LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday 10 August 1983

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

QUESTIONS

WATER SUPPLIES

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Water Resources, a question about water supplies.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: On 12 May last year I asked a question concerning water supplies to various townships in the South-East that were endangered because of power failures during the Ash Wednesday bush fire. I received a letter from the Minister that indicated that an investigation is being conducted. However, I was concerned about the last paragraph, which stated:

> The investigation may determine a need to significantly improve water supply pumping security; howevever, it is virtually impossible and prohibitively expensive to achieve a water supply which is 100 per cent secure.

The forest townships of Tarpeena, Mt Burr and Nangwarry and, to a lesser extent, Glencoe and Kalangadoo (the forests are not so close to those townships) are constantly in danger during summer periods. That has been the case for years: it is nothing new. The danger is accentuated by the fact that these townships are surrounded by forests. Any person who has been to the South-East would know what I am talking about. It has been a matter of grave concern for a long time. A number of these townships now have the forests cleared from around them because the trees were destroyed on Ash Wednesday, and I hope that this time common sense will prevail and a larger area will be left clear around the townships to ensure greater security.

However, a situation similar to Ash Wednesday is likely to arise again in the future, and it was clear that on Ash Wednesday, from a very early stage of the fire, no water was available because of lack of power. This was a totally unacceptable situation, and it is important to provide as near as possible a 100 per cent secure water supply in the summer months in these townships. I do not accept that it is 'virtually impossible and prohibitively expensive' to achieve a 100 per cent secure water supply. The only reason there would not be a 100 per cent secure water supply would be that diesel engines, which I imagine would be supplied, failed to start, and that would be unusual.

I point out that the supply does not necessarily have to be a full supply. In many cases during the fire, even a rainwater tank was sufficient to save houses, although in some cases the tanks disappeared through wooden planks which caught fire. In the case of Kalangadoo, it is possible (as I pointed out) that the entire population, which were sheltering in the hotel, could have been wiped out, because the power was cut and there was no water supply.

It was a very difficult and dangerous situation which should not have been allowed to exist. Again, I say to the Minister that I am not implying that the present Government is responsible for that, but that now we should learn from those problems. I ask the Minister again to look at this question, to look at the paragraph in this letter, to ensure that it does not become dominant in the thinking of the investigative team, and to give an assurance that in these endangered towns a secure water supply will be provided in the near future.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will refer the Hon. Mr Cameron's question to the Minister of Water Resources and bring back a reply.

MEDICARE FUNDING

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: Following the conference of Ministers of Health, is the Minister of Health able to say that the committed Commonwealth funding for Medicare is such that he can give an unqualified assurance that there will be no cuts in health jobs or services?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: We have not yet finalised the financial arrangements with the Commonwealth Government. We are well down the track and those negotiations have been proceeding to date with a good deal of co-operation. I am meeting with the Federal Minister (Dr Blewett) personally again in the near future. I hope that as a result of that meeting I will be able to take a recommendation to my Cabinet colleagues which will finally seal the renegotiation of the financial arrangements. What we have to consider here and be very careful about is that Medicare as such is essentially a system of universal health insurance. The renegotiation of the financial agreements between the Commonwealth and the States, on the other hand, should be seen as a separate, although quite obviously closely related, issue. As I say, I have been impressed by the spirit of co-operation which has been shown by the Commonwealth.

A few details are to be worked out. What I can say with regard to the 1983-84 Budget in general terms (so as not to pre-empt any details, which would be quite improper) is that we would certainly not anticipate any staff cuts. In 1983-84 it will be essentially a stand-still situation, remembering, of course, that at 30 June 1983 about 300 more people were employed in the health area than there were at 30 June 1982, so that the Government's commitment to stop further cuts in both staff and resources in the health area is not only being met but has been exceeded to the extent that those 300 additional jobs were there at 30 June 1983.

R.A.H. SURGICAL SESSIONS

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question about R.A.H. surgical sessions.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: In recent weeks there have been press reports of cuts in surgical sessions at the R.A.H., although I have been informed that some of these cuts may have been restored. I recall that the Minister, when in Opposition, was a champion of the cause of clinical services and was always ready to criticise the slightest cut in services at all.

I recall that in another answer to a question in this session the Minister referred to seasonal pressures related to winter respiratory illnesses in regard to waiting times for elective surgery. If that is correct, we should see waiting lists revert to their previous state very shortly, unless of course the cuts are significant and the Minister's part explanation was incomplete. That remains to be seen.

I recall hearing Drs Deeble and Scotton, prior to the introduction of Medibank Mk I, and these gentlemen explained the theory of the queue. They explained the necessity to prohibit or discourage private health insurance so that the shift of work load from private to public sector would produce the pressure of a queue. In this way, according

to Drs Deeble and Scotton, the pressure of a queue would cause the development of a form of rationing of medical services, thus benefiting the Government by cost containment. My questions are as follows:

1. Does the responsibility for cutting surgical sessions at R.A.H. rest with the hospital administrator, with the Minister or with the Health Commission?

2. What cuts have since been restored?

3. What, if any, is the net reduction of surgical sessions at R.A.H.?

4. Will the Minister give an absolute assurance that there will be no residual long-term extension of surgical waiting lists after seasonal respiratory infections have returned to normal incidence levels?

5. Have any visiting medical officers offered to extend their sessions for no payment or for a nominal honorarium?

6. What would be the Minister's attitude to such an offer?

7. Will the Minister assure this Council that he is not putting into effect the Deeble and Scotton theory of the queue?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I do not take shorthand, so I cannot respond to those seven questions *seriatim* in great detail.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: Would you like a copy?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Yes.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: We'll give you five minutes!

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I do not need a time limit: I am absolutely on top of the portfolio.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: They are at it again, Mr President. Call them into gear.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Stop provoking yourself.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Do you think that they will be coming—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think that the Minister should start to reply. That will make a difference.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: My recall of the press reports of cuts at Royal Adelaide Hospital is not good at all. I do not recall that specifically, although I do know that each hospital plays its own politics in its own way from time to time. Indeed, most of them are fairly good at it. The one thing that has amazed me since I became Minister is that the medical politics of this town are a good deal more vicious in some instances than those played between the Liberal Party and the Labor Party; sometimes they make us look like amateurs.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: What about the behaviour of the Liberal Party and the National Party?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: That is quite another matter. The increases in waiting times for elective surgery are, as the member rightly observed, a seasonal thing. In fact, there was a front page story in the first edition of today's *News* about a respiratory syncytial virus, which is putting additional stress on Adelaide Children's Hospital and Flinders Medical Centre, in particular. These sorts of respiratory things are a normal phenomenon in winter. This particular outbreak seems to be more severe than we normally encounter but, nonetheless, it is within that sort of range.

Regarding the alleged increase in waiting times for elective surgery and so-called cuts, our promise in a pre-election situation was that we would stop any further cuts in our major public hospitals, in particular, and we met that undertaking within three weeks of coming into Government by topping up the budgets of the teaching hospitals by about $4 000 000. As I said, the total number of persons employed in those hospitals at 30 June 1983 was 300 more—*vis-a-vis* the position at 30 June 1982.

There is no question of cuts. We have met our promises in that respect. It is very much a matter for hospital administrations regarding how they handle that money and how they play politics on that.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: So you do not have a policy of reducing the number of surgical sessions?

