and skin from the sheep that they are chasing, particularly around the shoulder and hindquarters, and they often get fly struck and die. However, dingoes also have a desirable effect in that they keep rabbits and kangaroos down. In fact, if one travels outside the dog fence, one will notice that there are certainly fewer kangaroos. They also keep rabbits under some sort of control, but in so doing they also attack sheep.

The dog fence has proven to be a very effective barrier against dogs. The fence is made of netting and fairly high posts. It is interesting to note that because of the problem with wombats experiments are being conducted with electric fencing, particularly in the far west of the State. Wombats dig holes under the fence which are then used by dogs. Wombats have a very great aversion to electric fences, and they are certainly proving to be very successful in that area. They are very successful in keeping wild dogs at bay as well. The dog fence needs maintenance and special care. It is high technology and needs particular people, so we need members on the board. The people who live just inside the fence are paid to patrol it on a regular basis and to assist in its maintenance. A specialist group of people also patrols the fence and looks after it.

A change in other legislation in South Australia affects the Dog Fence Act. The Vertebrate Pest Control Authority is now known as the Animal and Plant Control Commission and that change must be incorporated in the Dog Fence Act because the commission nominates a member to the Dog Fence Board. Not only that, but also a group has been formed in the far west, particularly around the area I have been talking about where the fence has been electrified. People from that area need to be appointed to the board, and that is covered in this Bill.

Each wool producer in the State now contributes towards the maintenance of the dog fence, and rightly so. I do not see why the people who live just inside it should bear the full brunt. It is a very expensive operation. A tremendous amount of money goes into it, and it is often used as a boundary fence. In fact, the McLachlans of Commonwealth Hill have some 200 miles of dog fence which they put up at their own cost. They look after it entirely on their own, and it is a very expensive operation. There are other areas of the State that have dingoes within the inside country, and I refer in particular to the Ngarkat Reserve (controlled by the Box Flat board) in the South-East. The people who surround that reserve often have trouble with dogs attacking their sheep. So, everybody pays to counteract the dog menace. It is not something that I have had a lot to do with, but I have seen the effect that dogs—not wild dogs, but dogs from cities and towns, particularly around Whyalla—have on a mob of sheep, and I understand the havoc they can cause. We support the Bill.

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

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 5)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 October. Page 1251.)

The Hon. PETER DUNN: The Opposition rejects this Bill, which it does not believe is necessary. It has nothing to do with the running of trucks, with the administration of safety or, for that matter, the supervision of heavy vehicles in this State. It is merely a money-raising measure. I would agree with the Bill if it was the only way that some money could be raised to pay for the inspection of these heavy vehicles to ensure that they were safe; I would have

no objection to that at all. However, when the State returns only 30 per cent of the money it raises from its fuel tax to road funding and operations within the transport division in this State, I have no sympathy for the Government when it wants to charge $150 annually to register these vehicles. Currently owners are charged $33, and I see nothing wrong with that. If the Government wishes to obtain money, then it should get it back from the fuel tax.

What about the Federal Government? It charges an enormous amount—about 60 per cent of the money one pays for a litre of fuel goes to Government taxes. In other words, when one pulls up at the bowser one is really pulling up at a taxing office: nothing more, nothing less. The Federal Government returns even less: it returns 20 per cent of it back to road funding and the administration of transport within this State.

The Opposition has no problems rejecting the Bill on that basis. If the Government wishes to raise money, it has avenues to do so. Why charge the carriers, because ultimately they will pass it on?. I, as a country person, will eventually pay for it. Unlike the situation that obtains in the city, I pay for my fertiliser to be delivered to my farm, and then I pay to transport my product from the farm to the port. So, I pay both ways. If there is an increase in the cost of road transport, I must pay more to get my product to and from the markets. For that reason, I believe the proposed $150 fee for commercial trailers (as it is called in the Bill) is an absolute rort.

This Government has done nothing but increase costs from the day it took office in 1983. It was interesting to listen to the Premier's speech prior to the 1983 election. Although he said that he would not increase costs, he was not in office five minutes when he was at it, and he is still at it. He has not improved. He has not learnt. All the Premier wants to do is get more money for building entertainment centres and fixing up in the city things that are not productive: they involve enjoyment and entertainment which people think are good for them. However, I doubt that very much.

The Australian Transport Advisory Council (the State and Commonwealth Transport Ministers' forum) initially discussed the Commonwealth Government's proposal recommending the introduction of a $400 heavy commercial trailer fee. It subsequently reduced that to $250. South Australia said, 'We will agree to an interim charge of $150.' In other words, it will go up later, anyway. I guess it will continue to go up and up. I understand that a fee of $2 000 was proposed initially to register one's trailer. That is very clever, because it got all the companies and road transport operators to think that they would have to pay a large bill to register their trailer. The Government then said, 'No, we will accept $400.' Then they said, 'No, it will be $250.' Then the State said that the fee would be $150. So, they have all grabbed it with open arms not realising what the end result would be. If costs continue to increase, it will be impossible to get one's goods to and from the capital cities. To be honest, Australia has large distances between cities, and it needs a safe, efficient transport system.

