

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 20 August 1980

The **SPEAKER (Hon. B. C. Eastick)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

### PETITION: EDUCATION FUNDING

A petition signed by 98 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose a 3 per cent cut-back in funding for the Education Department was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

### PETITION: PRE-RECORDED MUSIC

A petition signed by 3 141 residents of South Australia praying that the House ensure that playing of pre-recorded music was not to the detriment of working musicians was presented by Mr. Bannon.

Petition received.

### PETITION: STURT COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION

A petition signed by 22 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any proposal which would close Sturt College of Advanced Education or transfer any of its programmes in teacher education or the health professions to any other institution or location was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

### PETITION: WOMEN'S ADVISER

A petition signed by 20 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to immediately appoint a women's adviser for education programmes was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: RACING INDUSTRY

The **Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport)**: I seek leave to make a brief statement.

The **SPEAKER**: Is leave granted?

Mr. Millhouse: No.

The **SPEAKER**: Leave is not granted.

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer)**: I move:

That Standing Order 136 be so far suspended as to enable a Minister of the Crown to make such statement without leave of the House.

The **SPEAKER**: I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

*Several members having risen:*

Mr. **MILLHOUSE**: Mr. Speaker—

The **SPEAKER**: The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. **MILLHOUSE (Mitcham)**: I wish to speak on the motion. I inform the House, as I have already informed you, that, in opposing this motion, I have written a letter to the Premier bitterly complaining about the practice of

Ministers in making Ministerial statements in this House and abusing the privilege, and it is for that reason that I called against the Minister.

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The member for Mitcham has the opportunity to discuss the motion that is before the Chair; that is, that Standing Orders be suspended. He has no opportunity to progress the argument he is canvassing, and must come back to the motion before the Chair or I will have to withdraw his leave.

Mr. **MILLHOUSE**: I oppose the suspension of Standing Orders because it is an obvious ploy that the Government is using to get around the right of any member in this Chamber to oppose the giving of leave to make a Ministerial statement. That is the very obvious reason, and it has obviously been prompted by my letter, a copy of which was sent to the Leader of the Opposition and is known to all members on the Opposition side.

If this leave is granted, then it will be possible at any time for the Government to abuse the privilege of giving a Ministerial statement and, in the guise of that Ministerial statement, either anticipating business on the Notice Paper, as was done last Tuesday week, or making a blatant attack, as the Minister of Agriculture made on a member of the Opposition in the Upper House last Thursday.

The **SPEAKER**: Order! I have previously warned the honourable member for Mitcham that he is speaking to the reason for this suspension, not other events which have led in his mind to this suspension, but purely and simply to the suspension on this day.

Mr. **MILLHOUSE**: I do not know what the Ministerial statement of the Minister of Transport may be—

The **Hon. M. M. Wilson**: Sit down and you will find out.

Mr. **MILLHOUSE**: Yes, but I want to know first, and I said in my letter—and if I did know now, I might be quite prepared to let him make it without opposition.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr. **MILLHOUSE**: Well, I know that the Minister of Agriculture is pretty sore because he was reprovved by the Speaker after he had made his statement the other day, and so he should have been, because it was a blatant attack on the Hon. Mr. Chatterton.

The **SPEAKER**: Order! I withdraw the leave for the honourable member for Mitcham to continue. The question before the Chair is that the motion be agreed to. Those in favor of the motion say, "Aye"; against, "No".

Mr. Millhouse: No.

The **SPEAKER**: There being a dissentient voice, a division is necessary.

*While the division was being held:*

The **SPEAKER**: Order! There being only one member on the side of the Noes I declare that the Ayes have it.

Motion thus carried.

The **Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport)**: In the September election the present Government stated, as part of its policy, that it would investigate the racing industry. In November 1979, this Government established a Committee of Inquiry into the Racing Industry and set down terms of reference, which would require the committee to examine carefully the financial viability of all codes and to make recommendations that would assist in improving their financial position.

The committee of inquiry has now made an interim report to the Government on a number of financial matters that it believes require consideration. The committee of inquiry has strongly argued that the financial position of the three codes is critical and that their viability is dependent upon significant increases in stake moneys.

The committee points out that the level of stake moneys in South Australia is depressed in comparison with those of other States and argues that the industry requires

additional funds urgently. It also points out that static income from T.A.B. to the clubs in times of rising costs has precluded clubs from increasing stake money with a consequent drop in the quality of racing offered to the public.

The committee believes that the Government could well treat the T.A.B. as a joint venture between the Government and the codes in which both share equally the net operating surplus. It also believes that there is considerable scope for increasing T.A.B. turnover which, together with other economies, should increase the surplus available for distribution.

I accept the arguments put forward by the committee of inquiry in support of these statements. Accordingly, I have recommended, and the Government has agreed, that the method of distribution of T.A.B. surplus will be amended at the earliest opportunity to provide a significant benefit to the codes.

This benefit will be obtained by distributing T.A.B. surplus on the basis of 50 per cent to the Government and 50 per cent to the codes, to replace the present system by which a fixed percentage of T.A.B. turnover is payable to the Government as a first charge prior to the distribution of any surplus to the codes. The Government has also agreed to assist the codes by making quarterly payments, a step which will improve their cash flow position.

As a third form of assistance, the Government will provide payments to the codes in August or September of this year, totalling \$3 660 000, which will include the normal payment of approximately \$2 450 000 from 1979-80 T.A.B. surplus and an advance payment of approximately \$1 200 000 representing the estimated surplus in the first half of 1980-81. The new scheme of distribution will apply from the beginning of 1981, and quarterly payments will commence in April 1981.

The first quarterly payments under the new scheme would amount to approximately \$950 000 if T.A.B. surplus was to remain at the 1979-80 levels. In a full year, and not taking account of any other changes that the Government may introduce following the full recommendations of the committee of inquiry, the codes could expect to receive a substantial increased level of T.A.B. funding up to approximately \$3 800 000 annually. This latter figure may vary, of course, depending on surplus available and other amendments to be considered by the Government.

I feel sure that these changes will be welcomed by the industry, and it is my hope that the codes will in future be in a much better position to plan ahead satisfactorily as well as to receive more frequent cash payments. Because part of the reason for increasing the amounts available to the industry is that stake moneys in South Australia have been shown to be lower than those in other States in general, I would expect that, in due course, the increased allocation would be devoted to boosting stake moneys throughout the industry.

As I have said, this recommendation has come from an interim report, and I expect numerous recommendations for improvement within the industry to be included in the final report, which I hope to have in the next few weeks. The Government will allow this report a period of public debate while it considers the action it will take on the recommendations.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is my recollection that, when the Minister originally sought leave, which was subsequently obtained in another way, he sought leave to make a short Ministerial statement. I made no attempt to interrupt the Minister because, obviously, he had the leave of the House, which was obtained in another way. However, I

believe that it would be of use to members if a ruling could be given as to whether or not the Minister's statement was a short Ministerial statement.

**The SPEAKER:** There is no point of order, and there is no way in which the Chair will quantify an answer or a question. I do uphold the comment that the honourable member for Mitchell has made that leave was sought to make a short Ministerial statement. It is always within the province of the person making a statement as to what length of time it will take.

## QUESTION TIME

### PAY-ROLL TAX

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** Has the Premier obtained the information that was requested last week by the member for Peake on actual 1979-80 financial year expenditure on pay-roll tax rebates for the employment of young workers, and was the *Advertiser* report of yesterday morning accurate in suggesting that the Government has been able to spend only \$558 000 of the \$2 000 000 allocated in the Budget for rebates?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I have not received that information as yet. I have no doubt that it will be provided to me in due course.

### HOUSING LOANS

**Mr. GLAZBROOK:** Will the Premier give an explanation of the problems apparently occasioned to some applicants seeking finance for housing loans from the State Bank? A number of constituents have contacted me in relation to the very long delays and administrative difficulties being experienced in connection with their dealings with the State Bank. These dealings, I am told, sometimes take as long as 16 weeks to organise a loan, and a further four to five weeks for settlement. It has been further stated that such delays are causing real estate agents, brokers, builders, and clients some anguish. Also, it has been stated that builders must carry the loss of interest, etc., on their capital for beyond the period of contract through to the settlement period, as against that normally experienced.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I have received a number of complaints and expressions of concern about the time being taken in that matter. The complaints have come from members of the real estate industry and from individuals, and in response to those queries I took the trouble of obtaining an answer from the Chairman of the State Bank. I have been informed that the prime problem would appear to be the increased time taken in loan processing during the last few months. I am informed that this has occurred because of circumstances that have been quite outside the bank's control, and that in no way could the bank adequately anticipate the circumstances which occurred.

During that period of late 1979, and indeed into the first months of 1980, there had been a very sharp fall in effective final applications for loans. Notwithstanding a considerable increase in the numbers being called up from the waiting lists, the bank was receiving insufficient firm applications to maintain its authorised quota, which is at 55 a week. However, I am pleased to say that, from early this year, with the change in eligibility criteria approved by the Government, and some significantly increased readiness of eligible persons to commit themselves to home purchase, the number of effective applications has increased quite markedly and, indeed, rather more rapidly than was anticipated.

Involved in these applications were considerable

numbers of persons called up earlier who had delayed their applications because of the circumstances at the time. For the months of March and April, the bank has approved considerably more than the standard quota so as to cover some of the deficiencies of earlier months. Even so, the flow of applications for loans is still showing a very marked increase. Because of the obvious limitations regarding the amount of funds available and in prospect, it has been necessary now to revert to the previous maximum of 55 approvals a week, and this has meant an increased waiting time between call-up and actual approval of the loan. Approvals are necessarily given a strict priority according to application time, and this is the cause of the elapsed time; it is not caused by any inefficiency on the part of the bank's procedures.

The bank has latterly reduced the rate of call-up from the waiting list, but it cannot forecast accurately the numbers that are likely to reply and, at the same time, it wishes to avoid any recurrence of shortage of current applicants. It therefore must plan and expect to err on the side of having a rather longer wait than the time necessarily involved in processing, so that it does not fall behind the 55 a week.

It could not possibly agree simply to reduce to a minimum the time currently elapsing between call-up and approval, because that would mean to approve more over the next few months at the expense of being unable to continue even at the normal rate in later months. That sort of stop-and-start arrangement would be disastrous for the borrowers themselves and for the building industry.

During the recent period when the bank significantly increased approvals beyond 55 a week to make good some earlier deficiency, there was obviously increased pressure on the inspection and security section involved. The Chairman informs me that those pressures were coped with very well indeed. The delay was unavoidable; it was only temporary. The increased work load was handled very efficiently indeed, considering the marked upturn in applications in the early months of this year.

#### MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: PUBLIC SERVICE GUIDELINES

**The SPEAKER:** I have received the following letter dated 20 August 1980 from the honourable Leader of the Opposition:

I wish to advise that when the House meets today, Wednesday 20 August 1980, I wish to move that the House at its rising adjourn to 2 p.m. on Friday 22 August for the purpose of debating the following matter of urgency:

(1) That the Premier misled the House by claiming that the document "Guidelines for Public Servants Appearing Before Parliamentary Committees" tabled on 6 August 1980 had been extensively discussed by the Public Service Board and the Public Service Association; and

(2) That this document which is substantially different from that discussed by the Public Service Board with the Public Service Association places South Australian public servants at risk of being in contempt of the Parliament.

I call on those members who support—

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I want to try to take a point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** What is the honourable member's point of order?

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** This proposed urgency motion is clearly contrary to Standing Order 230, which states:

No motion shall seek to anticipate debate upon any matter which appears on the Notice Paper.

I emphasise the words "any matter which appears on the

Notice Paper". This urgency matter of the Leader's canvasses the guidelines for public servants appearing before Parliamentary committees, which is the subject matter of a motion that I have on the Notice Paper for next Wednesday, 27 August, as follows:

That this House strongly disapproves of the "Guidelines for public servants appearing before Parliamentary committees" approved and tabled by the Premier on 6 August; and upon the principle of open Government which he has claimed to espouse, calls upon him to withdraw the guidelines immediately; and affirms that in any case it is the members of Select and special committees of this Parliament who decide the questions to be answered by witnesses, whether those witnesses be public servants or not.

Apart from the subject matter being the guidelines, the last part of my motion is clearly the same as the assertion by the Leader in his motion about contempt of Parliament in the second part of his motion. Nothing could be clearer than that this is an attempt to circumvent my motion. It is contrary to Standing Order 230, which states:

No motion shall seek to anticipate debate upon any matter which appears upon the Notice Paper.

It does not have to be in the same form. The motion does not have to be the same as the preceding motion, such as this. In other words, the motion of urgency which the Leader wants to move does not have to be in the same terms as the motion on the Notice Paper. It is the subject matter that counts, and this motion is obviously contrary to Standing Order 230. I therefore ask you, Sir, to rule that it is not competent to be proceeded with.

**The SPEAKER:** I do not uphold the point of order raised by the honourable member for Mitcham. I acknowledge the wording which he has read of Standing Order 230, but I also draw his attention to Standing Order 1, which indicates that this House will have consideration also of those matters, the forms and practices of the Commons House of the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain, and so on. I have given a great deal of attention to the motion forwarded by the honourable Leader of the Opposition before accepting the motion, which has not yet had the opportunity of being supported, as I had intended prior to the honourable member's rising. I have carefully examined both the motion and the notice of motion of the honourable member for Mitcham, and I am of the opinion that the subject matters of the motions are quite different.

I also accept the urgency of the Leader's motion in view of the press statement released today by the Public Service Association in which certain claims are made against the honourable Premier. Debating this motion in no way precludes the honourable member's moving his motion when it comes on in due course, and, although he has identified 27 August, I have no certainty that that will be the date on which it will be brought on for discussion or for finality. Therefore, I not uphold the point of order.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I raise a further point of order, Sir, in view of your explanation. You say that you have no certainty that my motion will come on on 27 August. The Standing Order does not say that it has to; it simply says that no motion shall seek to anticipate debate upon any matter which appears upon the Notice Paper. This plainly appears on the Notice Paper; I have read it out.

How can the fact of whether the Address in Reply debate is filibustered long enough to cut out private members' business next Wednesday have anything to do with it at all? It is on the Notice Paper, and it is down for a subsequent day of sitting.

**The SPEAKER:** I do not uphold the further point of order raised by the honourable member for Mitcham. I draw his attention to Erskine May, pages 371 and 372,

more particularly where it states that, in determining whether discussion is out of order on the grounds of anticipation, the Speaker must have regard to the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the House within a reasonable time. I am not certain that it will be within a reasonable time, bearing in mind that the House will get up next week and that it is possible that committees will meet prior to the honourable member's motion being discussed. I ask for those members who support the honourable Leader to stand in their places.

*Members having risen:*

**The SPEAKER:** The motion is accepted.

**Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition):** I move:

That the House at its rising do adjourn until Friday 22 August at 2 p.m.

For the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely,

(1) That the Premier misled the House by claiming that the document "Guidelines for public servants appearing before Parliamentary committees" tabled on 6 August 1980 had been extensively discussed by the Public Service Board and the Public Service Association; and

(2) That this document which is substantially different from that discussed by the Public Service Board with the Public Service Association places South Australian public servants at risk of being in contempt of the Parliament.

On Wednesday 6 August, the Premier tabled a document headed "Guidelines for public servants appearing before Parliamentary committees". These guidelines were immediately condemned by the member for Playford, and other members on this side of the House, as a disgraceful attempt to restrict the Parliament's rights to information to which it is properly entitled. They were condemned as an ill-conceived and unnecessary set of restrictions that place Public Service officers in the invidious position of choosing between their obligations to this Parliament and the political instructions of a Government of the day.

The Premier, forced to defend his document, represented the guidelines to the House as the result of extensive discussions between the Government, the Public Service Board, and the Public Service Association. He then went further and implied that the guidelines were the result of agreements reached between these parties. It has now become clear that none of this is true. In reality the document tabled by the Premier is significantly different from that which was discussed by the Public Service Board with the Public Service Association.

**The Hon. D. O. Tonkin:** Where is that? Will you refer me to that bit, please? Can't you find that spot?

**Mr. BANNON:** If the Premier has a little patience, I will quote his own words, in order to explain to him clearly that he made the statement concerned.

**The Hon. D. O. Tonkin:** Please do.

**Mr. BANNON:** I advise him to listen to what is being said. This document, drawn up by the Public Service Board, makes no mention of advisers accompanying an officer appearing before a Parliamentary committee. They make no mention of the adviser deciding whether an officer will answer particular questions. They make no mention of the adviser intervening in the proceedings of a committee to postpone that committee's deliberations. Also, they give no indication that the Premier would in fact table in this House a set of guidelines that put public servants in the very serious position of risking being in contempt of Parliament. The Public Service Association issued a public statement earlier today. This was the reason why the Opposition considered this to be a matter of urgency that must be debated today rather than wait for the motion of the member for Mitcham to come on. The

association's statement is:

It should be made clear that, contrary to the impression created when the guidelines were announced, the Public Service Association had not called for such guidelines to be drawn up; had not seen, much less approved, the document tabled in Parliament by the Premier; and had not been advised that the issue was due to come before Parliament . . .

Further:

It regards the guidelines themselves as undesirable because they are likely to restrict excessively the amount of information to which the Parliament can have access; they are likely to bind the Public Service more closely to the political interests of the Government of the day; and they contain provisions which are vague and ambiguous, and control measures which may serve to intimidate public servants who are attempting honestly to carry out their legitimate duties to their departments, their Minister, the Parliament and the public.

These are not my words but those of the organisation that represents the majority of officers in the Public Service covered by these guidelines, namely, the Public Service Association. It is clear that these guidelines were not drawn up, as the Premier has said, for the protection of public servants appearing before Parliamentary committees. I heard the Premier say this morning at a meeting of public servants, at a conference held by the Institute of Public Administration, that the guidelines are there to protect Ministers of the Crown and to put a blanket between the proper searching inquiries of a committee and the information that it may adduce from public servants.

Let us put the matter into chronological order. The guidelines were tabled on 6 August without any of the usual verbose Ministerial statements to which we have become accustomed recently and which I hope have ceased. Interestingly, another document was tabled that day: the progress report of the Uranium Enrichment Committee, which was accompanied by a lengthy statement. The guidelines were simply deposited on the table. One might almost say that they were sneaked into the House by the Premier hoping that too much attention would not be attracted to them, because he did not make an accompanying statement, as is the usual practice in relation to such documents.

As I have already said, the guidelines, once they were studied by honourable members, quite rightly raised a furore. As the member for Playford said in the House during the adjournment debate on the evening of 6 August:

As far as I am aware, it is the first time in the history of the South Australian Parliamentary system that we have muzzled public servants appearing before committees of the House.

The Honourable Mr. Sumner, the shadow Attorney-General, wrote a comprehensive letter to the Premier in which he pointed out that there was never any evidence to suggest that this sort of protection of public servants had ever been necessary under previous Governments, whether Liberal or Labor. He also pointed out that the guidelines reflected upon the competence and integrity of public servants.

In his letter, it was stated that the Premier had given not one example of a public servant acting improperly before a committee of the Parliament that would justify the guidelines that he had proposed. He pointed out the committee system, in one form or another, was as old as the Parliament itself. He also said that the proposal for an adviser from the Public Service Board to accompany public servants when they appear before committees is a grave reflection on those public servants and their capacity to act in accordance with their responsibility to the

Government of the day.

After summarising the points in his compelling letter, in which he asked important questions of the Premier to which the Premier has not yet responded properly, Mr. Sumner said:

You will appreciate that this is a serious matter which goes to the heart of public access to Government decision-making.

It appears to me that you are providing protection for your Ministers under the guise of protecting public servants.

That is the nub of this issue. Faced with that reaction the Premier was forced on 12 August to defend them in a Ministerial statement, perhaps the statement that he should have made on 6 August. In the course of that statement he said:

The Government entered into extensive discussions with the Public Service Board, which in turn consulted members of the Public Service Association.

On the same day in reply to a question from the member for Ascot Park, the Premier said:

Let us get this quite clear. I said in my statement today that the Government entered into extensive discussions with the Public Service Board, which in turn consulted members of the Public Service Association, and that is exactly what happened.

It is now quite clear, following the statement from the Public Service Association to which I have referred and which was released today, that these statements by the Premier are completely untrue and that the impression they create of extensive consultation on the issue is completely untrue. The facts are as the Public Service Association puts it:

Some 2½ months ago a few senior officers of the association were shown an early draft of some proposed guidelines. The document was put before them in strictest confidence and on the understanding that it was not a subject for negotiation or active discussion.

How can this process be called "consultation"? How can it be called part of a procedure of "extensive discussions"? Quite the contrary; it is an insult to that organisation even to approach it in the way that it was done. But the Premier has gone further and, in his Ministerial statement last week, implied that the guidelines were in fact the result of an agreement between the Government, the board and the Public Service Association. The Premier said:

The intention of all parties has been to safeguard the political impartiality of the Public Service without compromising the Government's commitment to strengthen the Parliamentary committee system or the right of Parliament to control that system.

We can all agree with that aim, but the Premier is wrong to imply that there was general agreement between all parties (those parties named) that these guidelines were the best way to achieve that aim. Again, as the P.S.A. says in its statement today:

The association's General Secretary, Mr. Ian Fraser, made written criticisms of the early draft document, and these were forwarded to the Public Service Board. The criticisms had no effect whatsoever on the Premier's guidelines.

The statement continues:

The association flatly rejects any suggestion that it asked for or approved of the Premier's document. The council of the association states flatly that it does not want and never has wanted the Premier's guidelines to be introduced.