The Hon J.R. CORNWALL: Certainly not. I said in this Chamber recently, and I repeat, that the time has come when we must try to run the large major hospitals at an average bed occupancy rate of around 85 per cent. That will inevitably mean that there will be some deferrals of elective surgery. However, we cannot afford to idle along with an average bed occupancy rate of 65 per cent to 70 per cent so it will never be necessary to defer any elective surgery. There is certainly some difference with the waiting time for elective surgery between the major hospitals. Flinders Medical Centre is, I concede, under more stress than the other teaching hospitals. I will now answer the honourable member's questions specifically and succinctly. Question 1: does the responsibility for cutting surgical sessions at the Royal Adelaide Hospital rest with the hospital administrator, the Minister or the Health Commission? I am not aware specifically that surgical sections have been cut. I would have to see documented proof of that happening. I will be making inquiries of the Royal Adelaide Hospital management particularly, and the administrator, about this matter. However, the question of how money is allocated overall and how the internal affairs of hospital are conducted is, to a large extent, a matter for the hospital itself, provided that those decisions are taken within the overall framework of Government policy.

The second question related to which cuts had since been restored. I notice that in the honourable member's written question the word 'cuts' is in inverted commas. As I said previously, there was a general top-up of $4 000 000, but how that was allocated I cannot say specifically. However, there is no reason at all why there should have been cuts in any particular area. The third question was, 'What, if any, is the net reduction of surgical services at the Royal Adelaide Hospital?' I am unable to answer that question.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: I do not know the answer, either. That is a very genuine question.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: If, in fact, this has occurred, I will want to know why. If it occurred before the report of the Sax committee of inquiry, which specifically considered all these areas and allocations of resources to units within hospitals, then I will want to know a good deal more than simply why: I would be asking some serious questions indeed.

The fourth question is: was whether the Minister would give absolute assurances that there would be no residual long-term extension of surgical waiting lists after seasonal respiratory infections had returned to normal incidence levels? Nothing in the world is absolute. Ministerial assurances in this case are not able to be absolute. I am reminded by this question of the three great lies of our time. 'My cheque is in the mail' is the first great lie; 'I will still love you in the morning' is the second; and the third is, 'I am from the Government: you can trust me'. I am not about to give an absolute assurance in this matter, but I certainly anticipate that there should not be any extention of surgical waiting lists in the long term. If there were any movement in that direction, I would want to know why. The fifth question was whether any visiting medical officers have offered to extend their sessions for no payment or for a nominal honorarium? The day-to-day conduct of each of the 150 health units for which I am responsible is not something in which I get involved. However, if there was any suggestion that these people wanted to make these offers I would be prepared, if the hospital board of management brought the matter to my attention, to consider the matter, which answers

question No. 6. Question No. 7 was, 'Will the Minister assure this House that he is not putting into effect the Deeble and Scotton theory of the queue?' Quite frankly, I do not think that that question is worth answering.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN SPORTS INSTITUTE

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Recreation and Sport, a question about the South Australian Sports Institute.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I noticed recently that the Minister of Recreation and Sport has appointed two more members to the South Australian Sports Institute Board. The two new members are both women who have shown outstanding achievements in the sporting area. I was pleased to see such an increased representation of women on the Sports Institute Board which, until then, had been remarkably lopsided.

I am also aware that the Sports Institute is proud of the fact that during its brief history it has awarded sports scholarships to 120 different individuals from 26 different sports. Will the Minister ascertain how many of the 120 individuals who have benefited from these scholarships are men and how many are women and how many of the 26 different sports that have benefited are male sports and how many are female sports, so that Parliament may be able to judge whether the increased membership of women on the board was indeed extremely necessary?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I will be pleased to refer the honourable member's questions to my colleague, the Minister of Recreation and Sport, and bring down a reply.

TOBACCO SPONSORSHIP

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: My question to the Minister of Health concerns sponsorship by tobacco companies. In reply to a question asked by the Hon. Anne Levy in this Council on 3 May, the Minister stated that he intended recommending to Cabinet that he write to all sporting and cultural organisations in South Australia to ascertain the extent of sponsorship by tobacco companies. As three months have now elapsed since the Minister outlined that intention, I ask whether he received authority to seek such information from these organisations. If so, has he received any responses from those bodies? Is he able to advise the Council of the extent of tobacco company sponsorship in this State?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The Hon. Miss Laidlaw's recollection is perfectly correct: I told the Council on 3 May that I intended recommending to Cabinet that I write to all sporting and cultural organisations seeking details of the degree of sponsorship that they received from tobacco companies. I subsequently did that and referred a report to my Cabinet colleagues. I also wrote a letter, which was reproduced in the *Advertiser* (as a public document) shortly afterwards, to ensure that every sporting organisation in this State, large, small or middling, and any other cultural organisation in receipt of tobacco company money would be aware of what we were about.

The responses have been disappointing. I cannot provide the honourable member with the exact figures at the moment. In fact, it was only early this week that I went through the responses and handed them on for final processing so that I might be able to inform the Council and other interested parties of the extent of the responses received. From the responses that came in I recollect that a total of about $768 000 was accounted for in the previous 12 months.

However, several major organisations did not have the courtesy to forward a reply. Several other organisations replied and said that it was none of my damn business or the Government's business (they did not use those words, but that was the implication). At the moment, I am in the process of collecting and collating the names of those organisations that have responded, those that have not responded and those responses that are still outstanding.

In fact, two quite major organisations come to mind that have either stated that they would not co-operate or have not responded. That is most unfortunate, of course, to put it mildly, because what they are trying to do is fly in the face of reality. I do not have the slightest doubt that at some stage in the next decade, not necessarily in my time, the ongoing push to restrict advertising, whether through corporate sponsorship or otherwise, will become overwhelming. It would be very much in the interests of these organisations, I suggest, to co-operate in a friendly sort of way. Those that do not see fit to do so at this stage are doing themselves and their supporters no favour at all.

The $768 000 that is accounted for would suggest (and this is very much a rough estimate) that the $1 500 000 that has been talked about as the extent of the sponsorship in South Australia is probably somewhere near the mark. I will be very pleased to supply full details of that response for the honourable member and the Council in the reasonably near future.

FLINDERS RANGES

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, a question about exploration in the Flinders Ranges National Park.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: When announcing Cabinet approval for the Department of Mines and Energy to conduct exploration within the Flinders Ranges National Park on 11 May this year, the Government avoided one of the major requirements of the National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1972-1981, that any exploration in a national park can proceed only after a 'proclamation is made in pursuance of a resolution passed by both Houses of Parliament', and notice of motion to this effect must be given at least 14 days before the resolution is passed. The only reason the Government avoided this action was that the Act does not contain a provision that binds the Crown, but that provision is included in the Coast Protection Act.

The Minister responsible in the other House gave an assurance, which I believe was unsatisfactory, that the Government has already established a track record where matters of principle conflict with development. Having noted the Government's response to Roxby Downs, where principle was in conflict with development, I find that I am still very much disturbed. Further, in the same speech, the Minister stated that at this stage mining, even subject to the most stringent environmental controls, would not be contemplated within the Flinders Ranges National Park unless issues of State or national interest were paramount, for example, as the last resort to maintain the livelihoods of the people of Port Pirie.