This fee was originally introduced because it was thought that it would cover all those operators who did not have prime movers. For example, Brambles, who are big transport operators in this country, may own a number of trailers that they employ or contract out to private entrepreneurs who may own prime movers. They hook onto the trailer and away they go. When one registers a truck in South Australia, one registers the prime mover and one trailer—whatever the weight is behind the trailer—and one pays a registration fee. The fee is about $33 for a trailer. However, the trailer can be unhooked and hooked onto another prime mover. That is what these private entrepreneurs do: they hook onto a trailer which may belong to Brambles, and they cart a load to Melbourne, Sydney or wherever and return the trailer with another load on it.

The argument is that the trailer is not registered and does not have third party insurance. So what? Why not add the third party insurance to the prime mover? It is not done for the simple reason that the prime mover, whilst it is in the yard, might be loaded. But, while it is not moving it causes no problem to anyone in the community. It does not need third party insurance on it. That is a load of rubbish. That argument does not stand up anywhere. It is not until the trailer is hooked onto the back of a prime mover that it becomes a hazard to anyone. I vehemently argue that all third party insurance ought to be attached to the prime mover. I made that clear about 10 days ago regarding cars, caravans and small trailers, and I believe it should also apply to commercial vehicles. The argument to have a $150 fee to register a trailer is really nothing but a fund-raising exercise by the Government, and the fee will primarily be paid by country people.

This State has introduced $150 as a registration fee, and I understand that other States have slightly different fees. For instance, Queensland's fee is currently $71. One can imagine what will happen: the truck operators will register their trailers in Queensland because it is only $71, or only half the South Australian fee. We will therefore miss out. I must admit that our fee is lower than those in Victoria and New South Wales, but for the life of me I cannot understand why we need it at all. The prime mover is the problem; that is what needs to be registered, and in my opinion whatever is pulled behind it does not need to attract a registration fee.

Just recently, a very nasty accident involving a semitrailer occurred in northern New South Wales. I assure the Council that this Bill has absolutely nothing to do with safety, but it has everything to do with money raising. The Bill that this Council passed last week concerned safety, inspection standards, and standards of care and maintenance of vehicles, but this Bill has nothing to do with that.

Compulsory third party insurance on a trailer is $14 at the moment. If that small amount was added to the registration fee, which is about $300 on average in South Australia, we would not have any problems and would not need this Bill at all. In fact, the Minister's second reading speech proves that it is a fund-raising operation. He said:

> The new prime mover fee will be equivalent on average to the fee currently applying to a rig.

In other words, it will be added on. The Minister went on to say:

> It was considered that such operators had been 'subsidised' for many years by paying a very low fee ($33), zero for rebated trailers. The vast majority of owners of multiple trailers will face total increased charges of much less than $2 000 per annum.

In other words, the fees will go up dramatically, and someone with a road train looks likely to pay an enormous amount of money. However, that is not where the fee stops. It will continue to be increased by regulation as each year passes. It will be found that it takes a little more money to carry out inspections and an increase in bureaucracy to go to the far flung areas of the State to inspect the vehicles. An increase will be required to fund those people. It will be argued that, if they are not funded, the system will go by the wayside. That is an absolute load of cobblers.

The Government receives an enormous amount of money at the moment through the fuel tax. I recall the then Attorney-General, when it was first introduced in 1974, saying that the tax of 2½ cents (in those days) would go back to

the administration of the road transport authorities in this State. The next time he introduced it, it went into consolidated revenue. From then on, smaller and smaller amounts went back to administering what legitimately the taxpayers pay for. However, this State Government does not care. It is really interested only in fundraising. It is money hungry and cannot help picking on people who cannot avoid this sort of tax. There is no way that one can avoid this sort of tax: if one must have one's product at a certain place one needs the transport system. The Government sees it as an easy way of taxing.

This Bill is nothing but a State taxation measure, so every time one pulls up at the bowser one is pulling up at a tax office. In addition, it must make one cry to think that one must pay, on top of that, to have the right to run a legitimate business and have a trailer on the back of one's truck.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The Council divided on the third reading:

Ayes (11)—The Hons T. Crothers, M.J. Elliott, M.S. Feleppa, I. Gilfillan, Anne Levy (teller), Carolyn Pickles, R.R. Roberts, T.G. Roberts, C.J. Sumner, G. Weatherill and Barbara Wiese.

Noes (10)—The Hons J.C. Burdett, M.B. Cameron, L.H. Davis, Peter Dunn (teller), K.T. Griffin, J.C Irwin, Diana Laidlaw, R.I. Lucas, R.J. Ritson and J.F. Stefani.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

Bill passed.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 October. Page 1302.)

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: The amendment to the Stamp Duties Act is consequential on the Motor Vehicles Act Amendment Bill (No. 5) which has just been debated. Naturally, the Opposition continues to oppose the legislation, and I indicate that the line taken by my colleague, the Hon. Mr Dunn, is also maintained in this instance. We oppose the Bill.

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

BUDGET PAPERS

Order of the Day: Government Business, No. 8:

Adjourned debate on the question:

That the Council take note of the papers relating to the Estimates of Payments and Receipts 1989-90.

(Continued from 28 September. Page 996.)

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE (Minister of Tourism): I move:

That this Order of the Day be discharged.

Order of the Day discharged.

SOIL CONSERVATION AND LAND CARE BILL

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.55 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 25 October at 2.15 p.m.