Worse than the Premier misleading the House about the matter of consultation and negotiation with the Public Service Association—

**The Hon. D. O. Tonkin:** We are still waiting.

**Mr. BANNON:** The Premier will have his turn in a minute. The Premier would be advised to remain silent and listen to what I have to say. Worse than the Premier

misleading the House about this is the fact that the guidelines tabled by the Premier in Parliament are substantially different from those which the Public Service Association was given. There is not one mention in that document of the adviser to public servants appearing before committees. Let us look at the version that they were given. Guideline No. 3 states:

Public servants should acquaint themselves with the Standing Orders and any other special provisions.

That is quite reasonable and something which any professional public servants would be expected to do: in fact it is what professional public servants do today and have done in past years without prompting or guidelines. However, the official version of the guideline tabled by the Premier in this House, states:

That public servants, with the assistance of the adviser, should acquaint themselves . . . [and so on].

Part 2 of the guidelines forwarded to the association speaks of arrangements for officials to appear before a Parliamentary committee being made through the relevant departmental head with the Minister being kept informed. But, the version tabled in the Parliament adds:

An adviser arranged through the Public Service Board—not the appropriate department, notice—

must accompany an official appearing before a Parliamentary committee. It goes on to say that the adviser will decide what questions are appropriate for the officer and what questions are appropriate for the Minister.

Section 8 of the guidelines, of the version given to the P.S.A., suggests that a public servant, if he feels that he is being asked a question on which he does not have adequate knowledge or which requires him to give an opinion which may be inappropriate, may request permission of the committee to refrain from answering and offer the committee a further written submission.

Under the guidelines tabled by the Premier, the officer in this situation being questioned, or the adviser listening to the questioning that is taking place, can consider it inappropriate to provide the information or opinion requested, or if he considers that the committee's questioning goes beyond these guidelines, a postponement should be sought pending consultation with the Minister. So, the guidelines go on. The rights of the officer concerned to make requests of the committee and the committee's right to consider that request are now modified by the role of this adviser.

So, in summary, nowhere in the guidelines given to the P.S.A. was the word "adviser" mentioned. Nowhere was it suggested in the guidelines given to the P.S.A. that public servants would have to be accompanied by such a person who would vet their answers. However, the Premier insists that the guidelines that he tabled, so substantially different from those that the board and the P.S.A. were discussing, were the result of extensive discussion and were the result of the intention of all parties.

The final point concerns the grave matter of contempt of Parliament. Regardless of the Premier's attempts to mislead the House about the way in which the guidelines were drawn up, they, in any event, place South Australian public servants at risk of being in contempt of this Parliament. Erskine May is quite clear. At page 139 of the 19th edition, in the chapter dealing with breaches of privilege and contempt, it is stated:

Disobedience to the orders of the committee is a contempt of the House by which the committee was appointed, provided the order disobeyed was within the scope of the committee's authority.

A further statement, which is completely relevant in relation to the adviser, was made on page 157, as follows:

To tamper with a witness in regard to the evidence to be given before either House or any committee of either House, or to endeavour directly or indirectly to deter or hinder any person from appearing or giving evidence is a breach of privilege.

This principle has been reaffirmed by long Parliamentary tradition. It is a breach of privilege to give any advice to a witness that takes the form of pressure or of interference with his freedom to form or express his own opinions honestly or in the light of all facts known to him. The Premier cannot shelter behind these guidelines and behind his apparent concern for the protection of public servants to do what is manifestly his aim, namely, to protect his Ministers from their own inability and their own incompetence, and to prevent this House obtaining legitimate information.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer):** The first quotation that comes to mind is something about a great deal of sound and fury signifying nothing. Before we do anything else and get sidetracked on the issue to which the Leader has devoted almost all of his 15 minutes, namely, the pros and cons of the guidelines, we should get back to the substance of the motion that the Leader moved, a motion which, I might say, is totally inaccurate in almost every particular. I should have thought that anyone who lived in a glass house might avoid throwing stones.

The Leader has accused me of misleading the House and then proceeded to quote the very sentences that I used in this House which demonstrate, quite clearly, that I have not misled the House, and that I have stated the situation exactly. Because the Leader has chosen to imply, infer or put his own construction on some matter, he seems to believe that I am in some way responsible for his way of thinking. Heaven forbid that I would ever be in any way responsible for the Leader's way of thinking.

I have no doubt at all, from the way the Leader debated the issue of the guidelines rather than the substantive part of his motion that the Premier misled the House, that he was forced into this move by either his advisers or by his Party in very truth to forestall the motion that the member for Mitcham had on the Notice Paper. The proportion of time that the Leader spent on the debate gives great weight to that opinion. Let us examine the first part of the motion, which states:

That the Premier misled the House by claiming that the document "Guidelines for public servants appearing before Parliamentary committees" tabled on 6 August 1980 had been extensively discussed by the Public Service Board and the Public Service Association . . .

Quite clearly, there is no doubt about the wording. It is clear that, with this sole object in mind, the Government entered into extensive discussions with the Public Service Board, which in turn consulted members of the P.S.A.

Either the Leader is grossly careless in reading the matter that was before him or he is guilty of deliberate misrepresentation of what was said in this House. I refer again to that statement, as follows:

. . . extensive discussions with the Public Service Board which in turn consulted members of the Public Service Association.

There had been extensive discussion between the Government and the Public Service Board. Is the Leader suggesting that this did not occur? He does not answer. There was extensive consultation between the board and members of the P.S.A. Does the Leader suggest that this did not happen?

**Mr. McRae:** Yes.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** No, he has not denied that,

and I do not think the honourable member should speak for him. There is no way that the Leader can make this hold up, because there was extensive consultation between the Public Service Board and members of the P.S.A. I might say that I have been informed that the members of the P.S.A. involved were very senior members of the association and, indeed, they had already been consulted over a set of draft guidelines which the member for Elizabeth produced and which found its way to me attached to a letter. The situation is absolutely ridiculous; the motion before us is absolutely inaccurate. The motion as it has been designed represents a shameful twisting of words to suit the Opposition's obviously warped desire to create mischief at any cost, even at the expense of accuracy and of truth.

As to the second part of this motion before us, there is an absolutely astonishing contradiction; a total inconsistency appears here. On the one hand, the Leader has accused me, quite inaccurately, as I think any reasonable person would agree, of misleading the House. He accused me of misleading the House because I said that "extensive discussions had taken place between the P.S.B. and members of the P.S.A.", and he implies that I am in error because he says they did not. He then turns around and in the second part of the motion he says that the discussions did take place. He cannot have it both ways; the discussions either took place or they did not. In one part of the motion he says that they did and that I was wrong not to say so, yet in the second part of the motion he turns around and admits that they did take place. Obviously he is referring to the wrong one. In all my days I have never seen such a clumsily constructed motion or such muddled thinking as is represented by this attempt to head off the member for Mitcham. It is absolutely pathetic. All I can say is that he must be a very muddled man indeed.

Quite frankly, this motion is not worth wasting a great deal of time on. The suggestion was also made by the Leader that public servants could be at the risk of being in contempt of Parliament. That is quite ridiculous. Parliament is the master of its own affairs; we know and recognise that. I think that it is important that at this stage I talk about one or two of the matters that the Leader spoke about at great length in relation to the guidelines. The guidelines are not, as some politicians have claimed, an attempt to subvert Parliament's ultimate authority in determining its own procedures. Nor are they an attempt to gag public servants and so prevent communication of information to which Parliament is properly entitled. Rather, they are an acknowledgement that open Parliamentary committees could become highly political forums into which public servants might unreasonably be drawn by overt political questions. Should this happen, then, of course, the political neutrality of the professional Public Service would be compromised, and the committee system would weaken, not strengthen, our Westminster traditions.

For these reasons, the Government has prepared a set of guidelines that balance the rights of Parliament with the Government's desire for an extension of open committees and with the absolute need to protect the Public Service from involvement in political controversy. I assure the House that the operation of these guidelines will be monitored carefully and, if changes are required, they will be made. Those are the words I used this morning, and I stand by them. I also remind members (and obviously this is something of which they should be reminded) of what I said in another statement, namely, that the guidelines are intended to provide a codification of procedures so that all parties are aware of their respective responsibilities.

The Government will be pleased to have balanced and

reasonable responses to the proposals, and these will be given every consideration. I am pleased to tell the House that there have been some balanced and reasonable responses to the guidelines, that modifications to clarify the intent of the guidelines have already been examined, and it is very likely that changes will be made. The intent has always been (and this has been clearly stated) that they will be modified, if necessary.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Premier seems to be addressing the public gallery. He had his back to you, and the requirements of Standing Orders are clearly that he must address the Chair.

**The SPEAKER:** That is not a point of order. I appreciate the content of the Standing Order. I have taken particular note that both honourable members who have already spoken in this debate have given due attention to the Chair by address and by directing their attention to it. It is not uncommon for members on both sides of the House to move their head while debating, and it is not the intention of the Chair that they shall be directed towards the Chair on every occasion.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am sure it was a good try by the member for Elizabeth, and I am certain that the Leader of the Opposition will indeed welcome such intervention to save him from the acute embarrassment he is now feeling. There is no doubt that we want those submissions to modification. It would have been far more reasonable, responsible and sensible for the Leader, on behalf of his Party, to put forward some balanced and reasonable responses to the proposals so that we could examine them, rather than wasting the time of this House in an inaccurate, foolish and stupid motion, such as he has moved today.

It is inaccurate; it misleads the House; and it does everything he accuses of me of doing. Fortunately, there is no doubt about the wording of the statements that appear in *Hansard*, and the Leader can twist and squirm and change all he wants but, when it comes to the point, he cannot pin misleading of the House on the Premier or anyone else in this matter, and he knows it. It is disgraceful. The fact is that he has, on the one hand, said that I was wrong because discussions did not take place and then, on the other hand, he has said that discussions did take place. He has thus admitted himself that discussions did take place. I think that he had better sort out his own thinking, and I do not think that his motion is worth spending any more time on.

**Mr. McRAE (Playford):** I support the motion, in the context of the Westminster conventions. It is therefore important to realise that no reckless allegations of deliberate untruthfulness or of similar conduct are being made, nor is there any personal reflection on the character or motives of the Premier. Within the context of the Westminster conventions, what is relevant is the factual accuracy of the undertaking given to the House. The guidelines were tabled, by command, on Wednesday 6 August. In its own terms, the document refers to all Parliamentary select or special committees, for example, sessional committees, which would include the proposed Estimates Committees.

On the evening of the day that the guidelines were tabled, I strongly criticised them in my Address in Reply contribution. I do not propose to repeat all that I said. However, I was particularly critical of the invidious position in which guideline 5 placed a Public Service witness. In particular, the use of the words "... information of a controversial or politically sensitive nature" had the effect of putting any civil servant into a potentially

dangerous conflict of interests. Furthermore, guideline 2 and guideline 8, which require an adviser from the Public Service Board to be present, placed both the adviser and the public servant in an untenable position.

On 6 August, it was not made clear whether the Public Service Association had been consulted. In fact, a key part of my speech that night was devoted to calling on Public Service unions to condemn the guidelines; that is, I assumed that they, in particular the Public Service Association, had not been consulted as to the document tabled.

I notice that the Premier is so contemptuous of the House that he now walks out. I repeat that I assumed that, in particular, the Public Service Association had not been consulted as to the document tabled—and how right I was.

As far as I am aware, the next step was that Mr. Fraser, General Secretary of the Public Service Association, contacted me, having been alerted to the problems created by the guidelines. That was on the day after, namely, Thursday 7 August. I sent him a copy of the speech I had made. He then appeared on *Nationwide* and made two basic points: first, he denied that the Public Service Association had agreed to or, for that matter, had even seen the guidelines tabled.

I will go on to summarise this, but what the Premier just said to the House was a load of garbage. There must be a conflict. On the one hand, the Premier, and, I assume, the Public Service Board, say to this House that the Public Service Association had seen the guidelines tabled: on the other hand, the Secretary of the Public Service Association says, "No, we had never seen the guidelines tabled." Someone is not giving accurate information. They cannot both be right, and I would have thought that any schoolchild could understand that.

Mr. Fraser condemned the Government, basically for the same reasons for which I condemned it. Furthermore, any discussions that did take place in relation to any guidelines (and no discussions took place in relation to the guidelines tabled) were "in confidentiality, not to be discussed with members." That worries me, as a democrat.

On 12 August, the Premier made the speech in the House to which he referred. Now, the clear intention of his speech was to suggest that there had been agreement of the Public Service Association with the guidelines tabled. It could not be anything else. What would be the point of suggesting that there had been any agreement in relation to any document other than the guidelines that were tabled? What on earth would be the point of tabling them in the first place? Mr. Fraser by this stage had denied any such agreement in the interview of 6 August, and by letter to the Public Service Board dated 12 August had specifically complained of such an inference. He again asserted that the Public Service Association had not even seen the document tabled. I call on the Premier to table that letter. The guidelines bear close similarity in many respects to those operating in Canberra, but the change has been the insertion of the adviser.

Taking the position at its most simple, we can see that clearly somebody is misleading the public and Parliament. Mr. Fraser and the Public Service Board and the Premier cannot all be correct at the same time, since they assert diametrically opposed factual positions. I suggest that any reasonable minded person looking at the situation would agree that it was hardly likely that Mr. Fraser would agree to a document of such importance and novelty. If there was such an agreement, where is the letter by which he agreed to it? How does the Government conduct its business? Where is the letter by which the Public Service Association agreed to the guidelines? I call on the Premier

to produce it. Assuming that the Public Service Board (which seems to be copping some of the flak over this) and the Public Service Association were stupid enough to reach an oral agreement, where is the statutory declaration of the officer of the board that would help prove that what the Premier has said is true? I call on the Premier to ask his officers to table such a statutory declaration, if they can.

The fact is that no such letter exists, nor has it existed, nor has any such consent or agreement been given. How could anyone in his right senses suggest that a person like Mr. Fraser, with his history in the Public Service movement and the union, would agree to a document of such iniquity that any schoolchild could see that it would bring great disservice to his members? The Premier totally ignored the statement made by Mr. Fraser and the Public Service Association today. If Mr. Fraser is correct, either the Public Service Board or the Premier, or both, are wrong. If the Public Service Board and the Premier are correct, then Mr. Fraser is wrong. Parliament does not deserve the cavalier buffoon-style answer that we got from the Premier. As an Opposition, we demand that the Premier produce the evidence to show that the Public Service Association agreed to the guidelines as tabled. The Premier laughs at me. However, the Opposition is entitled to know. We have a conflict here.

*The Hon. D. O. Tonkin interjecting:*

**Mr. McRAE:** I would do precisely this. Is the Premier suggesting that Mr. Fraser is lying? I do not believe he is suggesting that but, as the member for Mitchell is saying, he is trying to laugh the whole situation off. He will not laugh it off, because I know that there is acute embarrassment inside the Public Service Board, which is worried about this matter. Also, there is acute embarrassment inside the Public Service Association, and indeed in Government ranks, and that is well known to members of the Opposition.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There are far too many interjections from both sides, and I ask members to desist.

**Mr. McRAE:** It is clear we cannot have the Public Service Association and Mr. Fraser telling the truth and the Public Service Board and the Premier telling the truth on the same matter. Someone is giving factual inaccuracies, and the Opposition and the public are entitled to know what is the truth of the matter. We are being denied that truth in a style worthy only of a buffoon.

My concluding point refers to the contempt of Parliament. As long ago as 1932, Mr. Winston Churchill made the fundamental point that any person who attempted to tamper with a witness even to the extent of stepping between a witness before a Select Committee or any committee of Parliament and that committee would be guilty of grievous contempt not only of that committee but also of the entire Parliament. It is just as bad as a witness giving evidence in a court being interfered with by another party because it is conduct judged to bring the whole process of the court into ridicule and contempt, and to subvert the course of justice.

We are aware of what has happened. The Public Service Board has prepared some kind of document, but the document tabled was never shown to the Public Service Association. The board was not aware of certain changes then made in Cabinet, and the changes made, I suggest, relate to the insertion of the word "adviser". Ministers on the front bench are looking uncomfortable, because they know that that is true, and that what occurred in Cabinet was that, without the knowledge of the Public Service Board, the word "adviser" and the concept were inserted because, with the coming of the Estimates Committees

debates and other Select Committees, the Government was worried indeed that facts would come before the public. The public is entitled to the truth and, so far as the Opposition is concerned, will get it. We will not tolerate the nonsense that we have had this afternoon. The Premier has said that Mr. Fraser lied, and Mr. Fraser is entitled to his good reputation. If he lied, let the Premier prove it.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I draw to the attention of the honourable member that there have been recent examples where I have indicated that the words "lying", "lied" and "lie" are unparliamentary in this Parliament. I accepted the first occasion on which the honourable member used the word because of the manner in which he used it, but I ask him to desist from using any of those three words.

**Mr. McRAE:** I will indeed, Sir.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The member for Playford rather surprises me by suggesting in what he has said that I said that Mr. Fraser had lied. That is a patent untruth, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

**The SPEAKER:** That is not a point of order. As has every honourable member, the Premier has the right by way of personal explanation to require such statements to be corrected.

**Mr. McRAE:** I will withdraw, if I am wrong. I am not withdrawing it at present, because I hope the Premier will study what he said and realise that Mr. Fraser has said that neither he nor his association agreed to the guidelines as tabled.

**The Hon. D. O. Tonkin:** I didn't say he did.

**Mr. McRAE:** On the one hand, the Premier said that the Public Service Association had agreed to the guidelines. Now he is not denying it when Mr. Fraser said it did not agree to the guidelines.

**The Hon. D. O. Tonkin:** Show me where it appears.

**Mr. McRAE:** In the statement made on 12 August.

**The Hon. D. O. Tonkin:** Where? You don't know and you can't tell. You are not telling the truth.

**Mr. McRAE:** The Premier is trying to gag me, and take control of the Chair.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will not reflect on the Chair in that manner, nor will any other member.

**Mr. McRAE:** I withdraw that remark, Mr. Speaker, and apologise, but I was provoked by the Premier. Not all parties in this issue can be telling the truth, because one or two must be lying. I am sorry that I reflected on you, Mr. Speaker, in that manner and I apologise. However, I do not apologise for anything I have said about the Government.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier):** The Opposition is running true to form in that it is putting words into the mouths of people that were not uttered, and it is misrepresenting in this case the words of the Premier. I am well qualified to speak in this debate because, as I have pointed out to the embarrassment of the Opposition, for a long time it has been visiting on the public of this State a string of falsehoods and misrepresentations in relation to my portfolio. When I point out the truth the Opposition is embarrassed. This afternoon we are taking part in the same sort of exercise, except that the Premier now happens to be the recipient of a complete misrepresentation of what he said to this House. What the member for Playford has argued is shot through with inconsistencies.

I refer to three points he raised. First, he said that the Public Service Board had been made a scapegoat. In the next breath he said that the board was acutely



embarrassed about this exercise. That seems to me to be casting the Public Service Board into an unusual role, where the Government is seeking to make it a scapegoat and on the other hand it is embarrassed by its own actions. We are at a disadvantage when the Opposition states that the Premier claims that Mr. Fraser lied, because we do not know what Mr. Fraser said today.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the that that word not be used again.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, the Government is at a disadvantage. I think it is nonsense to say that the Premier is suggesting that Mr. Fraser is dealing in untruths, when we do not have the faintest idea, except from what we have heard from the Leader of the Opposition, of what Mr. Fraser said today.

**Mr. Bannon:** I quoted his statement.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Well, it seems to me incomprehensible that the Opposition can claim that the Premier is saying that Mr. Fraser is dealing in untruths when we do not have the faintest idea what he said. That really is stretching credibility beyond all bounds. The Premier said that the Government entered into extensive discussions with the Public Service Board, which we did and the Public Service Board in turn consulted members of the Public Service Association. No matter how the Opposition wants to twist that sentence, no matter what construction it puts on it, that is a statement of fact, a statement of truth, and it is recorded, if the Opposition wishes to read it.

The Leader's motion contradicts itself in its two parts, and that makes a nonsense of it. In the first part the motion states that there were no discussions, and in the second part it is stated that the discussions were the wrong ones. The motion itself is a nonsense.

**Mr. Mathwin:** Who wrote it—Gilbert or Sullivan?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** That is a good question. I do not know who energises the Leader's public statements or who is responsible for them. If they are his own efforts they reflect very poorly on him; if they are the efforts of his staff, I think it is time he changed it.

**Mr. Bannon:** I'll take responsibility.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Then it reflects very poorly on the Leader when he constructs a motion the two parts of which completely contradict each other. The fact is that what the Premier said to this House is on record, and the Premier and the Government stand by it because it is a statement of fact.

Another interesting aspect of the remarks of the member for Playford is that he suggested that there had been no consultation at all, yet a breath or two later he stated that there had been consultation on everything but the fact that there was going to be an adviser present. I find this highly amusing. When we get a legal mind of the quality of that possessed by the member for Playford getting up and threading his whole argument with this string of inconsistencies, how are we to treat it except as a joke?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** We are treating the argument of the member for Playford as a joke; we are not treating the question of the guidelines as a joke. This motion is an attempt to convince this House and the public that the Premier has misled Parliament. It is nonsense. I say again that the only course I have had to follow in the past when a similar tactic has been used against me is to point to what I said. A week or so ago, I was accused of saying something I had not said. I would have thought that Labor Party members would get sick of this ploy. They cannot get around the truth. All one has to do is to state the truth, draw attention to what one has said. We are not

debating the merit or otherwise of the guidelines; that will be done when the motion of the member for Mitcham comes on. This motion is a cheap attempt to try to discredit the Premier without one figment of evidence to support it.