What justification does the Government have for exempting the Department of Mines and Energy from the consideration by Parliament of its exploratory activities that would apply to the private sector? As the work is being carried out at the request of B.H.P. (as stated in the speech made in the other place), with a commitment being made by B.H.P.

to cover costs, will the Government indicate how much work has been done, at what cost, and how much B.H.P. has paid to cover that cost? Secondly, will the Government give an unequivocal undertaking not to mine in the Flinders Ranges National Park, and, if it will not, for what reason?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Hon. Mr Gilfillan, in his explanation, cast some reflections on this Government. I believe he said that, wherever development has conflicted with principle, the Government has gone for development, and his evidence for this was that the Government allowed the Roxby Downs project to proceed. I point out that the Roxby Downs project was entirely consistent with A.L.P. policy and, in fact—

The Hon. C.M. Hill: That is why you voted against it?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: In fact, it was one of the issues—

The Hon. C.M. Hill: You opposed it and voted against it.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Hill must not interject.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That was one of the issues on which we received our mandate from the people of this State. Therefore, I reject totally the statement (it was more than an implication) made by the Hon. Mr Gilfillan that this Government chose development ahead of principle when there was a conflict. Certainly, that is not true. Details of the questions asked by the honourable member will have to be supplied by the appropriate Minister, and I would be pleased to refer the honourable member's questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

WHEAT RESEARCH

The Hon. H.P.K. DUNN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Agriculture a question about funding of wheat research.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H.P.K. DUNN: In mid-July, the Federal Government stated that its contribution to wheat industry research would be cut by 8.6 per cent to $3 380 000 in response to the lower levies collected from the industry due to drought. These funds, which are added to the grower levies, are then handed back to State wheat committees for distribution to research projects.

As there is a decrease in this year's overall funds, it has been stated that there will be no new research projects and there will have to be cutbacks in the present research programmes. In the light of this, the wheat industry has recommended to the Federal Minister for Primary Industry that the grower tax be raised from 25c to 30c a tonne with a corresponding Government increase in the matching levy. The Federal Minister's reply was that, because of budgetary restraints, the priority for Government funding in this regard would be down the list.

As the wheat industry has such an influence on the nation's economy and as the sum sought is quite small in Federal Budget terms, will the Minister use his influence to have the Federal Minister for Agriculture accept the industry recommendation of 30c per tonne tax for research purposes and have Treasury match the industry funds dollar for dollar? Will the Minister also say which wheat research projects have been cut in South Australia, and which proposed projects have been shelved due to lack of funds?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The facts as stated by the Hon. Mr Dunn are essentially correct; obviously I read the same article as did the honourable member. My memory coincides with his. First, I will take up with Mr John Kerin the industry's suggestion regarding what should be done about a possible increase in the levy. I will do that in about 25 minutes—one cannot be quicker than that.

Regarding the second part of the question, I do not have with me details of any projects that have been deferred or cut back, but I will try to ascertain that information and give the Hon. Mr Dunn the results of that investigation.

HANSARD

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking you, Mr President, a question about *Hansard.*

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I notice that the first copy of the *Hansard* for the session has been placed on our benches this afternoon. The front cover states that it is the *Hansard* volume for 4, 9, 10 and 11 August 1983.

I realise that there is a certain predictability in the debates in this Chamber, but seeing that it is only 10 August at the moment it strikes me as somewhat incongruous that we should have a *Hansard* which purports to inform us what we will say tomorrow as well as the rest of the afternoon. Could you investigate this rather strange clairvoyance on the part of *Hansard*?

The PRESIDENT: I will certainly make an investigation for the honourable member, and I am sure that someone will explain the reason for the mistake.

PUBLIC FUNDING

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health, representing the Attorney-General, a question about public funding.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It has been Labor policy for some time to introduce public funding, together with public disclosure of sources of political funds. Members will be aware that public funding, together with public disclosure, has been instituted in recent years in New South Wales. I was interested to read in the April edition of the student newspaper, *On Dit*, a statement by the Attorney-General's office which appears to take the matter a little further than I understood the situation to be. I quote from Michael Jacobs, a spokesperson for the Attorney-General:

> In the longer term, the State Government intends to introduce public financing of election campaigns, disclosure of sources of political funds, limits on the size of donations and the naming of parties on ballot papers. 'These things are on the list—

that is, of actions for Government—

> but not on next week's list.

My understanding of the New South Wales legislation certainly is that it is limited to public funding and to public disclosure, but that there is not a restriction on the size of the donation that is or can be made by anyone or any body to a political Party. As long as they are prepared to disclose it, they can give as much money as they like, whether they be unions or corporate bodies. My questions are:

1. Will legislation on public funding and public disclosure be introduced by the State Government in this session?
2. Does the statement by Michael Jacobs, the spokesperson for the Attorney-General, reflect State Government policy?
3. Will the Government be legislating to limit the size of donations to political Parties in South Australia?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The Labor Party's attitude to these matters was spelt out quite clearly prior to the last election. The general policy is well known to the honourable member and to everybody else. The timing of the legislation and the other matters that the honourable member raised

are not within my knowledge. They are quite obviously matters which can be answered in any detail and with any real responsibility only by the Attorney-General, who has a pair today and is absent on quite legitimate business. I will be very pleased to refer the honourable member's question to the Attorney and make sure that he gets a very prompt reply.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ENTERPRISE FUND

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health, representing the Treasurer, a question about the South Australian Enterprise Fund.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Honourable members will remember that the two key economic proposals of the Labor Party at the last State election related to the Ramsay Trust and the South Australian Enterprise Fund. We already are aware of the fate of the Ramsay Trust, but there remains some interest in the South Australian Enterprise Fund.

The Labor Party first developed the notion of the South Australian Enterprise Fund at its November 1981 Convention. No less a person than a present Federal Minister (Hon. Mr Hurford) seconded the motion, which required the State Government Insurance Commission, the South Australian Superannuation Fund and the State Bank to purchase shares in the fund.

The South Australian Enterprise Fund next had an airing in the South Australian Labor Party economic policy released in May 1982, which stated that the fund would 'marshall capital resources to facilitate the development of industry within South Australia', with funds drawn from the private and public sectors.

We next heard about the South Australian Enterprise Fund with the delivering of the Labor Party policy speech on 25 October 1982, in which the following was stated:

> As a first step we will establish the South Australian Enterprise Fund to assist the expansion of industry.

It is now over nine months since the Labor Government was elected, but there is still no enterprise fund.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Is this relevant to the honourable member's explanation?

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: It is, Sir.

The PRESIDENT: I accept that.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: We heard from the Hon. Mr Sumner that he expected an announcement about the matter of the enterprise fund to be made as soon as possible in the new year. That was in mid-December. We heard in answer to a question by the Hon. Mr Cameron that the enterprise fund would be certainly with us before the end of June 1983 and that announcements regarding the precise structure and nature of the fund's activities would be made as and when appropriate.

However, in the Governor's Speech outlining the Government's legislative programme, the priority of the enterprise fund had been downgraded yet again. We heard that it is expected to be implemented before the end of the financial year. The delay in the introduction of the enterprise fund has occurred, presumably, because the concept will not work.

I have had it on good authority that the Premier and Treasurer has been told both by Treasury officials and businessmen that it will not work. It is generally recognised by the financial community that the South Australian Enterprise Fund, as outlined by the Labor Party, is a financial lemon. Indeed, the Government is scrambling to save face by now asking businessmen how it can get the enterprise fund off the ground in some way. Will the Treasurer confirm:

1. That Treasury officials have advised him that the enterprise fund as proposed will not work?
2. If the enterprise fund is eventually launched, it will not offer shares to South Australians as proposed, nor will it trade on the Stock Exchange?
3. If it is funded by moneys from such instrumentalities as the State Government Insurance Commission, the State Superannuation Investment Trust and the State Bank, this will only be done at the expense of existing projects?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I will not attempt to respond in any detail to those questions, obviously. I must say that it distresses me beyond all reason that just at a time when there are emerging signs of a fragile recovery the Hon. Mr Davis tries to denigrate the efforts of the Government on behalf of all South Australians to try to assist that recovery. We have seen politics of that sort for too long in this State, and it is about time that people like the Hon. Mr Davis lifted their game above the level of knocking and schoolboy debating. I must say that the kindergarten antics of the great white hope who still sits on the back bench never fail to distress me. However, I do not want to get political in these matters. I will be pleased to take those questions to the Treasurer and bring back a series of replies as soon as it is reasonably possible to do so.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. C.M. HILL: Can the Minister of Health say when the Government's inquiry into mental health services began? When does the Minister expect that the inquiry will complete its task? Further, what is the approximate cost of that inquiry to the State and, finally, is the Government deferring decisions on all matters relative to mental health pending that report?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I cannot recall the precise date. It was fairly early in my stewardship (and I do not stake my political future on my recollection) but I recollect that Dr Smith and Mr Unsworth arrived from the United Kingdom in April. They were joined by Dr Bob Kosky, Deputy Director-General of Mental Health Services in Western Australia, some time later and that whole team was subsequently joined by Dr Bob Newman from the Beth Israel Medical Centre, New York, for about two weeks.