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung, the motion was withdrawn.

**The SPEAKER:** Call on the business of the day.

#### STATUTES AMENDMENT (CHANGE OF NAME) BILL

Second reading.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I move:

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

The main object of this Bill is to provide a single statutory procedure for the changing of names. At present, there are two separate statutory procedures for this purpose, one provided by the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act, 1966-1975, and the other provided by the Registration of Deeds Act, 1935-1973.

Section 24 of the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act, 1966-1975, provides, *inter alia*, that all persons over the age of 18 years or who have previously been married, and whose births are registered in the Register of Births, or for whom there is an entry in the Adopted Childrens Register, with the exception of married women, may deposit with the Principal Registrar, an instrument changing any of their names. This section also sets out a corresponding procedure by which parents, or in certain cases, one parent, may change the name of a child under the age of 18 years.

Section 35 *a* of the Registration of Deeds Act, 1935-1973, enables any person over the age of 16 years to change any of his names by depositing in the Registry Office a deed poll or statutory declaration evidencing a change of name. This procedure is also available to either parent who wishes to change the name of a child under the age of 16 years.

It should be pointed out at this stage that nothing in this Bill affects the right every person has to adopt informally any name he chooses. However, it is considered desirable that there should be only one statutory method of changing names, to be effected through the office of the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages. It is proposed that all persons over the age of 18 years be capable of changing any of their names. Modified procedures for the changing of children's names by parents will be provided.

A further important object of the Bill is to do away with the assumption that underlies a number of the provisions of the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act that a child will, as a matter of course, take the surname of its father. The Bill provides a more flexible scheme for assigning surnames to children.

The changes outlined above necessitate extensive amendments to the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act, 1966-1975, and consequential amendments to the Registration of Deeds Act, 1935-1973, the Electoral Act, 1929-1976 and the Adoption of Children Act, 1966-1978. Provision is also to be made for certain formal matters previously dealt with in schedules to the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act to be prescribed by regulation. Clauses 4 to 35 of the Bill relate to the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act, clauses 36 to 37 to the Registration of Deeds Act, clauses 38 to 39 to the Electoral Act and clauses 40 to 41 to the Adoption of Children Act.

I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

### Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1, 2, 3 and 4 are formal. Clauses 5, 6 and 8 incorporate essentially formal references to the registration of changes in name in the long title, section 4 and section 7 of the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act. Clause 7 deletes the definition of "Christian name" from section 5 of the principal Act, as this term will no longer appear in the Act. Clause 9 repeals section 11 of the principal Act, which sets out the duties of the principal and district registrars. These, it is felt, need not be spelt out in the Act, but rather left to administrative direction.

Clauses 10 and 11 remove section 13 and subsection (3) of section 14 of the principal Act. Both of these provisions referred to forms previously set out in schedules to the Act. Clause 12 amends section 15 of the principal Act by providing that the particulars to be furnished for the registration of a birth shall be as prescribed by regulation. A reference to the former fifth schedule is also deleted. Clauses 13 and 14 effect amendments to sections 16 and 17 of the principal Act consequential on the amendment to section 15. Clause 15 removes references to the former sixth and nineteenth schedules in section 20 of the principal Act, and substitutes, where appropriate, reference to prescribed forms and particulars.

Clause 16, which amends section 21 of the principal Act, provides new criteria for determining a child's surname for the register of births. Previously, where a child was born legitimate, or legitimated subsequent to birth in pursuance of the Commonwealth Marriage Act, 1961, or where the paternity of an illegitimate child was either acknowledged or established by a court order, the child took the surname of its father, and in any other case, the surname of its mother. The new section provides that the surname of any child may be that of either parents, or a combined form of the surnames of both parents, whichever the parents nominate, and in default of a nomination, the surname of the father for a child born inside marriage, and the surname of the mother for a child born outside marriage. Of course, where the father of a child born outside marriage does not acknowledge paternity or is not adjudged the father, the child will take the mother's name.

Clause 17 repeals sections 22, 23 and 24 of the principal Act. Sections 22 and 23 related to the alteration or addition of Christian names in the register, and section 24 to the change of names. The new procedures for changing names render these provisions unnecessary or inconsistent. Clause 18 removes reference to schedules from section 25 of the principal Act and substitutes reference to prescribed forms. Clause 19 repeals section 27 of the principal Act. This section provided for the noting of changed names of married persons in the register of marriages. Such a provision is unnecessary having regard to the new procedures for changing names. Clauses 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26 delete reference to various former schedules of the principal Act in sections 29, 31, 39, 40, 44, 47 and 51, respectively. Where appropriate, reference to prescribed particulars or forms has been substituted.

Clause 27 enacts a new Part IX to the principal Act, comprising sections 53-55. These contain the main substance of the new procedures for changing names. Section 53 provides that a person who has attained the age of 18 years, or who has been married, may change his or her name in the prescribed manner. A parent is also empowered to change the name of his or her child. If there is another living parent of the child, the child's name cannot be changed without the consent of that parent, unless a local court of limited jurisdiction authorises the change of name, and in any case, if the child has attained the age of 12 years, his or her consent must be obtained to any change of name. A court, in authorising a child's

name, must do whatever is in the best interests of the child. The section also sets out certain procedural matters relating to the registration of the change of name. Sections 54 and 55 provide for the maintenance of a register of changes of name, and the notation or changes of name to be made in registers relating to birth and marriage. Clause 28 deletes reference to the nineteenth schedule from section 66 of the principal Act and substitutes reference to prescribed fees.

Clauses 29 and 30 insert reference to changes of name in sections 67 and 68, respectively, of the principal Act. These sections relate to certified copies of entries in registers and the correction of errors in registers. Clause 31 enacts a new section 68a which empowers the Principal Registrar to refuse to enter in the register of births any forename, or any surname that is a combination of the parents' surnames, that is obscene or frivolous. Similarly, the Principal Registrar may refuse to enter in the register of changes of name any forename or surname that is obscene or frivolous. Provision is made for appeal to a local court of limited jurisdiction against any such refusal by the Registrar. Again, where the appeal is in relation to a child's name, the court must act in the best interests of the child.

Clauses 32, 33 and 34 insert reference to change of name in sections 71, 74 and 75 of the principal Act, which create offences of (1) failing to register births, deaths and marriages, (2) refusal by the Registrar to register any birth, death or marriage, and (3) destruction, alteration or forgery of any register, respectively. Clause 35 deletes reference to schedules in section 76 of the principal Act, which empowers the Governor to make regulations under the Act. Clause 36 repeals all schedules other than the first schedule. The first schedule contains a list of Acts repealed by the principal Act. Clause 37 is formal. Clause 38 repeals section 35a of the Registration of Deeds Act, 1935-1973, thus abolishing the alternative statutory procedure for changing names by deed poll.

Clause 39 is formal. Clause 40 makes consequential amendments to section 40 of the Electoral Act, 1929-1976, whereby the Principal Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages is now obliged to forward particulars of change of name of adult persons to the Electoral Commissioner. Clause 41 is formal. Clause 42 amends section 32 of the Adoption of Children Act, 1966-1978, by providing a new procedure for determining the surnames of adopted children substantially the same as that now provided for the purposes of registering names on birth.

Mr. HEMMINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from 19 August. Page 474.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): In beginning my remarks yesterday, I said that I supported this motion, and I will continue in the vein that I was referring to at the time, namely, the perks that business men and professional people can claim when they go on trips, whether in Australia or outside, and I also was referring to whether they can convince the Taxation Department that the ventures that they are going on are legitimately tied to their business activities. I believe that there is merit, in a country like Australia, where there are vast distances between many of our major tourist attractions and particularly our capital cities and where we have 11 500 00

of our 14 000 000 people living down the eastern seaboard, in having some taxation rebate system for people who take holidays in our own country.

I do not believe that it would be unreasonable if we allowed people (and I use for argument the figure of \$2 000) as a direct deduction from their taxable income where they use that \$2 000 on a holiday within Australia some considerable distance from their home. In other words, we would not want to allow it for a person who was travelling backwards and forwards to a restaurant within 20 miles of the person's home throughout the year and dining with friends and engaging in that sort of activity. However, where there was a genuine move to have a holiday within Australia, I believe the rebate could be allowed.

I know that the immediate response from Treasury officials would be that a considerable number of people already have their holidays in Australia and that, if we allowed this sort of deduction, immediately we would be taking away from the revenue area of income money that is already available to them and that sort of percentage of people having holidays in Australia would continue regardless of what incentives had been offered for others to have their holidays in Australia.

I know that that would be the case, but I would hope that members, the public and the Federal Treasury would look at the other aspects. We know that for every three tourists to Australia from other countries, we create one more job in Australia. It may be that for local tourism it is more like four or five tourists that would be needed to travel into an area to create another job opportunity. We do know that money turns over two, three, four, or five times through the tourist industry once it starts to move through that industry.

If we did end up encouraging (and I would hope we could) more Australian to see Australia first, there would be some benefits in other directions. In particular, I mention the employment area, but there would also be a considerable number of people who at the moment are on unemployment benefits of, say, \$50 a week (I believe it is \$52 and that the new Budget will take it up a little on the earning capacity they have) and who suddenly will be taken off the area of living on social service benefits and will be earning an income of their own.

Automatically, they would be paying taxation on their income, so, instead of it being a debit to the Treasury, there would be a credit in that field. The money that would be used in the main would be money that was going out of Australia. I made the point yesterday that there are more people leaving Australia and that more money is being spent outside Australia by tourists who are Australians or living in Australia than the amount of money or number of people coming into Australia from other lands.

Therefore, if we can get that money spent in Australia and employ Australians who pay income tax on that money that is really Australian money, it must be of greater benefit to our country and, in particular, it would give some young people the opportunity of having employment. Tourism is an area where a young person, or a person who is inexperienced but may not necessarily be young, can gain experience fairly rapidly in some areas where there is not a lot of need for great expertise.

In doing that, that must have a benefit for our total society. But not only is there income tax paid by those who are employed, but also there will be greater opportunity for profitability by business organisations, and from that profitability also taxes would be paid to the Federal Treasury. Not only would it go to the Federal Treasury: it would also come back to the State coffers, because every business organisation is taxed or charged some form of

fees by State Governments, and in some cases they are charged fees other than income tax by the Federal Treasury or Federal Government.

Australia has, as the member for Brighton pointed out, a vast potential for tourist attractions and facilities for Australians to see, let alone for those outside Australia to see, and, if more Australians looked at them and were encouraged to look at them, we would find that, by word of mouth, by a neighbour going to Darwin, Perth, Port Lincoln, or some other part of Australia, coming home, and saying, "I had a wonderful trip and it is worth going to have a look," more people in this country would be encouraged to spend their money within Australia.

We all know that, in the main, Australians who have a job are well paid by world standards and that this is a lucky country for those who have jobs. We know that, because it is a lucky country, a large percentage of our population is able to afford to go overseas and spend their money. I made the point yesterday, and I reiterate, that I know that air travel to our near neighbouring countries in the Asian area is reasonably cheap. In fact, it is cheaper in many cases than the cost of travelling within Australia, because of the vast distances between our cities and more particularly because of the light loads that our airlines must carry in transporting people to those areas. Because the airlines do not get full pay-loads on a regular enough basis, their charges must be higher.

If we can counter that by offering a tax concession, it then becomes cheaper for people to travel within Australia than it is at the moment. I say with all sincerity that this would be one of the greatest areas for creating job opportunities if the Government had the courage to do it. I know that one of the answers, apart from the one about the loss of present revenue that is available, to which I referred earlier, would be that if we implement it and it fails, we can never take it away. There is an old saying in politics that, if you give a dog a bone and then take the bone away, the dog will bite you. If you give the community some benefit and try to take it away, even though it is a benefit from their own club, to which they pay their subscription and find that the club cannot afford to meet the benefits given, and if you take away that benefit under that sort of light and thinking, people will not accept it.

I think that gradually the Australian people are being more realistic, because, in the main, I believe that the Federal Government has been more realistic in facing up to this sort of issue and not trying to buy votes, and that more of the community will accept that that is worth a try and it should be experimented with. If we only had an increase in job opportunities in that area for four, five, or 10 years and then people looked at most of the things they wanted to see in Australia, that would take Australia out of a serious situation that most of the Western world faces in relation to unemployment.

I am strongly convinced that within our community one of the biggest problems that we face socially, and as far as many young people in particular are concerned, is the lack of job opportunities. I made a point yesterday, though, in relation to so many more cases of dual-income families. The number of dual-income families in this country now is over 200 000 more than it was in 1975. In fact, there are more people in Australia who have jobs now than there ever were before in the country's history.

The only difference is that, instead of having only one person working within the family on average, we have two. I am not saying one of them should give the job up, but what happens in most cases in that mum and dad are working and sons or daughters are sitting at home and saying, "Mum and Dad, we cannot get a job." That is

because in most cases one of the parents is taking the job that traditionally 20 or 30 years ago the child would have had the opportunity to learn and occupy.

Society must live with that because it cannot be said, by legislation, to a person in society who has the capacity to hold a job regardless of age, marital status or income, "Thou shalt not be allowed to work and earn an income." More people should think about the position that they are in, even if it means that they move back to permanent part-time work in order to give someone else an opportunity also to obtain a permanent part-time position.

I know that many business houses consider that they cannot afford to employ young people because, at 18 years of age, a young person is entitled to full adult wages and that, before the age of majority was lowered from 21 years to 18 years, this was not the case. By law, an 18 year old is entitled to full adult wages, even though some may not want it. These young people would rather have an opportunity to gain experience. Some employers consider that they cannot afford to pay 18 year olds adult wages if they are inexperienced. If, somehow, young people could work for 12 months at a lesser rate, until they had gained some experience, they would have more opportunity to gain employment.

Small business houses, in particular, cannot take the risk of employing a person who does not have the capacity to do the work necessary to show a profit. Very often, the worker is the owner and he works long hours to make merely a meagre living. In many cases, some people in small businesses do not earn what people in other professions earn, be they community welfare officers, school teachers, university lecturers, or public servants. Many small business men who often work many more hours do not earn what the people to whom I have referred earn. They are not therefore enthusiastic about employing people who have little experience and who are entitled to full adult wages.

Under the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment regulations, an owner of, say, a small workshop or garage must provide certain lunch-room and other facilities, and in some cases he is not prepared to do that.

I know of a case in my community where a person, who is a good tradesman, was prepared to take on a young apprentice. However, the prospective employer was told that he must install a washroom and other facilities in the garage, even though the garage was next door to his private home and even though he had indicated that the facilities in his private home could be used. That person was over 50 years of age, had been in the trade for 38 years and wanted to train a young person who could take over his business later on. He decided that he would not provide the additional facilities, that he would work for a few more years, and then get out, leaving to someone else the responsibility of training a person to take his place.

A young person may be prepared to learn a trade and to come to an agreement with an owner, but our laws are laid down strictly by the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment. Those laws and regulations, which have been passed by this Parliament, sometimes make it impossible for some people to gain employment. I am conscious of the unemployment problem, much of which, I believe, has been created by our attitude as politicians, our trying to be trendy, and our forcing new ideas on industry and individuals who wish to be employed, thereby placing them outside the market.

It is no good our saying "You are entitled to this and that, and something else" if we, in regard to the domestic market, cannot afford to pay for these things and, more particularly, if those concerned with the export market

cannot afford to pay for them. We will merely price ourselves out of jobs. We in Australia have achieved that quite successfully, except in regard to those in the public sector who are guaranteed an income, such as politicians or public servants.

I now refer to an issue raised by the member for Spence, namely, homeless youths within our community. As the honourable member said yesterday, some young people in our community are homeless. In some cases, it is a genuine case of a parent or parents becoming unbearable for young people to live with, resulting in a young person's searching for other accommodation. I hope that the Government, the Opposition and community welfare officers will examine the matter seriously.

**Mr. SLATER:** Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr. EVANS:** A situation that requires serious consideration is the advice that is given to young people who are experiencing conflict with their parents. We all know that, at times, community welfare officers tell young people to take no notice of the police and that they have legal rights. It is stated, "If you go to school through the front gate, it does not matter if you go out through the back gate without attending school. No-one can force you to go to school if you don't want to and if you are over the age of compulsory education. Even if you are under the age of compulsory education and you cause enough trouble, no-one will force you to go to school." It is also stated, "If you have an argument with mum or dad, leave home. We, as community welfare officers, do not have to disclose to mum or dad where you are living."

In situations like this, the police are reluctant to do anything. The general attitude has been that young people are always right and that mum and dad are wrong. It is simple to advise young people to leave home, regardless of what problems they may face in the community, instead of the community welfare officers trying to keep the family together. I do not say that all community welfare officers do that kind of thing, but we know that it occurs in some cases. In virtually every situation in which a homeless youth is involved, there is a home somewhere in Adelaide that has an unoccupied room available. In most cases, there is also a mum or dad, if not both, to welcome a young person home.

Also, in most cases, a mum or a dad are prepared to compromise. We all know that we, in our youth, would have had some conflict at home and that some compromise and understanding would have been needed, more by parents but often by the young person. However, we have developed an attitude in our society that states "If you do not want to stop at home, leave home, and some Government authority will find a place for you to live at the expense of the taxpayer, and that authority will also find benefits for you to live on so that you do not have to work." To the credit of most young people, they do not accept that. However, if some young people get by by that method, automatically an incentive is created for others to test the system, and that has been occurring for a number of years.

There is no doubt that one of the problems that confronts our Police Force is that police officers cannot manhandle a junior in any way, even if the youth gives all the lip in the world. At one time, the long-time tradition of a slap under the ear and a youth being sent home to mum and dad would have been followed. The police believe that there is no point in charging a youth with a minor offence because a review committee will say "Go away", after giving the youth a block of chocolate and telling him to be good in the future. There is no incentive for youths to have

self-discipline.

I now refer to sport, about which some comment was made recently in relation to the problems faced by our olympians and international sports people and those people who wish to compete at a high standard. Some people consider that they cannot compete with people from countries like East Germany, Russia, Poland, or even the United States, under the Australian system for participation in sport.

The Australian community would not accept children becoming the property of the State so that the discipline required to become a sports person is applied by the State and not by the individual. In an affluent community it is very difficult to apply self discipline. If one lives in a community experiencing hard or harsh times, where one must discipline one's way of life even to get a reasonable feed and survive on the amount of money made available, self discipline is forced on people. However, in a society like that in Australia, where self discipline is not forced upon us, it is very difficult for top athletes, or people who have the potential to become top athletes, to make sacrifices.

When we consider the achievements of our country's top athletes who competed at Moscow and also those who chose to take the other course and not compete, and look at the achievements that they have made while living in a community of affluence, we see that their achievements are greater than those achieved by the Russians and the East Germans, because our athletes had to make sacrifices to get by in our society while their friends could go dining or could travel wherever they wanted and please themselves what they did. The people in the communist countries that our athletes were hoping to compete against were told when they should train and what they should do, and that if they wanted the perks of life they had to succeed. An example of this occurred in 1956, when the Pakistani team was competing in hockey matches in Melbourne. When the team was sent out on to the field to play in the finals, the members were told that if they did not win they knew what would happen.

**Mr. Slater:** Dead!

**Mr. EVANS:** Not quite that bad; they did not live under the member for Gilles. They were told that, if they did not win, they would be demoted from the rank of command officers within the Police Force to the rank of constable. Those were the terms—win or else. These people were in the Police Force only because of their hockey skills; they had to train at hockey, and they were used for police work only in an emergency.

If one looks at the types of people competing in many of the Russian teams, one can see that they are top sports advisers or command officers within the armed forces, and the perks of rank were provided for being top athletes. In this country it is different, and those who argue that we should be trying to compete with communist countries and spending more money to develop our athletes know that it is an impossibility. Even if the money were made available, the same result would not be achieved, because our people could not knuckle down to the same sort of discipline.

**Mr. Slater:** Some can.

**Mr. EVANS:** I agree that a few could, but because of the Australian way of life there would be virtually no-one who could get down to the sort of discipline that the top Russian and East German athletes must exercise for competing in the Olympics. I think we would all agree with that.

**Mr. Slater:** But what is the population of those countries?

**Mr. EVANS:** I agree that those countries have a large

population. I think that our athletes have one advantage, namely, the weather. It was interesting to view the opening and closing ceremonies of the Olympics at Moscow. A film was shown of an East German inter-competition three years ago. If members have seen that film they will have seen that it was exactly the same format as the Russians used. They cheated; they could not even think up their own ceremonies, so they copied those used by the East Germans. That film is in Adelaide now and is readily available from the athletics association for people to look at. The Moscow ceremonies were virtually a replica of what the East Germans did three years ago. People applauded the ceremony and said that it was great, but it was not original, as the views pushed to us by the news media and other sources suggested.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** It was very mechanical.

**Mr. EVANS:** It was very mechanical, and was done, no doubt, with a purpose. However, I do not wish to get into that political arena in that sense. I respect what our athletes have achieved. Some members of the Opposition at a recent dinner meeting would have heard Sir Hubert Opperman, who spoke of his achievements and of those who competed with him. He spoke only of the hardships. Sir Hubert rode a bicycle from Fremantle to Sydney in 1937. If honourable members can imagine what the Eyre Highway was like then, that will give some idea of the sort of endurance that people like him had. In those days, cyclists rode in 2 000 km races in France, and through Europe and the Alps. The contestants would leave at midnight from a station, riding cycles without any lights, and travel for 200 miles through the night. From this, one can envisage the sort of endurance those people had. That sort of thing happened in many other fields of athletics.