I talked to members of that inquiry on at least three occasions, the last of which I can remember clearly being when they had completed their formal inquiry and were about to depart our fair city. I have seen the draft preliminary recommendations only at this time. However, the report has been completed and, as I understand it, it is currently with the Policy and Projects Division of the South Australian Health Commission. At the committee's request, the division is writing an additional chapter on priorities and funding in co-operation with committee members. I understand that the report should be in my hands by the end of August, and I anticipate that it will be a public document not later than about mid-September.

As to deferring decisions on all matters pending the report, that is not so. I find that I have plenty to do in taking decisions in the area of mental health services, as in all other health services, but there are some specific and important areas in which decisions will not be taken until the Smith Report has been endorsed and noted by Cabinet and released as a public document. Of course, some of these will include the future role and functions of the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board, for example, and whether it should continue in its present form or be included in the general upgrading that I am anxious to see happen in the alcohol and drug services area; perhaps it would be

more appropriate for it to be restructured in various ways and its current policies modified.

Some of these matters have been canvassed in public already. For example, the future of Willis House is a matter on which there will be specific recommendations, as I understand it. The future of the Enfield complex is another matter about which I understand there will be a specific recommendation. So, in those areas where I anticipate specific recommendations we will certainly be keeping our powder dry until the report has been circulated, until we have had public input on it, and until I have been able to get specific recommendations to Cabinet. In regard to deferring decisions on all matters, that is neither practical nor desirable, and we certainly have not done that.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: What about the approximate cost?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I can give only an approximation at this stage as I have not seen the most recently available figures. My best recollection is that it is about $70 000.

CELL THERAPY

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: The Council may be aware, as a result of articles in the press, of recent discussions regarding the use of cell therapy in the treatment of the brain injured. I have been contacted by the F.B.I. (Friends of the Brain Injured)—an association in South Australia. For some time this organisation has strongly supported the use of this therapy, particularly for sufferers from Down's syndrome, but also for those with other brain injuries. The Friends of the Brain Injured have contacted both the Federal and State Ministers of Health seeking approval for the importation into Australia of the material used in the cell therapy treatment. In most cases the patients concerned have, at the expense of their families, travelled to Germany for treatment by Professor Schmidt, the main proponent of the therapy. These people have returned to Australia, but it has not been possible to have the material used in the treatment brought to Australia. To date, as a result of approaches to the two Ministers, they have had little satisfaction and, in the case of the Federal Minister, their correspondence has been ignored.

In November last year Professor Schmidt visited South Australia as a guest of the Friends of the Brain Injured and lectured audiences on the therapy that he employs. I might add that Professor Schmidt did not charge either for his lectures or for the contact that he had with a number of parents of brain-injured children. I am advised by Friends of the Brain Injured that about 100 cases are being treated in South Australia and that the parents of these patients are becoming increasingly frustrated at the intransigence of the health authorities in preventing this treatment from being recognised.

In regard to Dr Blewett, he has stated that he has not met Professor Schmidt. In fact, I am advised that he did have a long conversation with him in South Australia. I suppose that it is just as well that Dr Blewett did not make that denial in Parliament although, in the light of current events, he would not have resigned anyway. I am advised that the Hon. Dr Cornwall, in his most recent reply to the Friends of the Brain Injured, simply and dogmatically (as is his practice) claims that Down's syndrome is untreatable and, therefore, he does not see any merit in allowing the therapy to be carried out in South Australia.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: Intellectual arrogance—you can only practise it if you have the input.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I would not like to be arrogant in any way—intellectually or otherwise. The point I make is that I am not qualified, and neither can the Minister himself be qualified, to judge the efficacy or otherwise of this kind of treatment. What I am talking about is the matter of consultation. I am not saying that the treatment is effective or that the material should forthwith be allowed into Australia. I am saying that there ought to be a more satisfactory form of consultation with a substantial group of concerned parents who really do have problems but who can really expect help from the health authorities. My questions are as follows:

1. Has the Minister consulted with any parents of the children being treated or who have been treated in this way and who strongly believe that there have been improvements in their children (they do believe that)?

2. If not, will he receive a deputation of parents and accept the evidence they put to him of such improvements?

3. Is the Minister aware that Professor Schmidt has been operating in Germany for nearly 35 years and that his cell therapy treatment is accepted practice in that country?

4. Given this fact, does the Minister agree that claims by the Federal Health Minister, Dr Blewett, that this substance has been banned pending proof of safety is a foolish response, as over 30 years evidence is obviously available?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I will answer the last question first regarding the totally indecent slurs cast upon my colleague the Federal Minister of Health, Dr Neal Blewett.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: The great medical man.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: He has a Ph.D. and is a former Rhodes Scholar. What a lovely anti-intellectual approach from the cocky on the front bench.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: What's wrong with cockies?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: There is nothing at all wrong with farmers and graziers as a group.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: There are, however, strange individual cockies from the South-East who find their way into politics.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister is only provoking the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I must tell the Hon. John Burdett that, if this material was imported, there would be a serious risk of introducing foot and mouth disease, because the material is an extract of calf brain. Therefore, I suggest he ask his rural colleagues, including the Leader of the Opposition in this place and the President, whether they would be happy about this product being imported. I wonder what is the attitude of the Opposition spokesman on health to this matter. He seems to be all over the place. He made all sorts of claims initially and then put forward all sorts of disclaimers, so we do not know what his attitude is. However, we do know the attitude of the previous Minister of Health and the attitude of the Tonkin Government, which was similar to the attitude of the present Government, that there is no virtue in the idea.

The previous Government was acting on the advice of very much the same people who advised me. That advice is that there is no evidence whatever to suggest that there is any value at all in cell therapy for brain injury. Also, there is no evidence at all that there is any value in cell therapy for people suffering from Down's syndrome. It is my view, based on the very best evidence available (and within the South Australian medical fraternity the advice available is so expert as to be almost formidable), and the unanimous verdict of everybody who has advised me, that this whole matter is a cruel hoax.

I have spoken to a small number of parents and have said to them consistently that I would be pleased to have senior medical officers in the commission, our universities and the medical community generally assess the world literature. I have suggested to them that they get hold of Professor Schmidt and do what is always done in these cases—produce the evidence. If Professor Schmidt has been into this business of cell therapy for 35 years and if, in fact, as he claims, it has value, then in the normal course of events, as Dr Ritson would well know, it would have been documented in world literature and challenged or replicated by other work around the world. In fact, that has not happened. My answer remains the same: when people can produce from Professor Schmidt, or anybody else, evidence that this method is effective in any way then I will be perfectly happy to further consider the matter. Until such time as Professor Schmidt, or any of his associates, can do that, frankly I have better things to do, as had the previous Minister of Health and the previous Government.

I see no special point at this stage in receiving a deputation about this matter, but if people want to come and see me I have an open-door policy. I am arguably the most accessible Minister of Health to ever operate in this State. I spend many hours of every day receiving deputations and speaking to individuals, as I have told members of this Chamber before. My telephone number is publicly listed so that I can be rung at home, and I am rung at home from time to time. Therefore, there really is no problem.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: No wonder Dunstan called him the 'charisma kid'.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I am no longer a kid, but I have retained the charisma.

ETHNIC TELEVISION

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I move:

That in the opinion of this Council—

1. There is urgent need for ethnic television to be provided in South Australia to benefit not only the ethnic and migrant communities, but the people generally, and strong public opinion on the question has been evidenced by a street march, protest meeting, and other means, and fears have been expressed that the previous Fraser Liberal Government's approved plan for Channel 0/28 to serve Adelaide in the 1983-84 year will not now be pursued by the Hawke Labor Government despite Labor Party policy.
2. In view of this uncertainty, the Hawke Labor Government be acquainted with this strong public feeling, and the particular resentment due to the fact that citizens of Sydney and Melbourne have enjoyed Channel 0/28 since 1980, and people here deserve and demand equality with their fellow interstate Australians.
3. The Premier be asked to convey the substance of this motion to the Prime Minister so that the necessary action to dispel these fears can be taken, and the service provided in the 1983-84 year.

I hope that this motion receives the unanimous support of the Council. This issue generally has spanned a long period. The plan announced last year for ethnic television to come to South Australia appears to be in some danger. There is a strong groundswell of public opinion within this State demanding that this service be provided. I think that honourable members should be made aware that this matter is not an issue for migrants alone. We are not merely dealing with ethnic television for South Australia for ethnic communities but dealing with the entry of multi-cultural television to South Australia for the benefit of all South Australians.

When I say 'all South Australians' I mean the people here of Anglo-Saxon descent, people such as Aboriginal groups and the huge volume of post-Second World War migration in the community. As well, there are the relatively recent refugee arrivals from such regions as Indo-China. I make the point strongly that multi-cultural television is a service which should be provided for all people within this State. As with most proposals of this nature, the question of cost invariably arises. I have ascertained from press reports over the past couple of years that the cost of bringing ethnic television to South Australia will be approximately $700 000 to $1 000 000. Figures within those margins have been recorded.

The estimated annual cost of maintaining the channel in this State is between $250 000 and $400 000. Ethnic television is a Government service. When one considers that the Federal Government seems to be content to carry a deficit of about $8 billion, one realises that figures of the nature that I have mentioned to provide the service in this State are not large amounts at all. I will not go over the advantages of ethnic television for South Australia or the reasons for bringing it here, because we are not debating an issue that has arisen in the first instance. This is a service that has been established in other capital cities since 1980. I am referring to the extension of ethnic television to this State.

Ethnic television would bring great benefits to migrants in this State, and one must remember that 25 per cent of Australia's population is of non-British extraction (that figure was published in 1982). Of the nation's 14 000 000 people, 3 500 000 arrived here after 1945. More than 700 000 children in this country have a first language which is not English, and about 90 different languages are spoken in this country. Most migrants have a good command of the English language. However, that is no argument at all for expecting migrants to forget or do away with the language of their birthplace.

Ethnic television provides migrants with essential information about Australia. Without that information migrants are disadvantaged in the work place, in education, in recreation and in many other ways. In other words, ethnic television would provide migrants with the opportunity to fully participate in our way of life in this State. Without any doubt at all, migrants are entitled to an equal opportunity to participate in all areas in this State. The fulfilment of economic and social aspirations by watching ethnic television does not, as some people believe, alienate migrants as a separate group from the rest of the community. Indeed, when one thinks about the situation one must accept that ethnic television provides migrants with advantages which enable them to fully participate in our society.

Ethnic television provides migrants with psychological advantages, self-esteem and dignity, and it plays a worthy part in reducing tensions within the community. As I have said, this service would not only benefit the ethnic community. I have witnessed ethnic television in Melbourne and Sydney and I strongly believe that it provides the host population with many benefits. Ethnic television gives members of the host population the opportunity to see and enjoy the cultures, lifestyles, racial characteristics and the languages of the community around them. Ethnic television could provide the South Australian Film Corporation with more work. Our film corporation is one of the leading producers of films in this country. The extension of ethnic television not only to Adelaide but also outside the present system in Australia will require more programming and more films, and some of them could be made in Australia. In other words, ethnic television is not simply a medium for overseas programmes and films, because it could include films of an ethnic nature and also films made in Australia. I believe that the extension of ethnic television to this State would provide the South Australian Film Corporation with more work, and that would be a good thing for the corporation and for South Australia as a whole.

Some studies have already been conducted in relation to the effect of ethnic television in Melbourne and Sydney. It

is not a question of something about which we have no practical knowledge. It has been claimed that ethnic television helps the host population to better understand ethnic communities and that it helps migrants to adapt to the Australian way of life. I believe that these proven advantages must not be overlooked when this question is considered. Of course, it can be claimed quite fairly that South Australians have been subsidising the ethnic television service that has been operating in Melbourne and Sydney, because the ethnic television channel is subsidised by revenue from the Commonwealth, and that revenue is obtained from the taxpayer. Of course, that state of affairs is not very fair.

An estimate provided by the Audience Research Section of the A.B.C. states that every domestic television set is switched on in Australian homes between five and six hours daily. Therefore, Australians, whether or not they are migrants, watch television for long periods. I have briefly mentioned some of the advantages that ethnic television would bring to South Australia. The real problem confronting this State at this stage is that the proposal for the establishment and extension of channel 0/28 included a plan to bring the service to this State. That plan seems to be in danger of collapse.

Channel 0/28 was launched on 24 October 1980 in Sydney and Melbourne. It went through a fairly difficult initial period of 12 months, with reception difficulties and other problems. However, administered by the Special Broadcasting Service, channel 0/28 finally settled down and provided an excellent service to viewers. Throughout 1982 strenuous efforts were made to bring the service to South Australia. It has been suggested that the ethnic radio station in this State might object to this proposal because people might stop listening to the radio once ethnic television was established here. The Chairman of the ethnic radio station in this State seems to have refuted that suggestion in the press, because he has strongly supported the entry of ethnic television into this State.

An assurance was given early last year in the Senate that a proposal to bring the service to this State would be considered in the light of the 1982 Federal Budget. There was a call through the press from the United Ethnic Community of South Australia for the service, and in my last year as Minister calls were made, both directly and through the press, by both the then Premier (Mr Tonkin) and the then Leader of the Opposition (Mr Bannon) to their Federal counterparts to hasten the plan to bring the service to South Australia.

As a member of that Government, I can vouch for the fact that at every possible opportunity we mentioned to Federal Ministers the need for that service to be brought here, and we supported it very strongly indeed. Mr Tonkin wrote to the then Prime Minister, to Mr Brown (the then Minister for Communications), and to Mr Hodges (the then Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs) early in July 1982 on this matter. Very happy news came later in July 1982 when the Prime Minister of the day announced the $13 000 000 scheme to extend ethnic television throughout Australia. It was to be extended to 10 Australian cities: Canberra was to receive the benefit of the service in 1982-83; Adelaide, Brisbane, Newcastle, and Wollongong were to be served in 1983-84; and Hobart, Perth and Darwin were to be given the service in 1984-85. These plans and, indeed, this decision were all part of the Galbally Report, which I am rather proud to say was pursued very strongly indeed by the Fraser Government during its term of office.