Sir Hubert would agree with the point which I have made and which I think he was making at the dinner, namely, if you are going to succeed there is a penalty for it and a sacrifice to be made. Top athletes must make those sacrifices, and the greater the sacrifice a person makes in comparison with the ability that he has, the greater will be his success. When I heard of the sorts of conditions under which some of these people competed and the harsh times around the 1930's, I could understand that they had the capacity to do what they did and to develop their abilities so highly because they were not living in an affluent, easygoing, undisciplined society such as we find Australia today.

Local government has quite a role to play in providing sporting facilities. Gradually, with more State Government help and money made available from Federal sources, it is achieving its goals. I want to acknowledge, in particular, what the Mitcham council does in this field. Also, the Stirling council is gradually picking up the same sort of responsibility in relation to sport, and now the Meadows council is doing the same.

I refer now to the money made available by the Commonwealth Government (the Fraser Government, I point out for those who are not aware of whom I am speaking), for local government through its grants money. The actual overall increase made available in that area is 33.36 per cent. In my own area, the Stirling council has had an increase in grant money from \$178 000 to \$243 000 for this year, an increase of 36.31 per cent. That is not insignificant. We hear about 10 per cent being the inflation rate, and so on, but here is a Federal Government that is increasing grants by 33 per cent overall, and to the Stirling council it has increased the amount by 36.31 per cent. The Enfield council's allocation has increased from \$610 000 to \$829 000, a 35.9 per cent increase. Again, that is a substantial amount of money made available to a

community. For the Meadows council, the amount has risen from \$252 000 to \$340 000, a 34.92 per cent increase. The Noarlunga council now receives \$1 007 000 in Commonwealth grant moneys. When the Fraser Government took office it recognised the three tiers of Government, namely, local, State and Federal. It stated that local government bodies needed greater recognition and greater opportunities to make their own decisions on how they spent their money. In other words, they were provided with untied money.

Through the grants to local government, administered by the Local Government Grants Commission, we now have the Fraser Government contributing these millions of dollars of taxpayers' money (our money) to the club, and the club hands it back, to be used through the local government authority, without the State or Federal Government directing how it should be done. It is to their credit that they have taken it as far as they have taken it so quickly. I am sure that the local government authorities recognise the sincerity of the Fraser Government in giving them the opportunity to decide themselves how to spend their money.

I will now talk briefly about a problem I have experienced at the Flinders Medical Centre. The centre is a huge community complex, which has many thousands of visitors each week. The method that it has of organising car parking is misleading to some people because, when people first see the signs, they infer that only those on authorised business can enter the car park. Having gained that impression recently when trying to find a car park, I had to drive around to try to find a park.

I remind the Government that there is an urgent need for more car parking facilities at the centre. The community living in the Bedford Park triangle, bounded by Sturt Creek, University Way and South Road, should not be jeopardised by having cars parked along their streets while people visit or work at the centre. Land is available and could be developed, and I hope that the Public Works Committee, which is examining a proposal now, will give it all the consideration that it needs. I will give it all the evidence it needs to ensure that the facts are put before the committee.

There has also been much comment about the Sturt College of Advanced Education, which is virtually on the same campus as the Flinders' Medical Centre and Flinders University. As I have already stated strongly, I will not support the closing of the Sturt College of Advanced Education. If there is a need for rationalisation, let us develop, first, one college of advanced education, as suggested by the Sturt College people, and keep the campuses, rationalise their courses and programmes, perhaps introduce one or two others such as a sports residential college in part, if possible, expand the area of education diplomas that may be available for people who may be interested about or working in the tourist industry, and see what is the end result.

If, after two or three years, we find that there is still an over-supply of facilities for the campuses, we should consider closing one of the campuses; however, I argue strongly that it should not be the Sturt College of Advanced Education, not because it happens to be in my district (districts change year by year, and so do politicians) but because it is the only one in the south, it serves the total southern community, and it adjoins two other teaching institutions. Other campuses need to be looked at more seriously than does the Sturt College of Advanced Education.

I appreciate the concern that the Minister of Transport, who is sitting in front of me, has shown my area by improving some of its transport facilities. I make the point

that, within an area such as the Hills, transport is difficult and that it is difficult for the Minister to provide services. However, there is a need for improved services in the Hills, particularly if the new subdivision is established at Craighburn (as it will be). The new subdivision will have large allotments and will, in the main, be environmentally acceptable by the community. There will therefore be a need to examine what sort of transport services we should have in those areas, together with what sort of roads should be made available. We need to be concerned not only about public transport but also about the opportunities for those with cars to travel nearly as freely from those suburbs as they do from any other Adelaide suburb.

I hope that the Minister and his department will look seriously at the extension of the railway line from Bellevue Heights, across the Sturt Gorge, past Flagstaff Hill and Aberfoyle Park, without going through the residential sections, past the reservoir that serves Happy Valley, through to the back of Reynella. The extension of the line would mean that many cars would be taken off the road, and it would be a rapid trip into the city by rail. Although it would be costly to take the line across the Sturt Gorge, the long-term benefits would be substantial to the Minister's department, particularly to the community, the environment, and in relation to fuel economy in the long term.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** Some \$60 000 000.

**Mr. EVANS:** If that is the initial estimate, I hope that it will be estimated again and that it is found that it can be done more cheaply. Perhaps that was examined when the scheme was to be done through the Public Works Department. If the Minister examines the matter, he may find that private contractors can perhaps do it more cheaply. I ask the Minister to take up my challenge, as I am sure he will.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** There will still be a need for a station at Bellevue Heights.

**Mr. EVANS:** There is no doubt that a station is needed at Bellevue Heights, particularly now that 350 aged persons will be residing at Resthaven, which is virtually adjacent to that area. Bellevue Heights needs a railway station, and I have raised this matter previously. If the Minister is also looking at that, he pleases me and a large section of people in the Bellevue Heights area.

Recently, I raised a point of concern to some people, even to some of those who belong to my organisation in the Parliamentary sector, namely, Parliament House. I suggested to a newspaper that perhaps the tower, which was originally planned, could be constructed on this building to celebrate our 150th birthday in 1986. I compare it with 1936, when the House, as far as rooms were concerned, was only half completed, although the House of Assembly was built in 1889. In 1936, Sir Langdon Bonython gave £100 000 (equivalent to \$5 000 000 today) so that the State could begin that part of the building, the Legislative Council, which is the Upper House of this Parliament House.

*Mr. Lynn Arnold interjecting:*

**Mr. EVANS:** Although some members opposite wish that it had never been built, it has carried out its role effectively and has generally done a good job. Indeed, it is a vital part of the democracy of this State. The tower would be nothing more than an ornament. However, the photograph in the *Sunday Mail* was not a photograph of the final plan; the actual sketch of the final plan, which is in the lobby of this building, is available for all members and the public to see.

I said something which was not included in the article and which disappointed me. I said that, if some major

companies such as mining companies (and I can think of some that have given large sums recently for special cultural art projects, which I think was good) could contribute to the building of the tower over the next five years, Parliament House would at least be completed as was originally intended.

At no time did I say that peoples' money, in the sense of taxes collected, should be used. We have spent \$15 000 000 on a building next door. The plaza for that building can only be described as a tank trap. We paid a person from overseas who is supposed to be an expert to design it. However, he ripped us off in relation to a gory thing that few people think is attractive; it is not much benefit to the Festival Centre in relation to the colours, shapes and design that have been used. We have spent public money in other areas that could have been used more wisely. At no time, however, have I advocated that public money should be used to build the tower.

Finally, I refer to the way in which we operate in this Chamber. I have been here for some time and, although I do not feel old in terms of service, I am starting to reach the stage where only the member for Mitcham and the member for Victoria have served longer than have I. I learnt an early lesson when I came into Parliament. Before I came into Parliament, and when I was door-knocking, I made a personal attack on the then member for Millicent (later the Premier for a short time), Mr. Des Corcoran.

Now that I look back, I think that I reflected on him and his attitudes unfairly and he proved that to me later in the Parliament. That was a lesson I learnt; there is no benefit in this place in reflecting on individuals, their personal life, their attitudes and their families. The former member for Brighton, the Hon. Hugh Hudson, argued strongly on this in the House at one stage. On another occasion one member of this Parliament was up on a serious charge on a complaint by a private individual. That member went to the other side of politics and asked members on that side not to raise the matter in Parliament because of the effect that it would have on his family, especially his wife, and perhaps others. Members on the other side agreed to say nothing, and that is what happened.

Recently, however, I have seen a trend which indicates that these conventions are going. I recall talking in the bar with a member of this Parliament about the Upper House. In joking terms, I said that it would make a wonderful squash court if it was ever abolished. That member, who was a Speaker of this House, told someone else, and another person raised it by way of a question to me. I told that Speaker that I could not trust him again in a private conversation. It is important that we, as Parliamentarians, disregard anything we see or hear in the corridors of the Parliament. It has nothing to do with what happens in the Chamber. If we have an argument in the Chamber, when we walk out of here we should be able to sit and talk on most occasions, person to person, friend to friend. That applies in the majority of cases.

We have coming into this place now a trend towards attacks on personal lives, or whatever else it might be, quite often with the individual attacked having the strength to carry it off, but the family members affected are the ones who really suffer. Those who make the attack do not always understand the repercussions involved for others, whose health and welfare could be affected. I hope that you, Mr. Acting Speaker, will convey to the Speaker my belief that he has set out to try to eliminate as far as he can the areas of unparliamentary practice that have gone on in this place for some time. I believe that the Speaker is trying to restore some higher standards, but I do not think he can do that unless we co-operate. Many of us might think that we have no skeletons in the cupboard, or no

sources of concern but, if the crunch really comes, we are all told enough about one another to make the situation embarrassing if we wish to do so.

I was grateful to the then member for Millicent at the time, and I appreciated the point made by Mr. Brookman, the former member for Alexandra, and Mr. Hudson, the former member for Brighton, over the years that, if we keep personalities out of this place, ignoring what people might do in their private lives, and worrying only about philosophy, policy, and Parliamentary procedure, Parliament will be a better and more friendly place in which to work. I hope that will be the trend in the future.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury):** It is with pleasure, Sir, that I take this opportunity to address a speech in reply to the Governor's Speech in opening this Parliament. The Governor indicated the philosophy and the directions which the Government hopes to follow in the next session, and I hope to take this opportunity to summarise the findings that I reached in my overseas trip to try to expand my knowledge of various areas of relevance to government.

I place on record my thanks to this House for giving me leave of absence for the two weeks of sitting in June to enable me to be away at that time. I also thank my personal assistant, who ably managed my office and constituent affairs in my absence, and the Foreign Affairs Department, which did a great deal to make sure that the time I spent overseas was used to the best possible advantage. I also owe thanks to people I met overseas. I met many people and covered a wide range of topics, and I was able to cover all sorts of interesting areas in these contacts. I even met the member for Glenelg overseas, and it was a pleasure to me to see that he had been released from his Transylvanian gaol. I met him in Munich.

**Mr. Mathwin:** Yes, and I bought you a cup of coffee.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** That is so. If the honourable member wants to go back to Munich and wait for me to come again, I shall be happy.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** What part of Transylvania?

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** He came from a Transylvanian gaol. I was away for nine weeks. I visited 10 countries in Western Europe, incorporating 22 cities, and covering a distance within Europe of 11 000 miles. In the course of that 11 000 miles and nine weeks I had an opportunity to have about 50 appointments, involving about 70 or 80 people and covering a wide range of topics. Given that there was press comment in my absence that the trip was being paid for by this Parliament, I must say that this was not the case. It was a self-paid study tour, with no recompense from this Parliament, and the suggestion in the press was a little mischievous.

The areas that I covered included energy questions, development of regions within the national structure, research facilities of governments, participation of government in industry, the automobile industry, market gardening, tourism, and public transport. It is a pleasure to see the Minister of Transport here today. All of these topics will take a great deal of time to cover, and I can at best only summarise my findings. I hope in due course to prepare a longer report that I will address to the Leader of my Party, so that other people can study the matters in greater detail.

I should like to turn first to the question of energy. Obviously, nuclear energy and the decision whether or not to use uranium is of great importance in this State. The potential for alternative energy sources is also of great importance, and I was interested to find out what I could in these various fields. One of my first appointments was

with officials of the International Atomic Energy Agency Commission, in Vienna. I met six officials for 1½ hours, discussing various questions, and I analysed some of their comments afterwards with the attache to the Australian Embassy in Vienna.

It was clear that they were doing a high pressure sales job on the need for nuclear energy, on the importance of mining uranium, and the importance of this State's becoming involved in that. I found many of their arguments very interesting, and some of their arguments perhaps even changed some of my knowledge about the nuclear industry. They gave me, as all agencies in Europe have a tendency to do, a vast volume of paper. Perhaps that was a mistake on their part, because I read the paper, and conclusions and deductions can be drawn from some of the comments perhaps different from what had been anticipated. One document I found interesting was prepared by one of the people I met, Mr. Niehaus, who was comparing the relative hazards of power generation from various forms of fuel—coal-oil, liquefied natural gas, uranium, and solar energy. It went into a great deal of statistical study looking at these areas, proposed various hypotheses, and came up with some deductions. It included statistics and tables, and I seek leave to have that material inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Russack):** Is the information purely statistical?

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Yes, Sir.  
Leave granted.

EFFECTS FROM ACCIDENTS AND DISEASES FROM  
SUPPLY OF 1 GWa (e) (8.76 x 10<sup>9</sup> kWh) (1 - 20)

	Accident Injuries (in man days lost) This Study	Accident Deaths This Study	Fatal Diseases This Study
<i>Occupational</i>			
<i>Coal</i>			
Fuel Supply	3 020-3 090	0.66 -0.73	0.097
Transport	710-880	0.351-0.381	
Normal Operation	213	0.016	
Construction	240	0.055	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>4 200-4 400</b>	<b>1.08 -1.18</b>	<b>0.10</b>
<i>Oil</i>			
Fuel Supply	2 640	0.387	
Transport	470	0.068	
Normal Operation	130	0.013	
Construction	230	0.054	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>3 500</b>	<b>0.52</b>	
<i>Gas</i>			
Fuel Supply	1 770	0.22	
Transport	100	0.02	
Normal Operation	140	0.012	
Construction	210	0.049	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>2 200</b>	<b>0.30</b>	
<i>Light water reactor</i>			
Fuel & Reprocess	190	0.094	0.28-0.3
Transport	7	0.002	0.0006
Normal Operation	140	0.014	0.13-0.18
Construction	235	0.055	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>570</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.42-0.49</b>

*Solar Thermal*

Material Supply	290	0.055
Transport Mat.	82	0.021
Construct Plant	4 620	1.07
Construct Storage	30	0.012
Normal Operation	3 450	0.96
<b>Totals</b>	<b>8 500</b>	<b>2.12</b>

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** The statistics refer to the findings of the paper on the number of man days lost, accident deaths, and fatal disease deaths that may occur with the various forms of power generation, if each one of them generated one gigawatt of energy. The surprising thing is that, with regard to the area of the man days lost, the paper suggests that the most hazardous form of power generation is none other than solar energy.

It proposes that 8 500 man days would be lost by that power and compares it with nuclear power systems with a loss of 570. It suggests that, in relation to the fatal disease side, solar energy is not fatal, but it does suggest that nuclear energy may cause one or two deaths. That point interested me, because it is one of the tenets of my belief that solar energy has great promise for the future and is a safe form of power generation. Therefore, it was incumbent on me that I should study the paper at great length, and I quote some of the comments made in the paper because they indicate that the findings of the paper cannot be taken as seriously as it is suggested that they should be, albeit that it is issued by an agency of such respect and repute as the I.A.E.A. One comment states:

The health effects of the storage of nuclear waste were assumed to be close to zero and were not considered.

The figure listed for man days lost and fatal diseases did not include any possibility of accidents happening in the storage of nuclear waste. No-one here would suggest that nuclear waste is a safe thing to be stored like a can of baked beans in a cupboard, because it is not. Yet that whole range of hazard is left out of the statistics. The report continues:

Low frequency hypothetical reactor accidents are not included.

It has been suggested that when a reactor goes through a serious melt down or some other major accident occurs there is likely to be devastating injury beyond calculations made from previous experience, but the paper blithely regards that as not significant and wipes it out, thus helping to explain the relatively low death figures it gives for nuclear energy. However, the report qualifies it by saying:

One limitation of such analyses is that only those failures and event sequences can be included which experts can imagine.

It seems to me that the authors are especially unimaginative if they cannot realise what would happen in a serious accident at a nuclear facility. The report states:

The health effects from nuclear power are comparatively well understood.

I know that scientists in 1945 also held that the health effects of the atom bomb were understood and that they had some idea of radiation diseases. However, in the past 30 years the body of knowledge in regard to radiation diseases is far greater than it was in 1945, and anyone who now suggests that we know all the health effects of nuclear energy is being unreasonable. In 30 years we will have new findings into this health hazard.

That was one piece of evidence given to me indicating that nuclear energy was the hope of the future. I cannot take this seriously after those comments. I hope that in future people who say that it is safe will come up with a better attempt to compare the hazards of the nuclear



industry and solar energy.

One other document presented to me was the International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation Report, which was released for public comment in March 1980 and which was the result of two years study by various nations of the world involved in the nuclear question. It is regarded as of great significance for the technical study of the nuclear industry. I am still studying it carefully and considering all of its information. Nevertheless, at this stage I am able to say that certain comments in it astound or disappoint me. It indicates at one point that issues of a sociological nature and societal nature have nothing to do with the aims of its study. It refuses to enter into the debate about whether the increasing aspects of the security needed to guard nuclear installations, waste products, or the transport of fuel are important. It refuses to look at the flow-on of those increased security needs on the general state of the security consciousness of society. Yet many contend that the more we turn to nuclear energy, the more stringent security measures and police measures would have to become, to make sure that those facilities are not abused to the detriment of society.

However, it indicated a little more reasonable approach to the question of the hazards of the nuclear industry than is displayed by Government members today. In the first session, the Deputy Premier suggested that the hoo-haa about safety hazards of the nuclear industry is nothing more than that. He has been very demeaning about attempts to raise it to a serious level of debate. The experts of the nuclear nations of the world are not quite so irresponsible, and I quote from this document, as follows:

Fears about the safety of nuclear installations and concern about radioactive waste disposal on which the public is reluctant to leave technical options open to be decided in the future . . . are highly emotive but nevertheless they are real, and in all countries they are necessarily taken very seriously. That must be the case. We cannot allow this debate to be taken down to the level of trivial response that the Deputy Premier and other Government members produce at times in this House. Another comment in the report concerns me. We have had mention by the Federal Government that one of the levers that we have to ensure that our uranium is safely used is a condition of contract and sale to the buyer. That is supposed to indicate that the material is in good hands, and that the Federal Government has everything under control. However, that is not really the case. The I.N.F.C.E. Report states:

The ability of a user to protect himself is enhanced by his being able to take advantage of the diversity in the types and degrees of flexibility of the contractual conditions offered by the now various suppliers.

That suggests that we have a bargain basement supermarket arrangement for uranium and one tries to get the best contract one can. However the document indicated a preference beyond that. It states:

The principle and preferred mechanism for the assurance of fuel supply should be a competitive market. Such a market protects consumers against interruptions of supply which can be caused by commercial, technical, social, or Governmental policies at the national level.

It comes out in favour of the fact that there should be a *laissez faire* attitude to the marketing of uranium and nuclear products. If that is the prevailing attitude, what possibility is there that we can anticipate that contractual conditions established by the Federal Government will result in honourable use of these materials? That undermines the credibility of the Federal Government and of Government members here who have the same attitude.

I met other officials in the nuclear industry who favored

it, but I do not believe that I should canvass their opinions now. I will do so later. I met an officer of the organisations called Geneva Alert, which is concerned to stop the proliferation of nuclear power within the region of the city of Geneva, including regions of France and Switzerland. In the process it has done much work on the hazards of the nuclear industry, and has studied fast breeder reactors. I read a paper given to me by an officer of the organisation that suggests that the possibility of accident in fast breeder reactors was not slight or likely but was inevitable. The starting thesis for the projection in that direction is the fact that fast breeder reactors contain high quantities of sodium at rather critical levels of activity.

The response from the Soviet Union, for example, was that not one experimental fast breeder reactor in that country has not had a fire with the sodium that is contained within it. That is rather great odds. The suggestion is, I think, reasonable, that the same will happen to the other fast breeder reactors that are being built elsewhere. Also, this group has done a lot of study on the relative advantages or disadvantages to the community on the use of nuclear energy, *vis-a-vis* solar energy. In particular, it had some interesting studies on land use.

I was interested in that because I know the member for Newland has made certain comments in that regard in the last week, inaccurate comments as I will show. Members will recall that the member for Newland suggested that the building of a solar power station that had a capacity of 1 000 megawatts would require 50 square miles of collectors. I was intrigued by that figure because it contradicted information I had received when I was overseas. One of the pieces of information that it contradicts is none other than that made in the paper by Mr. Niehaus whom I mentioned earlier. He is no protagonist of solar energy. He extrapolates how much land would be needed to create power from a solar facility compared to a nuclear facility. I use the figures that he gave and the parameters established by the member for Newland, and that suggests no more than 35 square kilometres of collector area. That is an incredible difference. I suggest at this stage that the figure given by the member for Newland is rather like a rabbit out of a hat. It goes much further than that.

I had an opportunity to inspect in Seibersdorf, near Vienna, a solar electric generation facility that is being developed by the Austrians. That is an interesting facility.