So everything seemed to be going well, and ethnic people and other people in South Australia were looking forward to receiving this service in 1983-84. The promise was made, and no-one suspected that there would be any retraction from that promise. Then danger signs loomed on the horizon with the change of Government in Canberra early this year. One of those danger signs was the attitude of Senator Button, who became a senior member of the present Federal Government. An article, dealing with the Australian Labor Party Federal Conference of 1982 on this subject, which appeared on 20 July 1982 in the daily press, stated:

> . . . the S.B.S. nearly found itself at odds with the A.L.P. at the Party's national conference. A draft policy presented to the conference called for the abolition of the S.B.S. and the development of a new television channel to be used by a consortium of the A.B.C. multicultural sources and public television. The Federal member for Burke, Dr Andrew Theophanous, proposed an amendment to the draft policy allowing the retention of the television service and calling for its extension to all States.
>
> He argued that the proposal would cause 'massive uproar' in the ethnic community. The Opposition spokesman on communications, Senator Button, said in support of the original draft policy that 0/28 was watched by 'middle-class Australians who are too lazy to go out to a continental cinema'. He said ethnic communities should not be treated any differently from anyone else. The electorally palatable amendment was eventually carried by 50 votes to 41.

That was not a very large majority in such a temple of power as the A.L.P. national organisation, and must have caused ethnic people within this State some concern. In June this year calls were made by the Hon. Mr Sumner and by Mr Olsen, the Leader of the Opposition in another place, who wrote to Mr Duffy, the Federal Minister for Communications, asking that the Federal Government honour its election promise. In the *News* of 10 July this year, Penny Debelle, a correspondent, wrote:

> Doubts over the establishment of an ethnic television channel have been raised in the context of Federal Budget cuts in August.

This quite understandably was enough to cause many people within the ethnic community a great deal of concern, which culminated on Saturday 30 July when a large crowd marched from Victoria Square to the steps of Parliament House, where a meeting was held on the theme that South Australia deserves ethnic television now. The advertisement which publicised that march and which sought support was inserted by a number of groups and organisations, the names of which were cited in the advertisement. So that people can gain some idea of the strength of this movement for action by the Commonwealth Government on this matter, I will read out the names of the organisations that supported the protest march. They are as follows:

Adelaide Juventus Sports and Social Club
Alabarda Sports and Social Club
ANEA
Anzano Social Club of Adelaide
Association Toscana del S.A.
Campania Sports and Social Club
Casa D'Abruzzo/Molise
CIRCAS
Co-ordinating Italian Committee
Eastern District Azzurri Sports Club
Famiglia Istriana
Famiglia Zaratina
Italian Village
Madonna del Carmelo/Centro San Francesco, Lockleys
Madonna di Montevergine
Marche Club
Molinara Social and Sports Club
Radio Italiana
San Giorgio Community Centre
St Joseph's Association
Sicilia Social Club
Society of St Hilarion
South Australian Association of Teachers of Italian
South Australian Italian Association
Veneto Club

Some members may gather from those names that the march was a totally Italian community event; however, I can assure the Council that that was not so. At the meeting that was held in front of this building, there was a representative of the Ukrainian community, who stepped forward to give the views of his association which, of course, strongly

supported the advent of ethnic television in South Australia. A representative of the Greek community—

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: Was it Nick Bolkus?

The Hon. C.M. HILL: Senator Bolkus spoke as a Senator of the State. He is not a representative of groups in this State: he represents the whole State, as the Minister should know. Another senior member of the Greek community spoke on behalf of Greeks and stated that they strongly supported this move. It was an overall view of the ethnic community in this State that now is the time for action in regard to this matter.

So, for the reasons I have given, and because of the strong desire of many people in South Australia, both migrants and other people, for the Commonwealth Government to honour its promise and to bring ethnic television to this State, I have moved this motion. There is no question, as I said, of the need for such television in this State. All communities, all political Parties in this State, and all ethnic groups want it; the Ethnic Affairs Commission, through its Chairman, inserted an article in the press sometime ago supporting it.

Ethnic Broadcasters Incorporated (the ethnic radio network in this State) wants it. The plans last year to bring the service here were approved and announced, and the money was allocated for it. It was being put in train during the last financial year and at the time of the change of Government earlier this year. Then the election came, and now there are doubts about it. If we are to send this motion to Canberra, as I hope we will if this Council supports it and the message goes down to the other place and the other place supports it, there should not be a long delay in our doing that. If this message is to be given any credence by the Federal Labor Party (and I certainly hope that it will), time is running out, because the allocations in regard to funding for the Commonwealth Budget, of course, are all in the process of being finalised now. It is no good if we dilly-dally too long here or we will leave it too late because of that urgency and timing in regard to the consideration of the Federal Budget.

The feeling in this State amongst the ethnic communities is running high. That was evidenced at the march. Strong feelings were expressed and very strong words used during the march and at the meeting. I feel that I have a duty to report that to the Council as evidence of the importance of this matter.

If we do not get it here and have to go without it, we are being treated as second-class citizens in South Australia. Not only are the migrants being treated as second-class citizens, but all South Australians will be treated like second-class citizens because our counterparts (our fellow Australians in Sydney and Melbourne) already enjoy this service. If we have to go without it, it is shabby treatment indeed by the Hawke Labor Government.

The Hon. M.S. Feleppa: What about the previous Government? Don't forget that.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I thought that I had covered that point. The fact of the matter is that, in July last year, within a $21 000 000 package deal—

The Hon. M.S. Feleppa: That was promised.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: Yes, that was promised in July last year.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Committed.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: Committed, and, as I was saying, within a $21 000 000 deal to help the ethnic communities was this $13 000 000 to extend ethnic television not only to Adelaide but to 10 Australian cities. Quite understandably, a staged plan was laid down, which we all accepted. Part of that staged plan was that in the financial year 1983-84 we would have it here. It was a fact of life that one could not just extend it within a matter of weeks, a month or a few months, as a certain amount of work had to be done in the technical transmission situation and in the area of cable laying, and so forth, because some cities could not take further television on the existing cable and transmission structure without considerable damage being done.

But, that was accepted and the promise given, and it would have been fulfilled and it might still be now. If the Labor Government in reply to this and to all the other opinions that are being expressed in South Australia says, 'Yes, we will carry on with it immediately and get the whole plan in train,' I will be the first to thank it. It will be too late if we do not say anything now and it finds because of its financial stuation, which it is assessing at this point of time, that it has to say that we certainly should have made our voices heard.

So, I appeal for support for the motion. We should as a House of Parliament all join together as soon as possible and pass it. We shouid join together as a Parliament and pass it. We represent all South Australians as a Parliament. So, if we can send this down as soon as possible and have the matter treated as urgent, the message can be sent to Canberra from the Premier. That message, in short, through the vehicle of this fairly lengthy statement in the motion is: South Australia wants ethnic television now.

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA secured the adjournment of the debate.

NARCOTIC AND PSYCHOTROPIC DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act, 1934. Read a first time.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Australian Royal Commission of Inquiry into Drugs, of which the Hon. Mr Justice Williams was Commissioner, recommended in its 1980 reports to the Governments of the Commonwealth, Victoria, Queensland, Western Australia and Tasmania that greater attention should be given by Governments to the 'money aspect of illegal drug activities'. That royal commission made recommendations in respect of both the powers of investigators and the powers of courts. And the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Drug Trafficking, of which the Hon. Mr Justice Stewart was Commissioner, this year affirmed the recommendations by the Williams Commission that the courts should have power to order the confiscation of the assets of convicted drug offenders.

During 1982 the Liberal Government was developing legislation to focus on the proceeds of criminal drug activities, and leading up to the November 1982 State election it gave a positive commitment that it would introduce legislation to empower the courts to confiscate the assets of drug offenders. Subsequent to the election, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr John Olsen, indicated that if the Labor Government did not introduce that sort of legislation in the first session of this Parliament the Liberal Party would do so. The Bill which I have now introduced implements both the election commitment and the post-election public commitment to give wider powers to the courts in respect of drug offences.

The Williams Royal Commission, in concluding that because of the scale of the illegal drug problem it is essential 'that the money aspect of drugs and crime receive greater attention', saw the justification for this conclusion in the following considerations:

1. Following the movement of money towards and away from the illegal transaction assists in appreciating the ramifications of the activities of a particular organised group. It may lead to the identification and ultimately the conviction of those who otherwise remain aloof from the criminal activity but who have a major impact on it—those whose effects on the illegal drug trade far outweigh their numbers—the financiers and organisers.

2. It is money and the further accumulation of money, resources and assets which money permits, which underpins the groups of criminals who are engaged in this illegal importation, production and trafficking of drugs. Thus:

- money renders the group less vulnerable to successful law enforcement action. The loss of a shipment is not fatal to a group which has accumulated sufficient money and assets to finance the acquisition of a replacement shipment and arrange for its illegal importation, continuing its activities notwithstanding the particular loss of the operating funds and expected profit;
- money finances methods which make the task of law enforcement most difficult. A shipment of drugs may be split among a number of couriers to minimise the effect of one being caught. A person whose background is unlikely to attract attention from the authorities can be offered sufficient to induce him to act as a courier. The extra cost of trans-shipping goods can be borne so that they enter Australia from a place not normally associated with drugs.

3. Money facilitates the corruption of authority—not only in Australia but also overseas—and so facilitates the illegal activity.

4. Money gives access to expertise and to equipment to facilitate the illegal activity. Thus the evidence received by the commission establishes that those engaged, particularly the upper levels, in illegal drug production, importation and trafficking may have recourse to the best legal and accounting advice. Those giving the advice are not necessarily aware of the illegal activity. They may believe they are advising legitimate businessmen, such is the aura that access to large sums of money creates and the influence it commands. Sophisticated equipment may be acquired, for example, to permit law enforcement radio communications to be intercepted and overheard.

In addition, that Royal Commission also points out that those involved in the illegal drug trade do not restrict their criminal activities to drugs. It says:

The evidence received by the commission shows that it is more than likely that profits from criminal activities such as illegal betting and gambling finance drug trafficking or the illegal importation or production of drugs. It is also more than likely that profits from drug trafficking later finance other criminal activities such as prostitution and pornography. Funds generated from any or all of these criminal activities may be invested in business enterprises of varying degrees of legitimacy.

Examples given by the Williams Royal Commission suggest that as much as $16 000 000 leaves Australia each year to buy heroin to supply Australian addicts and that 'when the proceeds of that supply and their leaving Australia to be "laundered" are taken into account the figure could be as high as $100 000 000'. And the profits, too, are enormous. Recent reports of marihuana crop discoveries in South Australia, running into multi-million dollar values, reinforce the assertion that the proceeds are enormous. Add to this the fact that a number of persons involved in the drug trade in South Australia have, over the past three or four years, been apprehended and convicted (the most recent being Mr Conley for illegal heroin trafficking, bringing the stiffest penalty imposed by the courts in South Australia for this offence—15 years imprisonment) and it can be seen that South Australia is not untouched by the activities of illegal drug traffickers.

Support by recent Royal Commissioners for the establishment of a Crimes Commission with wide powers, and wider powers for enforcement agencies highlights the wide community concern about the problem. It is against this background, therefore, that this Bill is introduced into the Parliament to accelerate action of those matters affecting illegal drug trafficking. The scheme of the Bill is to provide (in clause 4) for a court to be empowered to make a sequestration order against the property of any person who has been charged with an offence against the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act where the court is satisfied that there is 'reasonable cause to believe that, if the person charged is convicted of the offence, certain money or real or personal property of the person charged or of a related person or body would become liable for forfeiture to the Crown under this Act'.

A sequestration order thus freezes the assets of the person charged or a related person, gives the court management powers over those assets and, when the person is convicted, allows the court to order forfeiture of those assets to the Crown. Under the proposals in the Bill, the onus lies upon the convicted person to prove that the money or real or personal property is not liable to forfeiture, a provision which is necessary in these circumstances because it is only the accused person who has direct access to the facts. The Bill also recognises that criminals may seek to distance themselves from immediate possession of the property derived from criminal activity by using various devices to keep property out of their names, whilst still retaining direct or indirect control. It is for this reason that the Bill gives the courts power over the assets not only of the offender but also of a 'related person or body'. That description includes:

(a) a spouse, parent, brother, sister or child of that person;

(b) a person who is cohabiting, or has at some time since the commission of the alleged offence cohabited, with that person as his husband or wife *de facto;*

(c) a corporation of which that person is, or was at any time subsequent to the commission of the alleged offence, a director;

(d) a corporation in which that person or his nominee holds, or held at any time subsequent to the commission of the alleged offence, shares entitling him or his nominee to cast more than one-half of the maximum number of votes that might be cast at a general meeting of the corporation;

(e) a corporation the directors of which are accustomed to act in accordance with that person's instructions, directions or wishes;

(f) a corporation that is, for the purposes of the Companies (South Australia) Code, a subsidiary of a corporation referred to in paragraph *(c), (d)* or *(e);* or

(g) a trust of which that person is, or was at some time subsequent to the commission of the alleged offence, a trustee, or in which he has a vested or contingent interest as a beneficiary.

The Bill recognises that after a charge has been laid, and until it is heard, the assets need to be managed. Accordingly, it gives the court powers with respect to management and control of the property, and the Government's own inherent powers allow it to obtain information with respect to such property. The powers given by the Bill are wide but, in dealing with the vicious illegal drug trafficking, where financiers at the top are more likely to be untouched by investigations and legal proceedings, I am sure that all of the community will accept the necessity for the powers given in this Bill. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 defines 'related person or body' to an accused or convicted person for the purposes of the amendments which follow, and relate to the property in respect of which a sequestration order or forfeiture order may be made by a court. The definition recognises the

complex arrangements which criminals may enter into to minimise the risk to themselves whilst retaining ultimate control of the property.

Clause 3 deals with section 14 of the principal Act. Section 14 sets out the powers of the court upon a conviction being recorded against a person and includes the power to order forfeiture of certain assets. This clause widens the court's powers. Clause 4 empowers the court to make a sequestration order against the property of a person charged with an offence where there is a reasonable cause to believe that, if the person charged is convicted, property would be liable to forfeiture. Where a conviction is recorded, the onus is upon the criminal to prove that the property is not liable to forfeiture. The clause prohibits dealing with the property, the subject of such an order, unless it is in accordance with the court's order. If the person who is charged is acquitted the sequestration order is discharged.

The Hon. C.W. CREEDON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SHOP TRADING HOURS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON (Leader of the Opposition) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Shop Trading Hours Act, 1977. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Shop trading hours are governed by the Shop Trading Hours Act. That Act prescribes that shop closing hours in the central shopping district or any other district where the necessary proclamation is made shall be 6 p.m. on week days, except for Fridays, 9 p.m. on Fridays, and 12.30 p.m. on Saturdays. In other areas, most commonly the suburbs, closing hours shall be 6 p.m. on weekdays, except for Thursdays, 9 p.m. on Thursdays, and 12.30 p.m. on Saturdays. Normally most shops close at 5.30 p.m., which has been long-standing practise and butchers close at 5.30 p.m. for the specific purpose of cleaning up. Within these time frames all but one commodity can be sold at all times. The exception is fresh red meat.