*The Hon. M. M. Wilson interjecting:*

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I appreciate the comments of the Minister that he will continue listening, especially to what I will have to say about the episode of O'Bahn. The Austrian officials provided me with the technical data of that facility. I studied that data carefully because I am a bit concerned about that 50 square miles that the member for Newland is dropping on us. The figure they gave is only 30 square kilometres for the type of facility they have developed. It is an interesting facility, and I believe the member for Newland would be well advised to read up about it. I was certainly interested to read about this facility, because I think it has a lot of future for the power generation needs, particularly of the developing world.

The Austrians are suggesting that the facility they have developed is superior to the solar powered generating plants that are presently being developed in France or Germany and they have compared the German and French plants with their own. More importantly, they recognise that solar power will have great potential for the underdeveloped countries of the world, and they want to provide it as cheaply as possible to those countries. The Austrian Minister of Science and Research has said that, a relatively small country not able to give large sums of

money, indeed will be able to transfer free technology to the underdeveloped world, and Austria foresees that this particular solar plant will be such an example of the unfettered transfer of technology to aid the developing countries. This facility will therefore be of much more benefit to the developing world than will the fast breeder reactors, nuclear-power stations or any of the other nuclear collection that the Government might try to foist on these people.

For example, it is unnecessary for a small community which is powered by the 10 kilowatt plant, which is the model plant Austria is hoping to send overseas, to have national grids and the expensive cost of the provision of those national grids all over the country, so costs will be saved there. These people have found that the type of facility they have developed is easy to maintain and to construct, and because it operates on low water pressures, rather than the high water pressures common for some other solar facilities, it has a lesser incidence of breakdown owing to the lesser stresses involved in the entire system. It also has a higher energy recovery rate. I think that that facility is something that we should look at, possibly with regard to supplying power needs to distant communities in South Australia.

In looking at the Austrian facilities, I also investigated one or two other areas of energy research. One I believe was promising, but sadly promising in a way, and that was the facility to generate power from windmills. At Seibersdorf, the Austrians have developed a 10-kilowatt windmill power station as a prototype for the development of a 70-kilowatt model at a later stage. They have developed a model that is more efficient in terms of weight, of moving parts, and many other parameters, compared to the windmills we know of old. I say it was a sad discovery because for decades Australia has been a world leader in the production of windmills, ever since the end of the last century. It is sad that the production of those windmills has not simultaneously resulted in improvement of design, we are still basically marketing today a windmill we produced 70 to 80 years ago. It has been left to other countries, which are not so committed to wind energy, to advance that area of technology. I think Governments in this country at the State or national level will decide that perhaps some changes can be made here in that regard.

With regard to energy, the proposition is often put that one of the best and greatest sources of future energy supply in the world is none other than the aspect of saving energy, energy conservation. In that regard I was particularly interested to meet with French officials to find out the various ways in which they are trying to promote energy conservation. They have specific goals for reducing the growth of consumption figures over the years ahead. I have some statistical information which I seek leave to incorporate.

Leave granted.

#### ENERGY CONSUMPTION

In millions of tonne equivalents	Consumption levels indicated by pre-saving growth figures	Anticipated consumption after savings	Energy savings
1974	181	176	5
1975	176	164	12
1976	187	174	13
1977	193	178.5	14.5
1978	199	183	16
1985	260	225	35

(objective) (objective)

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** The purpose for incorporating these figures is to indicate the goals that are being set by

the French Government and the extent of them; I think they are quite admirable. They are doing this in three ways: first, they believe an important role is to be played by education in the community. It is not quite the generalised type of education we have in this country, with television advertisements showing the setting sun over coal mines and moving music in the background; it is more specific than that, and is something people can relate to. They include information about how much specifically can be saved by the installation of a particular facility in one's house, or by the installation of a different type of appliance, or by switching out the lights in every room but one. These specifics mean a lot more to people when it comes to meeting the electricity and gas bill each quarter, rather than this somewhat emotional approach presently being adopted by our Federal Government.

From that they go on and offer diagnostic services to the community whereby officials from the Government will analyse ways in which a residence, factory or office can become more fuel efficient. They can provide actual ways that can be done to achieve real benefits for the householder or factory owner. On top of that, they offer financial incentives of two types. First, for enterprises or communities if they are able to make savings of a certain type, they will give them financial subsidies in return. For example, a 400 franc subsidy is available if, in annual consumption, one petrol tonne equivalent can be saved. Other financial incentives include tax deductibility for certain installations in houses that make it more possible for people to take advantage of those savings.

In the energy area I also looked at other matters, such as the tidal power station at La Rance, near Saint Malo. I also visited the solar facility at Font Romeul Odeillo in the Pyrenees. I do not believe I have time to go into details of the findings there because of their reduced relevance to our immediate situation in this country. Needless to say, however, they were most interesting ports of call.

Another area that I regard as of particular personal importance is that of regional development. It was suggested last year in the election campaign that this State suffers from a lack of its share of industrial investment—that South Australia is not getting a fair proportion of the total national industrial investment. Naturally, if this was true over a longer period of time, everyone would be concerned. I was therefore concerned as to whether there may be certain geographic or demographic features of this State that need to be examined.

Indeed, I believe that State Governments of both persuasions have adopted this attitude previously and have recognised that there may be a need to consider South Australia's rather special position. While the State has many advantages, we must acknowledge that it has certain disadvantages. Therefore, I was interested to meet with Government officials from various countries and to find out how they propose to solve problems of this kind. I met with the Cassa per il Mezzogiorno in Italy, D.A.T.A.R. in France, which is responsible for the Central Massif, the Spanish authorities and the German authorities. A great deal of interesting information came from those meetings.

I was able to examine the ways in which Governments believe that infrastructure can be supported, the ways in which there can be participation in the granting of incentives to attract industry, and the way in which training facilities are assisted. Nevertheless, I believe it to be a very complicated field and one involving a lot of problems. One of the major problems that emerged from the meetings with those officials from different parts of Europe is that perhaps supermarket bargain basement attitudes are being created for multi-nationals, which can play off one region against another in an attempt to

achieve the lowest possible price and therefore, by implication, reduce the real benefit for the host community. This was occurring while I was there.

The Austrians were competing with the Portuguese with regard to a new Ford facility that is to be built in the next couple of years in Europe. They were trying to undercut each other so that one country would ultimately win. That is not the best way to ensure the soundest investments for industry. I know that the Germans were concerned about the matter, as were the French. The Germans feel that some means of control must be adopted in relation to offering incentives. They realise that the coming incentives battle that will occur not only between the nations of Europe but between all nations of the world in the years ahead will become a significant battle.

Therefore, for that reason and for another reason, the French authorities believe that their main emphasis should be not on the promotion of grand industries and big facilities but on the promotion of smaller businesses and smaller factories that employ fewer than 50 people. Indeed, their financial incentives to those small factories are much greater than for large factories. The impact of what is offered by way of construction deductions and other incentives is much greater for the smaller enterprise than they are for the larger enterprise.

There is even a special industrial finance agency that will lend only to new industries that are not subsidiaries of bigger, outside industries. This agency is predominantly for the benefit of localised industry. I believe that we will see in the years to come that that region has achieved a better spread of industrial development that more fairly attunes to the local community than other methods followed in other regions.

Of course, it takes account of the other acknowledged fact of life that at least 50 per cent of employment in many communities is supplied by small industry and not by large industry. Past industrial incentive programmes internationally have often overlooked the role of small industry in this regard. While I was there, and in regard to Government participation in regional development, I visited a facility in Sines in the south of Portugal, which is the site of the largest Portuguese petro-chemical plant and is of some significance by European standards. It is due to come on tap later this year and, therefore, I was reasonably interested to see what had been done in the surrounding areas to cope with that facility, given that it has some relevance to us because of the possible Redcliff development.

The first thing that I noticed was that the Government of Portugal, through a holding company, owns 50 per cent of the petro-chemical complex because it believes that, as it is a basic industry, it should be under at least half control of the Government as it is of such significance to the national economy. I believe that that is interesting. There is a positive role for Government investment in the area of basic and heavy industries.

The proposal in regard to that area is to develop an industrial port facility and refinery facility that will ultimately have a population of 100 000 people and will cover an area of 40 000 hectares—a massive area. A special agency has been created, the Gabinete do Sines, which is entirely responsible for the development of that area. The office is independent of all other Ministries and is responsible only to the Prime Minister of the country. It is unique in that particular regard.

Special legislation was passed by the Parliament that applies to that area of the country only, and therefore environmental standards have been set that are the strictest in Portugal and, indeed, would rank very well in regard to standards anywhere in the world. One can only

hope that the facility and its aims are met in the years ahead and that the steel plant and other facilities that will be built there will go ahead as easily as possible.

I was very impressed with the planning initiatives; there was a deliberate effort to make the residential areas and the old town areas as discreet as possible from the industrial facilities. There was an obvious conscious desire to ensure that the environment of those who will have to work in these heavy industries will be as pleasant as anywhere in Portugal, and I believe that their planning efforts deserve to be commended. I believe that we can learn from some of the things that the Portuguese were attempting to do. I hope that the facilities that may be built at Redcliff will take account of some of the constraints that were applied in Portugal.

I refer now to the role of Government in industry. I have always believed that Government can play a positive role in industry. I do not accept the argument that Government in industry needlessly leads to bad investment patterns, bad economic decision-making or low economic growth. Indeed, the record goes in the other direction. Therefore, I was interested to note areas in which the Government was involved in industry, and I have mentioned the petro-chemical facility in Portugal.

I also visited the Renault company in Paris, of which 90 per cent is owned by the State, the remaining 10 per cent being owned by the workers at the factory. It is also interesting to note that that car company is the most successful car company in Europe at this time. No other car company is able to achieve the profitability of that company, which has had for many years a record of profitability that is the envy of all other car companies in the world.

I was interested also to note the role of the Government holding company concept that is followed in Italy, Spain, Austria and Sweden. My particular area of reference was the Institute of National Industry in Spain, which plays a significant part in that country in relation to industrial development of one sort or another. It is a very large corporation and ranks tenth in the list of European companies. It has fixed assets of \$11 000 000 000, employs 6 per cent of the industrial labour force of that country, and provides 15 per cent of the industrial exports, as well as providing 11 per cent of the gross industrial product.

This corporation competes with other companies in the Spanish economy and controls certain sectors because it is believed to be in the national interest that it do so. I refer, for example, to the steel and ship building industries. It also has significant shares in many other industries, such as the automobile industry. One of the things that intrigued me was employment. I have some statistics in this regard, and I seek leave to have them inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

#### RATES OF EMPLOYMENT

Year	Employment	
	I.N.I.	Total Civilian
	(millions)	
1975	0.226	12.69
1976	0.236	12.54
1977	0.239	12.44
1978	0.244	12.09

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: These figures show the situation over the past four years in regard to employment within

both the Institute and its various subsidiary companies, of which 60 are direct and 200 are indirect, and the total civilian employment within the country itself.

Members will know that Spain has undergone an economic crisis during the last four years and has had to face many problems. The situation is that, over that period of time, the Government holding company and its various subsidiaries have provided 18 000 extra jobs, a growth of 8 per cent on their 1975 figure, or roughly 2 per cent a year, at a time when the total civilian employment has declined by 600 000, or a 4 per cent decrease. In other words, the Government holding company and its subsidiaries have been able to modify somewhat the effect of the economic crisis in that country, and without giving way to massive losses, I might say. Most of the companies within the I.N.I. stable are profitable. Indeed, until 1978 the entire holding company as a whole was profitable, and only the ultimate crises in the steel industry and the shipbuilding industry took it into loss figures in that particular year. That is clearly a positive advantage to the employees, the working population, of that country, namely, an ability for the Government to take an active part in trying to reduce long-term unemployment and in trying to create new jobs. Indeed, many of those new jobs were created in under-developed regions of that country, thereby alleviating even more serious unemployment problems that exist within those particular regions.

I think that this country should take a more serious look at the possibilities of Government initiatives of this type. This is not limited to Spain. There are other examples in Italy, Austria and Sweden and, indeed, Governments in Europe in one form or another accept that they should be involved in industry. Perhaps there is another area in which Governments can be involved in industry that is less direct and does not involve a form of capital take-over or capital participation, and that is the ability of Governments to take the research bill of industry, to take over the very heavy work and burden that is involved nowadays in developing and keeping industries competitive on the international scene. It is in that regard that I was most impressed to see what the Austrian Government does. The Austrian Ministry of Science and Research offers to Austrian companies a research facility that I think is quite unparalleled. It operates like this: an Austrian company may feel that it has a concept, an idea, which it would like to see developed, but it knows that it to be beyond its own financial resources.

It knows that it cannot within its own budget take it to its conclusion to which they think it could well go. Hence they take the idea to the Government. In the Government that I mentioned, the Ministry develops the project right to the concluding stages, to the finished product. It then returns to the Austrian company that brought it in the first place, and says, "There is your product. You now have a lead time on production; you now have a lead time to get the product on to the market, and therefore to make the profits that a lead time can give, but after that lead time any Austrian company can participate in that particular idea and its development." Of course, it is only right that it should be like that.

So, two things have been achieved. First, the country as a whole has taken the cost of developing the product. It is shared throughout the entire community, and that company is given the opportunity to make some return on its initial concept. The second thing, of course, is that the community as a whole is not prejudiced to the extent that that idea becomes the monopoly of one Austrian company, but rather the Government has seen that it becomes the facility of all Austrian industry. I think that was a very impressive scheme that I hope it will be looked

at in this country seriously.

I now refer to the question of temporary job creation programmes, such as those that we had in this State last year with the State Unemployment Relief Scheme. I investigated this matter, too. I feel that the SURS scheme that we had in South Australia has proven to be the best possible type of scheme in its basic principles. The schemes that are presently operating in Europe confirm that opinion. The concepts that we had with the SURS scheme exist in many countries within Europe. However, there did seem to be the possibility that one or two improvements could be made to a new SURS scheme idea when it is reintroduced into this State. I shall therefore mention them for the record.

First, the Germans, who have the closest parallel to our old SURS scheme, felt that six months was not long enough. They in fact believe that a maximum time of three years employment within a SURS scheme should be possible, and they gave me the positive proof that that works—in statistics on the employment of people who partook in such a scheme. They indicated to me that, within the first 18 months, one-third of those who entered into such a scheme had found alternative full-time employment, and that by the end of three years another one-third had found alternative full-time employment. Also, of the one-third who had not found full-time employment at the end of that time, a substantial proportion went on to find employment within a reasonable period of time. That is a very successful rate of employability for those who had the opportunity to take part in the scheme.

**Mr. Mathwin:** But those figures are much better now in relation to unemployment in Germany.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** I thank the member for Glenelg for allowing me to have a water break. The question of whether these schemes are successful depends on various elements. One of the things that the Germans believe to be highly significant in their programme is the element of training within the programme. Perhaps they pay more attention to training than we did in our scheme here. Again, that would be another insight that we could consider in any such future programme, when the present Government recognises the foolishness of axing the programme and brings it back on to the scene again.

Also, I met with various Government officials at the O.E.C.D. about how successful their job creation programmes were. They indicated that they do have a degree of success matched by the figures I just quoted on Germany, and similar figures were given to me from other countries outside of Europe indicating their success. They also indicated that ultimately there are very real benefits to the economy as a whole that outweigh the possible costs that a Government must meet. Of course, in this country we face the problem that, ours being a Federal system, under the SURS scheme it was we who were paying the money and the Federal Government which was receiving the benefits without giving us a matching subsidy. I think that is something that should be faced in the future also.

I refer now to the question of the automobile industry. When I spoke in the first session of this Parliament, I suggested something that one member in this House regarded as nearly heretical, and that was that different car companies should possibly consider talking to each other and do joint research, and possibly consider jointly producing parts for their various products, and then compete on the open market. I did not apologise for the heresy at that time. I did not withdraw the comment after I had received the reaction from the other member. However, I feel I was wise not to do so, because my experience in Europe vindicated that idea which I had.

That is what has been happening for years in Europe—not only happening for years, but happening on a growing scale as the years go by. I shall mention some examples.

The Renault people told me that for 14 years they have had a joint factory with Peugeot, their chief competitor within France. Also, they have had another factory added to that one within the intervening period. Likewise, they told me that they had production agreements with Fiat and Volvo. Shortly before my arrival in Europe, there was the announcement of the foundation of the European Automobile Research Association, which consists of Fiat, Leyland, Volvo, Renault, Peugeot, and I think one other company. Its sole work is to amalgamate the research capacities of those major automobile producers to achieve the best possible product, because they realise that it is through research and development that they will be able to produce a product that will compete into the next decade

against the Japanese industry and the American industry. As I say, that vindicated the attitude that I took before. I believe that we should again try to promote that particular concept within this country. Now that we have seen a change of ownership of one of the automobile manufacturers, perhaps it is becoming something with a greater possibility.

Another interesting feature came to my attention while I was visiting one of the automobile people, namely, the Renault factory. First, I would like to have inserted in *Hansard* some statistics from which I can draw conclusions.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Are the figures of a purely statistical nature?

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** They are.  
Leave granted.

#### RENAULT FACTORY

Year	Hours per week	Gross Profit million Fr. francs	Total staff	Production (agricultural tractors and R.V.I. excluded)		Total all vehicles	Exports
				V.P. Cars	V.I. Com. veh.		
1968		309	76 060	734 455	72 952	807 407	432 060
1969		542	86 349	911 264	98 108	1 009 372	526 097
1970		370.1	93 672	1 055 803	103 942	1 159 745	680 639
1971	av. 45 hours	262.2	94 335	1 069 070	105 244	1 174 314	661 174
1972	av. 44 hours	996.3	95 661	1 202 686	115 641	1 318 327	712 597
1973	av. 43½ hours	1 034.5	97 518	1 292 991	121 572	1 414 536	809 255
1974	40 hours	932.4	96 504	1 355 799	131 729	1 487 528	844 376
1975	39½-39¾ hours	520.9	100 147	1 293 551	98 397	1 391 948	825 683
1976	39-39½ hours	1 843.2	106 753	1 500 922	159 051	1 659 973	935 436
1977	35-39½ hours	1 612.8	106 310	1 584 201	153 506	1 737 707	963 263
1978		1 845.4	104 659	1 573 368	145 030	1 718 398	960 241

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** The figures relate to profitability, employment figures, production figures and the hours worked on average per week by the employees at the Renault factory between 1968 and 1978. I might say that this is a very interesting set of figures. They confirm my comments about the profitability of that company. Also, they confirm the success of that company in production and in export but, more importantly, they also confirm that that company has been reducing the hours of work per week worked over the last 10 years (the period mentioned) very successfully indeed.

They are now working, on average, 35 to 38 hours a week. Reductions have been consistent over that 10-year period: some years, 20 minutes a week, other years, half an hour a week, or whatever. The reduction has come from the figure of 45 hours a week in 1971. That, I think, has significance to us, in view of the campaign being mounted in the country for a 35-hour week, and the response that it is receiving. We are told that it is impossible, and that, if it happens, there must be a wide-scale introduction of technology, thus displacing masses on to the unemployment market.

However, the employment figures for the Renault company do not indicate that. Indeed, the number employed by Renault over that period was 30 per cent greater than it was at the start of the period. Likewise, the company's production has increased markedly, as has its profitability. The approach taken by Renault over 10 years to have this steady reduction in its employees' working hours, recognising the legitimate right of its employees to

participate in the company's profitability, has benefited it, rather than the trauma that would result suggested by the opponents of it in this country. The most reasonable response to the campaign for a 35-hour week is the programme's steady introduction, rather than the attitude of blind, head-in-the-sand resistance which we are currently meeting.

I also wanted to make some comments about market gardening and tourism, in relation to which I will have to be briefer than I had anticipated. With market gardening, I found that research is the key to solving any difficulties in the world ahead. I was impressed by the facilities that the Dutch had installed in this area. I was interested to note that market glasshousing (which is my particular interest) is an industry that is 100 years old, and that it has been matched by a research facility in The Netherlands for the past 80 years. The fact that they are the world leaders in glass housing, and its production, helps to explain the obvious advances that they have made. They are aware that Government must provide the research facilities for the development of products. It is a shame that South Australia does not have a Government-funded institute to support the development of products grown in glass-houses, thus enabling the industry to survive. Already, the industry is facing serious problems, and this is an issue that I will be following up in times ahead.

Another matter that concerned me with regard to market gardening was information which I received from the Food and Agricultural Organisation. It suggested to me that it was doing much work in this field in the Middle

East. It is promoting the development of glass-housing in various Middle East countries. That automatically rang alarm bells in my mind, because I know that the Department of Agriculture is going around to various market gardeners and suggesting to them that the solution to their problems in South Australia is to export glass-house products to the Middle East. If this information which the F.A.O. gave me is correct, it can at best be a short-term solution only, and, if our market gardeners place too much reliance on it as a growth market, they will face serious marketing problems by 1990. I hope that the Minister of Agriculture, who is in the caverns of the building somewhere, is listening and paying attention to what I have said.

Another area of agriculture that interested me was the production of heat energy, carbon dioxide resources and other energy from grape marc, which is the waste product that comes at the end of winemaking. The Austrians, who have done much good research in this field, have proved that it has much potential that we may not otherwise have

expected. It is a potential fuel that has more energy value than does wood. It is between brown coal and black coal. For a State that has such a big wine industry, this is something we could seriously look at in the years ahead, first, for the production of heat and, secondly (and perhaps more significantly), for the production of CO<sub>2</sub> which, in terms of glass-house production, can be significant for improved vegetable production.

Another area to which I wanted to pay some attention is tourism. It has been suggested that tourism will be the hope of the future in this State and will provide the jobs we need. It has been stated that, if we can provide three tourists permanently, one job will be created. I hope that that is so, but I want to look more at figures in the months to come. I ascertained overseas certain information which suggested that we ought to take a close look at that assertion. I have some statistical information, and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard*.

**The SPEAKER:** Is it purely statistical?

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** Yes.

Leave granted.

#### STATISTICS RELATED TO CHANGES IN TOURISM FROM 1977 TO 1978

Country	Change in Employment	Change in monthly average occupancy of hotels rate	Change in nights of occupancy of hotels and similar
Australia .....	+1.6%	+ 0.9%	+ 2.2%
Austria .....	+2.4%	+ 1.4%	+ 4.0%
Finland .....	-6.3%	+ 0.5%	+ 4.1%
Germany .....	-2.4%	+ 0.6%	+ 3.3%
Ireland .....	-9.6%	+ 4.4%	n.a.
Norway .....	no change	- 4.1%	- 0.1%
Portugal .....	-0.4%	-11.0%	-12.9%
Sweden .....	+3.7%	- 4.8%	n.a.
Switzerland .....	+0.7%	- 1.8%	- 2.8%
Yugoslavia .....	+6.8%	+10.4%	+15.1%

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** The information concerns the increase of employment within the tourist industry between 1977 and 1978, the change in the monthly occupancy rate of hotels, and the change in the nights of occupancy in hotels in various countries. It is an attempt to try to measure a growth in tourism against the growth, or otherwise, in employment. I do not believe that, on those figures, there is the support needed for the assertion that three extra tourists create a job. Some of the figures suggest that perhaps increased productivity was even losing jobs while the number of tourists was increasing. I hope that those members who are interested in this matter will look closely at the figures, and see whether or not we are trying to buy ourselves a big surprise package that will have more danger to it than benefit.

Another area with regard to employment which concerns me and which has not been paid sufficient attention is the seasonability of employment in the tourist industry. I studied figures of various European countries, particularly the examples of Austria, where the lowest level of employment in a month is only 72.7 per cent of the highest level month; that is a wide variability. Do we have a market that wants that type of employment structure for a large number of its people? We must plan ahead to see how we can modify that variation, perhaps by the altering of school holiday periods interstate, or whatever. I hope that we will look at that more seriously, and not accept this as the street paved with gold that will bring us all our fortune.

Another matter that concerns me is that it seems to me, looking at the O.E.C.D. figures, that tourism is a highly vulnerable industry and that, if one country catches cold, in economic terms the host tourist country catches pneumonia. I looked at the figures for 1973-4, the oil price crisis period, when the economies of countries throughout Europe were affected. At that time the tourist kingdoms of Greece, Spain, Portugal, Italy and Switzerland suffered dramatically. Greece, for example, suffered a 32.5 per cent drop in its tourist industry; Spain had a 9.3 per cent drop; Portugal had a 30.6 per cent reduction; Italy's drop was 24 per cent; and Switzerland had a 12 per cent drop. Do we want an industry that is entirely volatile in its income patterns? If we do, what can we do to ensure that that volatility is reduced, so that we do not see the wild fluctuations in income that cannot be good for an economy.

**Mr. Mathwin:** That must be the first time in many years that it's dropped in Switzerland.

**Mr. LYNN ARNOLD:** It shows that surprises come in tourism. To conclude, I will mention public transport, and I will have to leave out the good side of it, namely, The Netherlands. I will deal with that matter at great length at another time. I was tremendously impressed by the imagination and ability of the Dutch to cope with the public transport problems in their country, and to provide a community service, and do it well. That is the good news. The bad news was my discovery at Rastaat, in the Federal Republic of Germany, where I visited the

Daimler-Benz facility. I thank the Foreign Affairs officials and Daimler-Benz for giving me the opportunity to ride on the O'Bahn bus. Therefore, I have to say that my conclusion from my experience with the O'Bahn is that the Minister of Transport and I have been taken for a ride on O'Bahn. Of course, the Minister has never actually been on the bus, so he has been taken for a ride in a different sense. I do not believe that this system will be the answer to our public transport needs for the north-east for a variety of reasons.

It obviously has some advantages. No system could be entirely without advantages, and such a respected company as Daimler-Benz would not be involved in the scheme if it did not have some advantages. The first advantage is that the buses, as they travel along their guided rails of steel or concrete, can travel at speeds greater than those normally travelled on an ordinary road. The company suggests a speed of 80 km/h, and I accept that. When these guided rails go down the various suburban roads in this city, will we be able to allow them to travel at that speed? What about the hazards to pedestrians? Will they still be expected to abide by the normal speed restrictions applying to every other vehicle within the suburban area? I think the answer will have to be, "Yes".

The other supposed advantage is the supposed flexibility. It has been suggested that the problem with the l.r.t. system proposed by the Labor Party when in Government was that it did not have flexibility. People had to change their mode of transport up in Tea Tree Gully and get into another form of transport. This was inconvenient—and indeed, that is so. But a simple deduction about O'Bahn indicates that 80 per cent of travellers on the future O'Bahn system, if it ever has the misfortune to come into existence, must have a change of mode ahead of them.

The O'Bahn bus involves one bus. When it reaches the end of its guided rail system it can go on only one route. All the other passengers who want to go somewhere else in Tea Tree Gully will have to get off the bus and on to feeder buses to take them to other areas of Tea Tree Gully. It is not possible for one bus at one time to serve 10 different routes. The supposed flexibility serves to benefit only one select group of O'Bahn passengers, and not all the residents of Tea Tree Gully, as has been suggested.

I was pleased to learn that, if the bus breaks down within the guided rails, it will not be the serious problem that we thought it would be. It is possible for buses coming behind to push it out on the guided rails to the next break in the system. That is the good news. The bad news is that it cannot be done as quickly as trams can push each other out on the tramlines, and there would be substantial disruptions in the timetabling of the system if a bus broke down while in operation. That cannot be regarded as efficient public transport.

The other question which the company was not able to dispute (and I would be interested to know whether the Minister is able to dispute it) relates to the lifespan of the buses. Trams in many parts of the world, including our own city, have lasted for decades, and yet the generally accepted figure for buses is 15 years. Therefore, in the long term it cannot be said that the capital cost of the O'Bahn system is cheaper for equipment than is the l.r.t. system. The Daimler-Benz officials told me that the actual cost of installation of the guided portion of the track, where the concrete and steel rails run, is no cheaper than is the installation of the l.r.t. system for its own rail portions. I thought that that was highly interesting, because we have had quoted to us how many millions of dollars will be saved by the installation of O'Bahn in preference to l.r.t.,

and yet we have the statement that the guided portions cannot be considered any cheaper. I think that needs some explanation. One of the other features that came up is that there was an impressive subway construction system available for the O'Bahn.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

**Mr. OSWALD (Morphett):** I rise to support the motion so ably moved by the member for Newland and seconded by the member for Mawson. The Liberal Party entered the 1979 elections with a health policy that showed grave concern for the community over the increasing incidence of dependence on drugs, including alcohol, and offences related to drugs. The Liberal Party promised that, when in Government, it would move immediately to improve liaison between the Alcohol and Drug Treatment Board, the Health Commission, the Education Department, the Department for Community Welfare, and other concerned voluntary organisations, to co-ordinate intensive measures to combat this growing problem, with particular emphasis on action directed towards the root causes as well as prevention and out-patient care.

The Liberal Party also promised to support and expand the role of health educators in our schools, so that teachers and student teachers could be given special training to be able to lead education programmes in schools and be in a position to identify and deal with problems as they arise. I am, therefore, particularly pleased to see this policy enunciated in His Excellency's Speech at the opening of Parliament on 31 July, and to see that a Drug Education Liaison Committee has been established.

Also, I am sure that the people of South Australia are pleased to see that the new Government has moved quickly to grasp the nettle of drug abuse in our community and also is moving to implement the recommendations of the South Australian Royal Commission into the Non-medical Use of Drugs, which called for the establishment of a committee to co-ordinate and extend the activities of Government and voluntary agencies in drug education and counselling. Never before in the history of the community health area has there been a greater need for the co-ordinated public health education committee.

We cannot talk about the need for drug education and counselling without including it in the context of a total community health education programme. South Australia needs a core of professional health educators. We are particularly fortunate in this State in having some of the most efficient and effective alcohol and drug treatment centres in Australia. The South Australian Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board conducts clinics and has a reputation known across the Commonwealth.

The Health Education Unit of the Health Commission is a very efficient and professional organisation, with the ability to establish a concept of self-responsibility for the development and maintenance of health in our community. It aims to encourage and assist individuals and communities to analyse their health behaviours and develop preventive health services. It provides an advisory and training service for our preventive health agencies and develops programmes based on its assessment of community needs.

An example of the unit's work is its highly effective stop-smoking programme. In this programme smokers are grouped together. The aims of conducting stop-smoking groups are to make it easier for group members, first, to understand why they smoke and state their own goals towards giving it up; and, secondly, to share a personal attitude towards health issues and support each other in developing a health promoting attitude.

It is by working in these groups under the guidance of the Director of the programme that members are able to recognise their own abilities to free themselves of the habit permanently, to be able to recognise their ability to help other group members to maintain the motivation to stop smoking, and to develop their own self-confidence by being able to free themselves of a dependency. These stop-smoking groups are conducted not only by the unit, but are now expanded to community health centres and major metropolitan hospitals.

The South Australian Education Department has developed a curriculum for a comprehensive school health education programme. Eventually, students, according to their ages, will be taught about drugs within the context of instruction about health in general. It is a very broad programme, covering the areas of consumer health, diseases and disabilities of the body, what constitutes a healthy environment, the body's need for food, rest and activity, our mental and emotional health, sex and family life, the use and abuse of drugs, general safety, and our general attitude to work. I think it is important to note that this programme has been developed and is being modified by trained professional educationists.

The Drug Squad of the South Australian Police Department is another department that undertakes drug education sessions on request, and has two major education roles, which are, first, to educate the public in drug abuse and, secondly, to ensure that the public is informed of the police role in drug law enforcement. I understand that, because of time and manpower restraints, the squad is concentrating mainly on professional, medical, and legal bodies, parent groups, school staff, and students.

In drug education, we also have the education sections of the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board. This section is conducted by two registered nurses, and its aim is to operate as a public relations unit to inform health and welfare professionals, as well as the general community, about the services of the board. It is a source of technical information about drugs, their uses, and their effects on human behaviour.

The section also provides drug and alcohol education for medical students, nurses, school students, and the general community, as well as training teachers and providing education on alcohol and other drugs for workers in industry.

I have deliberately spent a few minutes discussing the drug education programmes undertaken by some of our Government departments or their agencies. Despite the excellence of their individual work, it is generally agreed amongst health education lists that there is a lack of co-ordination amongst the various bodies attempting to teach and provide information at the various levels in South Australia. The Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs stated that the growth of educational activities had been haphazard and had largely been an *ad hoc* response to our expression of public anxiety.

Unfortunately, the result of this *ad hoc* expression of public anxiety brings about numerous requests for single-session teaching courses in school classrooms and school council meetings by "drug experts", and also similar requests for speakers to address community groups. This type of general drug and alcohol education in the schools or in the community can be counter-productive unless it is conducted by teachers who are offering it as part of an on-going, broad, community-based, co-ordinated education programme as envisaged in His Excellency's Speech.

Because school teachers have this continuous on-going relationship with the students, the Health Education Unit of the Health Commission uses its trained health educators

to conduct short-term instruction and workshops for school teachers who wish to learn methods of health education. The teacher, who knows the children more intimately, then instructs the classes in an on-going general health education programme.

Until the Governor's Speech, there was no real commitment as a matter of Government policy to a co-ordinated health promotion exercise in South Australia. Health promotion has frequently been identified as an important and necessary aspect of our health services for the future, but a real commitment can be made only on the basis of a plan for development accompanied by the resources to do the job.

Much needs to be done in the promotion of a co-ordinated community health education programme. I have already pointed out that health promotion activities in this State are conducted on an *ad hoc* basis, inasmuch as they are not part of an overall health promotion plan that tackles clearly identifiable health issues. Unfortunately, programmes largely operate independently of each other, resulting in duplication of effort and diffusion of resources. It is not difficult to detect varying standards of programme, and often conflicting messages are generated on health promotion issues. On some occasions programmes are also under-developed in terms of their data base, and they lack the support of high quality resources and aids. Further, there is much health promotion effort and enthusiasm, but little or no knowledge as to the relevance of activities or their impact.

I think it should be quite clear to members that this state of affairs in health promotion has implications for the Health Commission in general and both the Health Promotion Unit and the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Board in particular. There is a clear need for a viable central organisation to bring pattern, purpose and meaning to health education activities.

If the aim of the newly formed Drug Education Liaison Committee is to co-ordinate and extend the activities of Government and voluntary bodies in drug education and counselling, as was mentioned by the Minister of Health in a press release on 30 April last, then for pattern, purpose and meaning to be established in health promotion activities, there are clearly some organisational functions which can only be provided at a central organisational level. I refer particularly to the need for the co-ordination of a State Health Promotion Plan, backed up by research, monitoring and evaluation services.

The plan will need media programmes in support of local activities, training facilities and an information service on programme methods, programme development and resources, and audio-visual aids available. In addition to these essential services, there are also some services which are cost beneficial to provide at a central level, and I refer to resource production. This is that large area of posters, pamphlets, programme kits and audio-visual aids.

If this centralisation can be achieved this will overcome the present duplication of materials, increase the quality of programme materials, and achieve the benefits of scale while at the same time providing an overall view of the State's production resources. There are also other aspects to support administration at a central level which would facilitate and support our health promotion activities. The central body could produce a newsletter encompassing new initiatives, any effective programme methods, any local, interstate and overseas events and ideas being reported. It could also act as the co-ordination of expert groups and as the focal point for professional development.

It is not enough to identify the services that one requires to bring purpose and meaning to health promotion



activities in South Australia; it is also vital to identify how they will be used and organised in the form of a positive plan set against the resources to do the job.

From my observations and reading, I am confident that the expertise is available within the Health Promotion Unit of the Health Commission, the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board, the Education, Police and Community Welfare Departments to implement the Government's policy of a co-ordinated, planned attack on overall community health education in South Australia.

Having spent some time establishing in the minds of members the need for a co-ordinated approach to community drug education, I would now like to briefly address myself to the current situation of drug abuse and drug dependence in South Australia. It is only by studying the three major areas of drug dependency that it becomes very evident that the total community education programme is the only one which has any hope of long-term success. Let us have a look at why, basically, there is a need for drug education to be viewed in the overall community health programme.

First, I should say at the outset that the Government does not have an official policy to eliminate the non-medical use of all drugs. I must point out, however, that by definition the word "drug" has many connotations and implications, some of which are medical and some emotional. A drug educator must view drugs medically, legally, socially and pharmacologically (this last term refers to the action and uses of a drug on the body).

Today I do not intend to look at drugs as a pharmacologist, but rather from the general viewpoint of the total human environment. In this day and age, many chemical substances are used in medicine, industry and agriculture. Most chemicals are dangerous to the body if taken in the wrong dosages but, if the public is aware of the dangers, they can usually be avoided. By medical definition, a drug is any chemical substance, natural or synthetic, that changes the physical function or emotional response of a person. Dangerous chemicals in industry or agriculture can be produced or sold under close controls. On the other hand, slightly dangerous chemical substances are very useful for other reasons, including the treatment of certain medical conditions. The use of these chemicals is accepted by the community, as the human risk is small when compared to the medical advantages. Let us face it, without modern drugs and chemotherapy, medical science would not be the advanced science that it is, and our life span would have been considerably shortened some time ago.

The great problem arises when some of the chemical substances used in routine medical treatments under professional supervision become mood-altering drugs in the hands of the habitual drug taker. Some of the mood-altering drugs are extremely dangerous, depending on how they are used. The South Australian Royal Commission noted that our society adapts to the availability of drugs whose dangers may be, at first, difficult to determine, by establishing controlling agencies which experiment with potential new drugs. There are those which are too dangerous to use and which, as far as possible, are withheld, and the supply and use of them, while perhaps pleasurable, are known to be dangerous when used in certain ways.

These types of drug are regulated by formal and informal means. It cannot be over-emphasised that the real nature of the drug education process involves collating the dangers, the realistic clinical advantages and disadvantages of each new drug, and then spreading this knowledge throughout the community. It is well known that nearly every drug which today causes concern was

once widely prescribed by the medical profession. Fortunately, as medical science is identifying more and more dangerous side effects of certain drugs, we are seeing moves to place restrictions on their availability. This has only come about by drug education at all levels of the community.

People in the community with a drug dependency take numerous types of drugs and some take combinations that affect them both physically and psychologically. The psychological impact is the one from which it is harder to recover. I believe that, basically, drugs of dependence can be divided into three groups. There is the illegal group of heroin, L.S.D. and Indian hemp (or marijuana and hashish as it is also called); there is the group of drugs prescribed by doctors such as sleeping tablets, tranquilisers, antihistamines; and there are the over-the-counter sales, which include alcohol, tobacco and certain analgesics. Make no mistake, all of these groups may be misused, and people can become psychologically dependent on them. The treatment will therefore be different for different people depending on what drugs they are misusing and the reasons why the patient resorted to those drugs in the first place.

The medical cause of dependency is still debated, but there are many known reasons why people misuse drugs. Curiosity, peer group pressure, and boredom must rate very high on the list, followed by a desire to escape from problems, the desire for instant happiness and the hope of an improved sex life. It is well known that each individual responds in a different way to the frustrations, tensions and strains that are inevitably part of everyday life. Some are able to cope, some endure it and others escape in various ways. Sadly, drug misuse is one form of escape that usually only adds to the problems and certainly does not solve them.

The greatest problem of drug abuse occurs in regard to legal drugs, and I refer specifically to alcohol, tobacco, analgesics and those drugs prescribed legally by doctors. To a lesser degree, the schedule 3 proprietary medicines available from pharmacies also cause problems, although I have noted that this group is slowly being brought under control by the responsible attitude of pharmacists in the community. If we look at a few statistics, we can easily see the need for urgent co-ordinated community health education programmes.

Tobacco each year continues to contribute to the death of approximately 8 000 Australians from heart disease and about 3 500 from lung cancer. In South Australia, it is impossible at present to accurately determine the financial cost to the community, although I must compliment the Minister of Health and the Health Commission staff who are now commencing to collate this type of information.

The only figures I have been able to obtain relate to some of the alcohol, tobacco and drug-related diseases being treated in recognised hospitals, and I emphasise the word "recognised". Even these figures, which are based on 1977-78 figures for occupied beds in hospitals, are alarming. For those diseases related to alcohol, we recorded 6 854 patients, for tobacco 4 856, and for drugs 255, making a total of 55 670 bed days in South Australian hospitals.

This imposed a cost to the community of about \$7 900 000 for that year. This figure is incomplete and is by no means a benchmark, because it does not include the costs incurred in private hospitals, mental hospitals, consultations in private practice, industrial accidents, or absenteeism from work with "Mondayitis", and so on, nor does it cover the cost of pharmaceutical benefits paid for treatment, which runs into millions of dollars annually.

The analgesics report from the Australian Kidney

Foundation, covering the period from 1971 to 1976, highlighted that, of 1 681 people who were on dialysis, 317, or 18 per cent, were on end stage renal failure caused by over-use of analgesics. Australians consume 270 powders or tablets annually per head of population, while, by comparison, in the United States, the figure is 240 doses and in Britain it is as low as 90 doses. Thirty per cent of renal deaths are due to analgesic consumption. Cannabis or marijuana, whichever you wish to call it, is still the most widely-used drug in South Australia, other than alcohol. About one person in 20 uses it fairly regularly, and about one in seven has used it at least once. Those who use it are not distinguishable by social class or any other particular characteristic other than perhaps youth, because most users are under the age of 35 years.

As with all drugs, the medical knowledge of their side effects grows day by day and, as a result, it may not hurt a few of our young marijuana smokers to learn that very recent medical evidence indicates that, in the brain, we have the hypothalamus, and hanging from this is the pituitary. As little as a billionth of a gram of the alkaloid tetrahydrocannabinol (THC), which is the alkaloid in the marijuana plant, can affect the hypothalamus which, in turn, affects the pituitary, which in turn regulates the endocrine functions controlling sex drive and reproduction. With this threat, it is a wonder to me that any young person is game to smoke pot.

Recent studies of women who are regular pot smokers showed that 31 per cent of the menstrual cycles of pot smoking women showed a shortened luteal phase. This shortened luteal phase can mean that a growing embryo might not be properly nourished. Recent surveys conducted amongst pot smoking men between the ages of 18 and 30 years who had smoked pot for several years showed a significantly lower rate of sexual activity and the ability to have fewer orgasms. I am sure that, if this information could be passed to the community through our trained health educators, we have here an excellent example whereby the public can recognise the long-term dangers of the drug and avoid using it.

For the interest of honourable members, I point out that cannabis is used in four forms—marijuana, cannabis resin, buddha sticks, and hash oil. Marijuana, which is a preparation of the dried total cannabis plant, is prepared for smoking, and contains about 1 per cent of the alkaloid THC. Cannabis resin is a concentrated preparation of the resinous parts of the plant which is usually compressed in blocks, and its THC content is up to about 10 per cent. Buddha sticks, which are made from the flowering top of the plant which has been bound together around a bamboo twig with hemp tissue, has an alkaloid content of about 12 per cent. Hash oil, which is an extract of the cannabinoids, is prepared from the plant by the use of organic solvents. When the solvents are evaporated off, it has an alkaloid content as high as 60 per cent.