Fresh red meat has been singled out for extra regulation within our already regulated shopping hours. There are those who say that there should be no regulation at all. That debate is for another time, but if we are to have some regulation of shopping hours then that regulation should be consistent. No one commodity should be singled out for extra control or regulation. It is incongruous that fresh red meat cannot be sold between 5.30 p.m. and 9 p.m. on Thursday nights or, alternatively, on Friday nights, whilst all its competitors can. Fish, chicken, pork and processed meats do not suffer the restriction which fresh red meat faces. Little wonder, then, that consumption and sales of fresh red meat have fallen substantially in the past decade while sales and consumption of competitive products have risen.

The Opposition recognises that there have been earlier moves to deregulate the sales of fresh red meat. Those proposals never came to a final vote as you, Mr Acting President, would be aware, but were in our view too broad in one respect: that is, that they would have so changed the trading position as to allow shops with an area of less than 200 square metres to sell red meats beyond normally accepted hours, thus swinging the pendulum too far the other way. What the Opposition seeks to achieve is a balance so that where trading hours regulations exist all commodities can at least be sold for the same minimum period. The arguments for and against an extension of fresh red meat sales times have been canvassed for some time.

Primary producers and primary producer organisations strongly support the deregulation of red meat sales which we now propose. This is understandable, given the declining sales and consumption to which I have referred earlier. The Opposition believes that, all things considered, the case for an extension of red meat selling hours in the way we propose is much stronger than opposing arguments. There are many arguments in support of an expansion of red meat selling hours. For a start, as I have indicated already, all other meats are available, so why should red meat alone be restricted? Liberal philosophy supports the rights of the individual to exercise freedom of choice. For shoppers this means that they should be free to choose the products they buy within what we accept as normal trading hours. For meat retailers this surely means being able to sell when they want to without Parliament supporting unfair or inconsistent protection.

Primary producers are aware of declining red meat sales and consumption and believe that every step must be taken to reverse this trend. Increasing the availability of red meat by expanding shopping hours will obviously improve this. We should not forget, either, that increasingly families, particularly where both husband and wife work, are taking advantage of late night trading to shop together as a family. It is most inconvenient that these families are not able to buy what is a basic commodity when anything else, from groceries to petrol, can be purchased without limit during those late trading hours. Because people are unable to buy fresh red meat on Thursday or Friday nights they are forced to make a second, and inconvenient, trip to the butcher or supermarket or to purchase some other commodity such as fish, pork or chicken.

The most recently available opinion poll indicated that nearly 70 per cent of people supported the sale of red meat on late shopping nights. Interestingly, 76.5 per cent of married people with one child and 72.9 per cent of married people with two children supported an extension. Although the poll was taken in December 1980, it is highly unlikely that consumer desire for late night red meat sales would have fallen. Indeed, if anything, late night trading has grown in popularity over the past three years. The main opposition to the extension of butchers' trading hours seems to come from the butchers themselves. This opposition is, I suppose, understandable, but I believe misplaced. I should add that not all butchers are opposed to late night red meat sales.

The attitude of butchers who support an extension of red meat sales is best summed up in the following quote from a suburban newspaper. In an article headed 'Alan wants to give meat laws the chop' in the *Community Courier* on 13 July, Fullarton butcher Mr Alan Bennet argues in favour of late night trading for butchers. I quote in part from the article, which states:

> Although Alan acknowledges many South Australian butchers do not want late night trading, he claims all butchers should at least have the option to stay open. He could see no other reason why butchers should be singled out when other shops remained open on Thursday nights.
>
> Alan's Arkaba Village Meat store is opposite a large Coles supermarket. He and his wife Margaret shop in the supermarket every Thursday night and are angered by shoppers walking through checkouts with meat in hand.
>
> 'It galls me to watch people walking out of the supermarket with their sausages, chickens, rabbits and knuckles, while there, a few paces away, my shutters are up', Alan said.

I am sure that you, Mr Acting President, would agree with that. The article continues:

> Under the current legislation, supermarkets can sell sausages, smallgoods and frozen meat but not fresh, red meat on Thursday nights. Alan, who has owned the Fullarton store for four months, specialises in making his meat 'different' by selling beef olives, chevapchichi patties and marinated steaks and satays. He says those sorts of meats are attractive to young business couples and

working singles, who normally would only get time to shop on Thursday nights. 'We are missing out on that trade', he said.

This was not organised between Des Colquhoun and me, but by sheer coincidence he took up the same matter in an article in this morning's *Advertiser*, as follows:

> Well, we do have some shops open on Thursday and Friday nights now, and good fun it is. But, unbelievably, they are not allowed to sell red meat. They can sell blue books and pink panties and orange oranges and green ginger wine, but they cannot legally sell red meat.
>
> They can sell white meat, so that chickens remains smugly and conveniently exposed, innocent as goose-pimpled eggs. But as the sun sets, the supermarket must cover the red meat as though it were some obscene harbinger of the Black Death.

I could not sum up matters any better than that myself. It is an absolutely absurd situation when one of the major products of this State is unable to be sold in competition with other goods, many of which are imported. It is something about which we as a Parliament have to take action. Mr Colquhoun and the butcher I have quoted have summed up the position well. However, it is not just the wishes of the State's 500 plus meat retailers which should be considered. We should consider also the wishes of the thousands of consumers who seek to buy red meat on Thursday or Friday nights and the 11 000 small businesses which produce red meat—namely, the 11 000 farmers and graziers who currently produce a product which they feel they are unable to freely sell. I am sure that the Minister of Agriculture would agree with me there.

It has been alleged that the retail price of meat will rise as a result of overtime payments. This need not be the case. Late night trading in other areas has led to more flexible working arrangements for employees without any long-term undesirable impact. Already employers are offering a degree of flexibility in the working hours of butchers employed to suit consumer buying times. This commonsense approach can be built upon. It is claimed that service to customers will be reduced. This need not be the case and is really just an assertion. Some butchers have not moved with the times in the promotion of their product and service.

Supermarkets prepack meat, have it on display more openly and offer great ease of selection. Butchers should learn from this. It has been said that supermarkets will have an unfair trading advantage. This does not follow. It appears that much of the concern expressed by butchers is really directed at the impact on their sales of the more marketing conscious supermarket. Trading hours, in this circumstance, are not the root cause of butchers' problems and they are wrong to oppose extensions. It is alleged that the number of apprentices that can be trained in accordance with the Federal Meat Industry Award will be reduced. Although this claim has been made, there has been no substantiation of it and there appears to be no reason why this should be the case.

It is claimed that employment in the meat industry will be reduced. The industry—producers, wholesalers and retailers—will be far more seriously affected if red meat sales continue to decline as they have been declining. Should some (a minority) retailers be protected at a great long-term cost to the industry?

It has been said that the family life of meat industry employees will be disrupted. Once again, flexible arrangements can be made. The impact of late night trading on this is clearly overstated. They are certainly not the only employees that have to work at abnormal times. If we were to make no changes every time we thought an employer's or employee's family life was to be disrupted, industry would never progress. It is also alleged that consumers who shop before 5.30 p.m. will be forced to pay high prices. Again, there is no evidence to support this. (Competition will affect prices favourably, not protection which artificially maintains prices.)

In summary, the Opposition believes that there is widespread community support for an extension of trading hours. We do not believe that there should be open slather at this time, but there is wide belief that late night sales of red meat should be allowed. Late night shopping is an increasingly important part of our way of life, and butchers can no longer hope to bury their heads in the sand. We believe it is in the best interest of the consumer and the red meat producer that late night trading for red meat be permitted. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 replaces subsection (4) of section 13 of the principal Act with a provision which will allow butcher shops to open on late night shopping nights until 9 o'clock. On all other days butcher shops will have to close at the times at which they are required to close at present.

The Hon. C.W. CREEDON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.14 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday 11 August at 2.15 p.m.