Time will not permit me to develop the theme of the heroin treatment and education programme in South Australia, except to express my alarm at the growing incidence of heroin use and what I believe to be the leniency of sentencing for possession and sale of the drug. I must admit that I have some sympathy for the addict who is convicted of selling heroin to maintain his or her habit. I emphasise that I have sympathy for the addict who is convicted of selling heroin to maintain his habit when such a person is totally hooked on a drug. Such people are sick, and we must through compassion have sympathy for them.

I am certainly of the opinion that convicted drug takers should be segregated and not placed with hardened criminals in our security prisons, as happens at the moment. Rather, a second rehabilitation section should be

set up for these offenders, away from the environment created in our top security prisons in South Australia. I am afraid I have no sympathy for the pedlar who possesses heroin only for sale and personal profit. The number of families these pedlars ruin is horrific, and the penalty should fit the gravity of the crime. For this type of crime, hanging should be reintroduced into South Australia. Seven years ago, there were an estimated 3 000 heroin users in Australia. This figure is now estimated at about 40 000.

The yearly statistics survey of the Commonwealth Police indicated 20 000 addicts up to 1977. The increases in charges rose by 48 per cent in 1973, 8 per cent in 1974, 178 per cent in 1975, 113 per cent in 1976, and 20 per cent in 1977. In 1977, 2 346 charges involving heroin as a drug were reported to the Commonwealth Police.

Mr. Speaker, \$4.5 billion worth of drugs have been brought into Australia in the past three years. Mr. Justice Williams in the Australian Royal Commission reports that 80 per cent comes from South-East Asia and includes all the heroin on the Australian market. He estimated the street value in 1978 of heroin, which was acquired and consumed by "hard core addicts", as between \$1 billion and \$1.6 billion. This compares with \$3.3 billion spent on alcohol and \$1.18 billion spent on tobacco products.

I would now like to address myself to another area of concern in the world of legally prescribed drug consumption, and that is the habit of sedating elderly members of our community in hospitals, institutions and private homes. All honourable members who have had an association with geriatric nursing homes would be familiar with the practice of handing out tranquilisers which serve to keep patients in their beds for the night. While acknowledging that some of the drugs are necessary, some of us who have been closer to the scene have been horrified at some of the dosages handed out by some of the less responsible nursing staff.

Rather than ask honourable members to take only my word for the seriousness of the situation, I will quote from statements made at a conference held in Sydney during March this year conducted by the Association of Drug Referral Centres. Many distinguished academics from the medical profession in the presentation of papers all highlighted the fact that misuse of drugs to alter the behaviour or mood of aged people was widespread in Australia. Mr. McArthur, an official of the association, said that 45 per cent of psychoactive drugs prescribed went to elderly people who constituted only 10 per cent of the population.

The conference, which was called "Drug Use Among the Elderly", heard that some drugs were not always prescribed for the benefit of the aged person. Psychoactive drugs, may I point out for the benefit of honourable members, include tranquilisers, sedatives and anti-depressants, and are designed to alter behaviour and mood. The conference was told that this drug misuse was not always voluntary and was frequently for the benefit of the person's family or the staff at an institution.

Professor G. Andrews, who is the distinguished Professor of Community and Geriatric Medicine at Sydney University, in addressing the conference said that these drugs should not be used as a substitute for patient care. He then went on to say that elderly people took five times more drugs than did younger people and that, from what he saw in hospitals, he got the feeling that a very significant proportion of that five times was not necessary. Dr. B. Learoyd, a physician of the Doctors' Reform Society, in his paper said that this drug misuse was widespread and that probably only 20 per cent of those taken was necessary.

Finally, Professor P. Sinnett, another distinguished Professor of Geriatrics at the University of New South Wales, reaffirmed that over-prescribing of behavioural and mood altering drugs was a "great problem", and went on to say that he had conducted a pilot study into drug administration in a Sydney nursing home, and some of the figures were "fairly staggering". I want to bring these to the attention of honourable members. This study showed that 48.1 per cent of patients took psycho-active drugs before admission to the home. After admission, the figure rose to 92.3 per cent. There is no reason to suggest that these figures cannot be directly related to South Australian nursing homes.

In the period I have left, I will reflect on the cost to our community of the abuse of alcohol and the need for a co-ordinated community education approach to enable the public to come to grips with this enormous social legacy. Not all honourable members may be aware that alcohol has been a major factor in the death of more than 30 000 Australians in the last five years. Deaths from cirrhosis of the liver have risen 75 per cent in the last 10 years. From 1965-76, the per capita increase in the consumption of beer has been 27 per cent, of wines 122 per cent and of spirits 50 per cent. That figure should be noted in direct proportion to massive cost increases of those beverages. 1 200 000 Australians are affected personally or in their family situations by the abuse of alcohol.

More than 250 000 Australians can be classified as alcoholics in the ratio of two females to every five males. One in five hospital beds is occupied by a person suffering from the adverse effects of alcohol. It is relevant to add to that the numbers of hospital beds occupied by patients with other drug-related complaints. Two in every five divorces or separations have resulted from alcohol-induced problems. Problems directly related to alcohol, including industrial accidents and absenteeism, cost the national economy more than \$500 000 000 in 1972-73. That is the latest figure I was able to obtain during my research. Members can relate the \$500 000 000, and use their imagination to hazard a guess at what it could be now: I suggest that it would be fairly astronomical.

About 73 per cent of men who have committed a violent crime had been drinking alcohol beforehand. Alcohol is also associated with half the serious crime in this country. Alcoholism among the young is increasing dramatically, and as many as 10 per cent of schoolchildren between 12 and 17 years get "very drunk" at least once a month. During the period 1976-77, deaths per 100 000 head of population due to alcoholic psychosis, alcoholism and cirrhosis of the liver rose by 59.6 per cent. This is compared with a decrease during the same period of 16.9 per cent for all other causes of death. It is estimated that alcohol was the contributing factor in 50 per cent of all traffic fatalities, 33½ per cent of all homicides and 20 per cent of all suicides.

Alcoholic liquor, whether for better or worse, if drunk in moderation is an integral part of the Australian way of life for a substantial proportion of the community, and it is because of this that a substantial proportion of people fail to recognise either the nature or the magnitude of the problem. It is a sad reflection that Australians generally are excessive users of alcohol, tobacco, analgesics and cannabis.

Alcohol is the major drug of abuse, and constitutes a problem in our community of epidemic proportions. Regardless of this, people in South Australia still take chances and drive under the influence, endangering the lives of others, in the hope they will not get caught. Only in June this year, 21 per cent of South Australian road accident victims had been drinking. This figure includes

only those who end up in hospital and does not cover minor accidents—the victim who will have a minor accident, go home so drunk, and report it the following day to the local police station.

I wonder whether members realise what constitutes the varying degrees of alcoholism. I will take a few minutes to explain it. We have the light, medium, heavy and very heavy drinker. An 8 oz. glass of beer contains 10 grams of alcohol, and this is equivalent to a 3 oz. glass of table wine and a 1 oz. nip of spirits. Talking in terms of beer equivalent, the light drinker consumes less than four glasses a day and has a very low risk of alcoholism. A medium drinker consumes between four and eight glasses a day and has a moderate risk of alcoholism. A heavy drinker consumes between eight and 12 glasses a day and has an extremely high risk of alcoholism. The very heavy drinker consumes 12 glasses or more a day, when there is certain to be tissue damage and damage to other biological areas.

Incidentally, females are at risk on lower amounts of alcohol, and equal amounts of damage may occur to men and women if the weekly average is drunk over two or three days (that applies particularly to the weekend drinker). There is a natural progression into becoming an unsafe, habitual drinker. A person first comes in contact with alcohol in the home environment or in the community, regardless of age. Drinking occurs in response to a desire at the football, at a wedding or at a dinner party.

The occasional drinker then moves to the habitual drinking stage, and it shows up by the habit of drinking regularly, such as after every pay day, every Saturday after football, every night at the pub on the way home from work, etc. The habitual drinker reaches stage 1 of unsafe habitual drinker when the force of habit is replaced by the force of craving. With this comes an increasing tolerance for alcohol (you need more and more alcohol to achieve the same effect). There is always an accompanying increasing need to secure a supply of alcohol, and the danger signs show up when the drinker wants more alcohol than his/her associates, and drinks it faster and more frequently. His glass is the one always empty first on the bar. He is the drinker who may arrive at the bar first to get one or two in before the group arrives, or he may slip one or two in, because he drinks faster than do his friends. There are early signs of damage, but in his case the recovery rate is very good.

The stage 2 defensive drinker continues drinking, despite his or her knowledge that he is in trouble. There is an increasing tolerance and also a withdrawal reaction if alcohol is stopped. The drinker resorts to an alibi to cover up his drinking, although there are definite signs of damage, and his recovery rate is only fair.

The chronic drinker thinks about alcohol all the time. He has no time for other activities, for example, work, his family, or the community. He has greatly increased tolerance for the drug and shows a marked deterioration in all areas of life. Unfortunately, his recovery rate is very poor. It should be quite evident that alcoholism is a progressive pathological reaction to alcohol characterised by a detrimental effect on our physical, mental, social or spiritual life. It is accompanied by the loss of ability to abstain.

I now turn to some specific issues of major concern to the South Australian community. They are concerns with which this Government will have to come to grips as a matter of urgency. The first is under-age drinking and smoking. Under-age drinking, in both the metropolitan area and the country, is becoming more and more prevalent. It is happening in both large and small country

towns, and children as young as 12, 13 and 14 years of age are becoming involved. To give teenagers something to do in their leisure time, unlicensed discos are organised for them, but, in a lot of cases, they have to be cancelled after only a short time because of the amount of alcohol that begins to be smuggled in.

The sale of cigarettes to minors is also a problem. Although there are laws to prevent this happening, if they are not properly enforced the problem will remain, and most likely increase. The same situation applies to the sale of alcohol to minors. I stress that we must come to grips with this problem as a matter of urgency. Stricter law enforcement must be applied.

Driving under the influence of either alcohol or drugs is another matter which affects everyone in the community. The public needs to be continually educated about the penalties they will receive if they are apprehended while driving under the influence. I believe this is not happening at the moment. In regard to driving under the influence of drugs, urgent research is needed to investigate further machinery suitable to detect whether a person has been smoking Indian hemp. It is technically possible at the moment, at fairly high expense, to carry out certain tests, but obviously the testing must be simplified so that testing can be carried out on the spot by a police officer. It is not possible technically to do it economically at the moment, but we must move fast in this direction to ensure that officers on the road have the ability to stop a vehicle and test the driver to see whether he is under the influence of marijuana, for instance. That man is in just as big a danger as is the person driving under the influence of alcohol.

It is apparently possible for a person to smoke Indian hemp today, and for the tetrahydrocannabinol to be still present in the bloodstream and fatty tissues some three days later. This is an extremely serious situation. It means that a person could be high on marijuana and, the following day or two days later, could still be in a state in which he is not a capable and responsible driver behind the wheel of a motor vehicle.

Two serious problems have arisen in regard to drug taking under the new Mental Health Act. First, persons who repeatedly take drug overdoses or habitually return to former criminal practices, who are a danger to themselves and, in many cases, to other people as well, are unable to be held in the long term under this new Act. Because the patients who have overdosed are almost back to normal in two to three hours or, in other instances, two or three days, then, under the Act, they are free to leave.

The second problem relates to people who have been under mental health care for many years and who have been released under the new system. They are now free to roam the streets and frequent the services in the city for homeless persons. It is not hard to visualise that, if a person who has been under mental health care for a long period of time were to take alcohol or drugs, he could become extremely dangerous. To have one of these people readmitted to a mental health institution is extremely difficult and is causing grave concern to health professionals who have to work in this field.

The main theme of my speech this afternoon has been support of the Government's move to co-ordinate drug education within the community, as well as contributing a few ideas of my own on where we should be going in the whole field of total health education. The effect of the total health programme which will be developed by the new committee the Minister has just set up can be measured only by the extent to which the behaviour of people and community attitudes can be changed. Education about drugs can take place only within this broad framework. A continuing and developing process of

health education involving the family, the schools, community agencies, work place situations, and society at large is the framework around which the programme will succeed. I congratulate the Government on its initiative, and support the motion.

**Mr. PLUNKETT (Peake):** As it is only a short time until the dinner adjournment, I should like to speak first on the Federal Government's attitude to the amendment of section 26E of the income tax legislation, which allows workers who are receiving a subsidised housing rent to be taxed on a minimum of \$20 as part of their assessable income. This amendment would affect many workers, and therefore I support the attitude of the Queensland miners who have been on strike for many weeks. As part of their job, they live in remote areas, with few facilities. It has been accepted by both Liberal and Labor Governments that, as a compensation, these people should have some of the benefits enjoyed by city people.

**Mr. Max Brown:** Apparently the Country Party supports it, too.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** Apparently the Country Party is in cahoots with the Liberal Party on this. Although we are talking only about miners, if the Federal Government is successful in making the miners return to work and accept the minimum of \$20 taxable assessment on their income, the situation will affect other workers, such as shearers, shed hands, people who work in the wool industry, working in extreme heat, travelling many thousands of miles in a year, and unable to claim back a cent in taxation.

Members opposite look at me and wonder what I am talking about, but I will give an example. I used to drive home from Tibooburra to Mildura, a distance of 500 miles. I would knock off at 5 p.m. on a Friday, drive to Mildura, travelling on rough roads to Broken Hill, from where the roads in the latter part of my time there were bitumen, and then at 3 p.m. on the Sunday I would have to leave to drive 500 miles back to be ready to start work at 7.30 a.m. on the Monday. My wife and children lived in Mildura and I was paying off a home there, and getting free accommodation on the property. In some cases the conditions were extremely bad, although sometimes they were good, depending on the owner of the property.

I see this as a similar tax, affecting not only people in the pastoral industry but also those on the roads, highway workers, road workers, council workers in some cases, private contract workers, and so on. It will also affect people laying rail tracks, with all the things they have to put up with, but here we have the Federal Government, supported by many State Liberal Party and Country Party members, saying that this right should be taxed. I see the situation as utterly ridiculous.

The Prime Minister has spent millions of dollars of taxpayers' money on travel, and he has had the special V.I.P. jet fitted out with a kitchen, so that he can have home cooked meals. I would not think Tamie would be cooking the meals, either. I think the taxpayers would be paying for a cook to go on the long trips he takes with some of his friends. In spite of all this, Mr. Howard, with the support of Liberal Party and Country Party members, both Federal and State, is saying the workers should have to pay this tax. The only person who really pays the full tax is the worker.

*[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]*

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** Prior to the tea adjournment, I was discussing the Federal Liberal Government's attitude to the amendment of section 26E of the taxation legislation, and this relates to housing subsidies. Queensland miners object strongly to this provision in the Act. Some people,

who are isolated, have no facilities, such as air-conditioning in extreme heat, electricity, television, or sporting facilities, and the cost of living is high. The Liberal Government seems set on scratching a few meagre dollars from this area and, as I said earlier, there will be repercussions in a wider area than the mining industry, because the legislation affects all those who construct roads in isolated areas and who live in poor accommodation, for which they are expected to pay a minimum of \$20.

I see that some Ministers are moving out; apparently they do not like listening to a Labor member defending the rights of workers who have to carry the taxation burden all the time. The Liberals have made clear that, wherever possible, people who have plenty of money, like the multi-nationals, will be given concessions. Multi-nationals come into the country and virtually rob Australia of its minerals, but they pay very little taxation. The Federal Liberal Government is now asking the miners to pay this taxation, and this burden will also fall on people who live in isolated areas. This action is typical of the Liberal Government's attitude—the burden has been put on to the workers.

I now refer to a subject that affects many people in my district—pensions. Recently, in Adelaide, we saw a major step forward in the move towards obtaining a fairer deal for pensioners. I refer to the pensioner rally that was held on the front steps of Parliament House, and I add that I did not see many Liberals at that rally. The rally of 900 aged pensioners has stimulated a greater awareness in the community about the worsening position of pensioners in our society. The Minister does not seem to be very interested—he is not even listening. Unfortunately, the present State and Federal Governments do not show any concern.

The Federal member for Kingston, Grant Chapman, abused pensioners at the rally and told them to study economics. The Deputy Premier has been quoted as saying that he believes that existing pensions are adequate, even though they force many pensioners to live below the poverty line. The Premier chose not to accept the pensioners' invitation to address the rally. I only hope he will change his mind and demonstrate some concern by attending, and speaking at, the next rally, which is to be held on 29 August this year.

That first pensioner rally stimulated other welfare recipients to get together to form a broader based coalition in order to fight for a better deal for all people on pensions and benefits. With 120 000 aged pensioners and 46 000 unemployed people in South Australia, not to mention the thousands who receive other benefits and pensions, there is a large, though as yet untapped, potential for an effective pressure group in this State alone, and that potential is growing. Unemployment rates are increasing, and the average age of Australians is also increasing. Long gone are the days of the baby boom. By the year 2000, the number of people qualified for age pensions in South Australia will have doubled.

I would like to tell members how the Australian Labor Party considers a fair and regular income can be provided for people on social services. First, we believe that pensions and benefits are a right, not a charity or a grudging acknowledgment that we owe something to our older, retired or unemployed people, who have given the country their working lives.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Given nothing! Come on!

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** I am speaking about pensioners; I would not expect the Minister to know a great deal about pensioners.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I'm talking about—

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** The Minister would not know what a pensioner was; he does not want to know. That is why he

does not attend any of the meetings. Pensions and benefits are not a charity to widows and supporting parents, who are raising the next generation of Australian workers. We consider that pensions and benefits are the right of every pensioner who cannot support himself or herself independently because of age, illness, bereavement or family responsibility.

The increasing number of people who would work if jobs were available should also be given unemployment benefits as a right. By most standards, Australia is a pretty wealthy country; we are therefore doing a shabby job if we allow the living standards of any person in this country to drop so low that he cannot have proper housing, proper food and something over for leisure so that he can enjoy and take part in community life. Since 1945, by referendum, and later by general consent, the Commonwealth has paid the income support—the benefits and the pensions.

While this State provides most of the community needs, South Australia, under the Dunstan Labor Government, led the way in setting up consulting committees to consider facilities that might be lacking and then to do something about getting them. Recently, the Federal Liberal member for Kingston criticised the Whitlam Government's record in regard to providing pensions. Let us look at the facts. The Whitlam Government's commitment was to get pensions to 25 per cent of the average weekly earnings. We almost succeeded and, if we had been allowed three uninterrupted years, I am sure we would have done so. Our record is a proud one. In those three years, pensions rose almost twice as fast as the cost of living rose. Pensions went from \$20 a week to \$38.75 a week, a rise of over 90 per cent.

In the same three years the cost of living rose by 50 per cent, mainly, as many will know, because we were getting the backlash of international inflation. In comparison, the first three years of the Fraser Government is fairly poor. Pensions rose by 37 per cent and the cost of living by 35 per cent. That is, pensions stayed close to the cost of living adjustments; they did not forge ahead as they did under the Whitlam Government. Before the Labor Government came into office pension rises were random in amount and in timing. The Labor Government promised and gave six-monthly rises with a view to getting the pensions from 19 per cent of average weekly earnings, as they stood at the end of the McMahon Government, to 25 per cent of average weekly earnings. By aiming high and not just keeping close to the living increases, the Labor Government raised the pensions from \$20 to \$38.75 a week. If pensions had been kept in line with the cost of living, as the Fraser Government has now done, pensions would have been only \$30 a week and each pensioner would have had \$17.50 less a fortnight.

Because the Labor Government kept its promise to raise pensions twice yearly, the Liberal Party was forced to follow suit. The Liberal Party promised twice-yearly indexation, tried to wriggle out of it for one six-monthly period, but was forced to be honest, after pressure from pensioner organisations, from the Labor Party and even from some of its own politicians. However, the Liberal Party's legislation allows it to hold up pension rises only for four months after the c.p.i. has been assessed; it does not allow the Government to push pensions ahead of cost of living rises, even when there is a case for it.

Let us compare what the Whitlam Labor Government did for pensions, compared to the Fraser record. The Labor Party abolished the means test for all pensioners over 70 years of age; the Fraser Government reimposed the means test for pension rises for these pensioners. We raised the subsidy on aged pensioner housing from 2:1 to

4:1; the Fraser Government reduced it back to 2:1. The Labor Party raised the subsidy on home care services and welfare services for the aged from 1:1 to 2:1; the Fraser Government reduced it back to 1:1 and made it more difficult for the State Government to expand its services. The Labor Party raised the supplementary assistance; the Fraser Government has kept it frozen at the 1975 rates. The Labor Party introduced the Australian Assistance Plan, which encouraged self-help groups and which, in its final years of operation, was funding over 50 projects for the aged, such as handyman services, work on senior citizen centres, and so on.

Finally, and most importantly to pensioners and low income earners, the Labor Party introduced Medibank, which ensured that every person had access to the health services free of the means test. The Fraser Government has found five different ways of dismembering it, and it has not finished yet. As a result, age and invalid pensioners and lone parents who feel afraid of the illness that may be around the corner are taking out costly health insurance, which is a drain on their already meagre income. The Labor Party has announced a modified health scheme which will ensure free health care to expectant mothers, all dependent children and other disadvantaged people, as well as the current holders of pensioner health benefit cards.

The Labor Party is conscious of the anxiety many retired people have when superannuation or other payment rises deprive them of their health cards, the most precious of the fringe benefits. A Labor Government would look at ways of allowing people to have these cost of living rises without losing their health care entitlements. A Labor Government would look at what it would cost for all age pensioners to be issued with pension health benefit cards. The only way of removing the confusion and distress about possible medical and hospital costs is not to force people to take more and more costly insurance but it is in the provision of a rational and total health care system.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Are you feeling lonely?

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** As long as I have you here I will not be lonely.

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*While the bells were ringing:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I draw to the attention of all honourable members that whilst the bells are ringing no member may leave the Chamber.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** The Labor Party has already stated that it will begin with families, with pensioners and beneficiaries, many of whom have not been eligible under the mutilated Fraser medical mess. The other area that the Labor Party is looking at is that of housing assistance for pensioner families. In 1977, in his policy speech, the Prime Minister announced that a new arrangement would be made in 1978-79 regarding pensioner housing to help those who wanted to stay in their own home and those who wanted to rent privately in their own neighbourhood. Nothing more has ever been heard of that and no money has been allocated. A careful look needs to be taken at how money can best be spent for pensioners. Supplementary assistance should be increased, but we would not like to see money go straight into higher rents. Pensioners living in their own homes would benefit from loans for repairs; their children would benefit from funds which would allow them to extend their homes to accommodate an aged parent, thus releasing that parent's home to another family. However, we would not like to see those sorts of concession turned into a racket. The Fraser Government has cut the money spent on age pensioner

housing. The Labor Party would need to have another look at the best use that could be made of that money.

Age pensioners are people who have been through at least one war and a depression; many have been through two wars and a depression and poverty.

**Mr. Schmidt:** The Governor spoke about that in his Speech.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** Members opposite would not know much about that. Aged people, living alone and paying rent comprise some of the poorest people in the community. We believe that that situation will remain while the Liberal Party is in office. The Labor Party has committed itself to protecting the poor, the aged and the defenceless.

I would also like to say something about the unemployed. The greatest tragedy in our society would be for them never to have hope. Age pensioners who went through the bad times kept themselves going by planning for better times. They planned their families and the way they hoped to live after the war, after the depression, and after they were out of debt. Many of the young can see no point in planning; they are despondent about the chances of finding any work, let alone satisfactory work. For that reason they have no incentive to plan homes or families, because they do not want to bring up families on unemployment benefits. The unemployed receive less than pensioners, have no rent assistance and no fringe benefits. The current rate of \$51.45 a week, payable to single beneficiaries, 18 years or over, without dependants, has not been increased since May 1978.

The current rate of \$35 a week payable to single beneficiaries aged 16 to 17 years has not been increased since November 1975. Getting young, middle aged and older people back into a work force is a very high priority, because they want independence and not to spend their lives depending on social services. I think we should be looking at community services for all pensioners. It is impossible to have any programme, however, that suits all pensioners. Even among age pensioners there are vast differences between the aged who own their homes and have money and other assets; the aged who live alone in isolated areas with land but no money; the aged who live in tiny rented accommodation in large, increasingly expensive cities; the aged who have families to care for them in times of illness; and the aged who depend on hospitals, visiting nurses and meals on wheels. Most of the aged have learned to be as independent as they can. They are the least likely, according to a recent study, to ask for emergency relief from welfare agencies.

A good Government looks after its weakest, and a good community does the same. A Labor Government is committed to try, within the bounds of the economic realities, to see that no person's income is below the poverty line and all persons have adequate housing and health care.

**Mr. Hemmings:** You wouldn't expect them to understand that.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** No; this is probably the first time that they have heard anyone standing in defence of pensioners and the unemployed. I notice that they went quiet when they found that it was not fashionable to interject.

Now I should like to speak on another item which concerns me greatly, and on which I spoke one night recently. I refer to uranium. As I have said previously (and I should like the Minister to listen to what I think of him), my concern is with people, the health and welfare of the people of this State. As I mentioned in my brief and much interrupted speech the other night, I am appalled at this Government's headlong rush into building a uranium enrichment plant without first considering adequate safeguards.

As a person who has fought for many years for decent working conditions for the workers of South Australia, I wonder how far this Government is prepared to go to sacrifice the worker for the sake of profit, and whether it cares how little of that profit goes to the State. Labor's policy is not to proceed with the development of Australia's uranium resources for export, until adequate safeguards are available. We have been told by Liberal Governments, both in this State and in Canberra, that adequate safeguards will prevail, yet only the other day we read—

**Mr. HEMMINGS:** Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** I must have the Minister of Agriculture mesmerised. He has not moved in his seat. He has interjected a couple of times but they have been very ordinary sorts of interjection. I am very pleased that he sees that I have something to say about which he is interested. He likes to listen to everything I say. For about the past hour he has hung on to everything I have said and I congratulate him on being able to come and listen to someone who speaks home truths and about what the Liberals' failures are.

We have been told by the Liberal Governments in this State and in Canberra that adequate safeguards will prevail, yet only the other day we read that two tonnes of uranium yellowcake was stolen from the Mary Kathleen mine and found in Sydney. It is thought that it had been stolen in small amounts over a period of several years.

**Mr. Hemmings:** Do you think the Minister of Agriculture stole it?

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** He may have. The Federal Government is now going to tighten safeguards on the movement of uranium in Australia, a case of bolting the stable door when the horse has gone. Is it any wonder that my Party views with cynicism those members opposite who mouth vague promises of adequate safeguards! My colleague, the member for Stuart, asked the Minister of Mines and Energy a question in this House on 23 October 1979, as follows:

Will the Minister during his forthcoming negotiations with Urenco-Centec, about a proposed uranium enrichment plant for South Australia, ask for a report on the security and safeguarding of Urenco's European plants?

This question was asked because of concern shown by my colleague at the report that the Dutch Government had admitted that an agent in Holland's Almelo enrichment plant, operated by Urenco-Centec, stole plans which have enabled Pakistan to build an enrichment plant with a capacity to produce weapons grade fuel.

I expect that the member for Mallee would laugh, because that would be about the extent of his concern for the lives of people and about uranium, because the people on the other side have not worried. As long as they can see money involved, they have never worried one scrap about the workers. One member who has spoken, the member for Morphett, had a chemist shop and speaks about drugs.

I would like to elaborate on some of the dangers of uranium mining. The major dangers involve the presence of radon and the possibility of surface and ground-water contamination.

**Mr. Oswald:** Who wrote that speech?

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** It is better than the speech made by the honourable member. In the 1920's it was found that a high proportion of cancer deaths were linked to radon. In 1965, Wagner and others clearly identified the relationship. This report concluded that the incidence of lung cancer increased from 3.1 to 116 per 10 000 miners in the industry.

The United States National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health conducted a study of uranium miners. The sample consisted of 3 366 white and 780 Indian miners who had been employed for one or more months in uranium mines in New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado and Utah. This study conclusively demonstrated the risks involved in uranium mining. This study shows an increasing number of cancer deaths and an increasing number of what doctors would call "excess" deaths. On the latest estimate there have been 160 excess deaths. The Fox Report has this to say on enrichment:

The main potential hazard in the normal working of enrichment plants is accidental release of uranium hexafluoride. An important guard against this is the fact that most of the enrichment in diffusion plants, and all of it in centrifuge plants, is carried out at sub-atmospheric pressures. Feed and withdrawal stations, where uranium hexafluoride is sometimes at pressures substantially above atmospheric, are designed to contain any accidental releases. These stations also have to be physically separated from the enrichment areas for safeguards and inventory accounting purposes.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** When are you going to turn on a bit of drama?

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** It is natural that the Minister would not really understand what I am speaking about, because I am speaking about the health and welfare of people who have to use the uranium. The Minister would not understand that, because he can only see dollar notes when people speak about uranium.

I am speaking about the safety aspect at present, and I would not expect the Minister to know much about that, because he has never bothered to concern himself with it. The Fox Report continues:

A potential cause of release of uranium hexafluoride in a centrifuge plant is an accident in which a rapidly-spinning centrifuge breaks up. There is a risk of this sort of accident causing a wave of destruction in a bank of centrifuges.

Because of the newness of the technology and the scarcity of published information, it is not possible to reach firm conclusions on the nature and seriousness of the hazards associated with centrifugal enrichment.

But there is no evidence to suggest that the technology poses any particularly dangerous hazards in normal (my emphasis) operation. For diffusion plants, the evidence suggests that only hazards of types common to large-scale chemical industries will be encountered. (My emphasis, again). However, as the level of enrichment increases, so, too, does the risk of accidentally bringing together enough uranium-235 to set off a chain reaction. Great care is needed to ensure that such an event never occurs.

The depleted uranium residue from enrichment plants is normally stockpiled for possible future use as a fertile component of reactor fuel. This material is mildly radioactive and gradually produces the much more hazardous nuclides radium-226 and radon-222. Production of these nuclides is very slow, being limited by the long-lived intermediate decay products uranium-234 (half-life 250 000 years) and thorium-230 (half-life 76 000 years). At present, any radiation hazard from the stockpiles is controlled by limiting access to the area.

It is obvious that some experts think that there is cause for concern with the wastes from enrichment plants, and certainly that adequate safeguards should be taken to prevent accidents. Mr. Tonkin has said that the wastes from an enrichment plant are negligible; that "enriching uranium concentrates the radioactivity". Obviously, he is no expert on the matter. Only 15 per cent of the total would go out as enriched uranium; the other 85 per cent would stay as "depleted" uranium, stockpiled here in

South Australia. As the Fox Report states, "At present, any radiation hazard from the stockpiles is controlled by limited access to the area." This "depleted" uranium is usually stored for possible future use as a fertile component of reactor fluid. Over time, as mentioned in the Fox Report, this material produces the hazardous nuclides radium-226 and radon-222.

It has been suggested that the centrifuge method will be the most likely type of enrichment process to be developed in South Australia. Each year, 50 000 contaminated centrifuges will need to be replaced and stored. The centrifuge method assumes an export market after five to 10 years of production. The multi-national with which this Government is going to do business, Urenco-Centec, plans therefore to proliferate enrichment technology. Urenco-Centec has been bargaining with the military Brazilian Government, wishing to sell enrichment technology to it. The problems of dealing with the Brazilian Government have become quite apparent—not problems associated with the effect on the Brazilians' social, economic and health aspects of life, but the problem is that Brazil has not signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty. In February 1978, the Dutch Parliament passed a motion that no enriched uranium should be exported from the Almelo plant in Holland (this plant is owned by Urenco-Centec) to countries that have not signed the Non-Proliferation treaty unless strict safeguards are agreed to in advance.

The Brazil question is important, as it could lead to West Germany and Britain breaking the Dutch connection. There are many reasons why a country such as Brazil (a country governed by a military dictatorship) should wish to buy enriched uranium. I do not intend to go into them all at this stage, but I point out that Urenco-Centec has a rather dubious record of safeguards, to say the least. On the same day as Mr. Tonkin released proposals for an enrichment plant in South Australia, President Carter's strategy on limited nuclear war was released.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I point out to the honourable member that, when referring to another honourable member, he should use the expression "honourable member", and not refer to the member by his known name. This is the second time that the honourable member has referred to the honourable Premier by his known name, and I ask him to observe the courtesies of the House.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** My apologies, Mr. Speaker. I thank you for that. Is it any wonder that we view with extreme concern the plan for an enrichment plant in our own State, let alone Australia as a whole. A South Australian enrichment plan would become a prime target in the event of a war between the Soviet Union and the United States of America. It would take just one week for a Urenco-Centec built centrifuge enrichment plant to be converted to producing weapons-grade uranium.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** The Minister has had the same argument every time the subject of uranium has been debated in the House. He is not interested in listening to people informing him of the dangers of uranium. He speaks one word every time, and he thinks that that is all he has to do. If he listens, he might get an education on the dangers to workers associated with uranium.

When one looks at the world-wide problems that should concern us if we go ahead with an enrichment plant, matters of how cost-effective it is would be pale in comparison. But I will mention here just how many jobs would become available, at what cost, and how they would affect the extremely high unemployment figures in this State. The truth of the matter is that they would not even

make a dent in the statistics. The investment would be about \$1 000 million, and the probable job-creation figure is about 500. This is a cost of about \$2 000 000 each job created—an absurd expenditure for so few jobs and such a grave risk. That is what Government members are always saying: "Why not mine uranium? Look at the employment it would produce." It is not a large employer, compared to the amount of risk involved. Should we have to worry about it for the next 250 000 years? That is what we must worry about.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I have counted the House, and a quorum is present.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** We also have to consider that the nuclear technology market is falling. The most recent reports released by the Atomic Energy Commission state that there is a glut of enriched uranium until 1990.

Predictions made in 1975 about world nuclear generating capacity in 1980 are down by one-third. It is, therefore, unrealistic to make any predictions about the market for uranium from 1990 onwards. Since the Harrisburg accident of April 1979, many nuclear proponents have become more concerned about the dangers within the industry. A similar incident anywhere in the world today would be enough to cripple the world's nuclear energy industry.

At present, the Legislative Council has a Select Committee that was appointed to look into the uranium industry in this State. One would hope that in the world-wide context, since South Australia could be so adversely affected, it will recommend procedures to the Government and issue a report. That committee is still hearing evidence. Therefore, no report has been forthcoming, so it is completely cynical of the Premier to ignore any possible findings of that committee and to go ahead with this destructive plan in conjunction with Urenco-Centec.

I would now like to touch upon the subject of education in my district. The Minister of Education is involved in this matter, so I would like him to take notice of my comments. I will comment on some of the problems experienced by schools in my area. The Minister of Education has repeatedly denied that there have been (or will be) any cuts in education funding, yet one of the schools in my area has been unable to have its playground (which is in a shocking state of repair) upgraded. That job was to be done in 1979, but it has been taken off the job list. I have been trying to get some word from the Minister of Education as to when money will be available to do that job. All I can get up to date is the comment from his department that money will be allocated, and that the job will be done. There is no statement about when it will be done. If the Minister listens he may then assist his department to get enough money to upgrade the yard at that school. The Minister is at a loss to say when this job will be done. Meanwhile, the children of Thebarton Junior Primary School have to put up with walking through deep pools of water, sometimes knee high, whenever it rains. Also, rain gets inside some of the buildings.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! There are too many interjections.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** There is grave disquiet at the Thebarton High School about the possibility of further cuts in funding. It has been stated that in 1979 that school did not receive a replacement staff member for an ancillary staff member who worked a 37½ hour week but who left to go interstate. Since that time, services to students at that school have suffered. Any further cuts in that area will mean more work for the already overworked



ancillary staff and teachers, and a further reduction of services in what is considered by the Education Department to be a priority school. It is not only in my district that there is grave disquiet about what this Government intends to do in the education area. There is a general feeling of no-confidence in the Government.

Soon after the September election, the Institute of Teachers sent a deputation to meet the Minister of Education. Following that meeting, the Minister made a statement that the Liberal Party would implement its election policies as soon as possible. Indeed, he is quoted as saying that he would strive to honour his Party's promises in the forthcoming Budget. We know now that that did not happen. The Minister claimed in this House that that was because there had been insufficient time to honour those promises.

In its election promises on education, the Liberal Government stated that curricula would be going back to the basics. The Minister is now terrified of implementing that policy for fear of being attacked by South Australian teachers because of the political manipulation of the curricula. I note that there is a national campaign by teachers to promote the concept that he will protect our most valuable resource. Members of the Government probably think that I am referring to uranium again, but I am referring to the resource that I consider should be protected at all costs—the children of this State. A Government so concerned about private enterprise should know that poor investments now do not pay the best dividends in the future. If we cut down on funding in this area, we are selling the future of our State short.

Under the Dunstan Government (and I am proud to use the term "the Dunstan Government", despite the fact that some people are trying to blame Don Dunstan for all the ills of society), South Australia's education services were transformed from the worst in Australia to the best. This is a fact acknowledged by the Federal Schools Commission. It is my Party's policy not only to maintain that position but to improve it. I would like to refer to yet another valuable resource that this Government is seeking to ignore—the women teachers in this State. We all know what the Liberals think about the position of women in our society—"Send them back to the kitchen sinks" is that Party's attitude.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member must cease interjecting.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** The Dunstan Government fought long and hard for equality of opportunity for women in our society, and was particularly concerned about equality in education. The Minister of Education is not going to reappoint a Women's Adviser in the Department of Further Education. That position has been urged for at least three years, was recommended by numerous reports and conferences, and was approved by the department itself. The position was advertised last September before the election. Interviews were conducted. A short list of two people was arrived at to be reinterviewed. The axe then fell. We all know what the Minister thinks about that position—he called it "a sop to womankind". The Minister is now going to appoint two officers, one in the Department of Further Education and one to replace Denise Bradley in the Education Department, to deal with the problems of minority groups.

On 6 August 1980, in this House, we saw a most amazing display by the Minister of Education when he was trying to wriggle out of the fact that he had downgraded the position of women to looking after minority groups. Women are seen by the Minister as being a minority group. I am sure that the women in my electorate will be

pleased that they are to be grouped with the minority groups! I suppose that the young girls at school in South Australia will be especially well cared for and encouraged as a minority group.

I consider the Minister's remarks insulting to the female population of the State as a whole. He is on record as being anti-progressive and anti-women, and now, apparently, he seeks to relegate women to an inferior position. Many of the teachers living in my electorate are women, but it is not only the women teachers who feel enraged about the Minister's decision: many male teachers in South Australia support the appointment of a Women's Adviser. They see the need for a person with particular skills and understanding to deal with the particular problems which arise for women, particularly in the area of non-sexist literature. I suppose the Minister would dismiss these men as "progressive", a word one would not apply to the Minister. The Minister makes great mileage out of the fact that these two new appointments are to be contract Public Service positions. He even alludes to the fact that these positions could be filled by a man, at a time when position discrimination in favour of women is deemed necessary. I will now answer some of the interjections made by members opposite.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I remind the honourable member that interjections are out of order and should be ignored.

**Mr. PLUNKETT:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That concludes my remarks.

**Mr. LEWIS (Mallee):** Unaccustomed as I am to speaking in an impromptu fashion, which is the position in which I now find myself, I will nonetheless support the motion, and with considerable alacrity. I do not believe that the piece of paper that I had set aside to make notes about particular items in the previous speaker's contribution has anything written on it about which I could comment. From that point, I will proceed to make a contribution in relation to the more effective function of this institution in the society that it serves. By "this institution" I mean the Parliament of South Australia. South Australia's Parliament has its origin in the Westminster system, as all members know. All members enjoy the benefits of a bicameral system of Parliament.

There are very few other such institutions that have served the communities they represent for as long or as well as this Parliament has done. In a moment I will quote from some notes that I made of the address by the Chairman of the Constitutional Museum Trust as he welcomed official guests when the Governor opened the Constitutional Museum. However, before doing that I urge every South Australian to take the opportunity to visit that museum to see exactly what has happened since colonisation, and they will be able to see with justifiable pride the history of this State.

Our Parliament has as a head of State a monarchy that is more than 1 000 years old. That monarchy learnt the secrets of responsible government and used it to build the States so that they could achieve nationhood without severing their ancient roots. The system of Government in this State is older than that of Germany, Italy, and 26 of the 50 United States of America. In fact, it is older than 115 of the 151 members of the United Nations. The two Houses of Parliament have met in regular session year in year out for 123 years, which is a record of continuity that can be matched by the elected Legislatures of only four other nations on this planet. That is something of which we can be proud.

It is probably of interest to members of this House, and I trust to the citizens of South Australia, to know that the city of Adelaide rose here 144 years ago. At that time San

Francisco and Los Angeles were nothing more than small mission towns with populations of fewer than 1 000 people. In fact, Adelaide rose before there was a Vancouver, Dallas, or Hong Kong. The Adelaide University, upon which we have relied over that period of time, is more than 100 years old. It has provided this State with the professional training that has enabled our State to reach the present standard of academic, professional and industrial performance that it now enjoys. Adelaide University is older than 36 of the 45 universities of Britain, and it is older than the universities of Stamford and Chicago. It is also older than 15 of the 36 colleges at Oxford.

To ensure that members of this House are aware of the pride that I feel in my heritage, I will refer to this State's traditions somewhat further, but I regret that it is impossible for members opposite who continually interject to feel that same sense of heritage. The most senior of our newspapers in South Australia, whilst it is younger than the *Guardian* or the *Times*, is older than *Le Monde*, *Der Spiegel*, *Il Messagers*, and the *Washington Post*.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** Mr. Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr. LEWIS:** It is a false view of progress that regards conservation as a hindrance to the advancement of mankind. We would all do well to recall Edmund Burke's words when he said:

People who do not look back on their ancestors cannot afford to be trusted to look out for the interests of their posterity.

Mr. Acting Speaker, your future and my future will be in very sorry hands indeed if Government is ever returned to the hands of people such as the member who just left the Chamber. It is against that background that I want to draw attention to what I regard as particular problems at the present time. Those problems largely relate to the role and function of this institution (the Parliament) and the community it serves. In recent years, and more particularly over the last decade, the dignity of Parliament has continued to decline.

We had the spectre of a Premier sitting in pink shorts with his knees up high like Mother Brown, as well as a few other people in recent times.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. LEWIS:** I have to agree with honourable members that it was not Mother Brown—at least, it was Mother Brown for whom I was concerned. Further, I should like to draw attention to the regrettable standard of dress that I observed at the time that I arrived here. If we cannot indicate that we respect each other and if we cannot indicate, not only by the things we say but also by the things we do and the places in which we say them and do them, that we respect each other, and that we respect our fellow man, then it is unlikely that we will get any better standard of behaviour elsewhere in the community. I support the member for Fisher in his remarks on that topic in his Address in Reply speech.

I want now to refer to another aspect of Parliament and Government which is not well understood and which brings the institution into disrepute in the mind of the general public. I refer to accountability. A few days ago I heard comments made by an honourable member from another place while he was addressing a public meeting. He pointed out the very essence of the remarks that I would have liked to be able to make myself as having been made by none other than Gordon Reid. The honourable member from another place of whom I speak was the Hon. Ren DeGaris, who was of considerable assistance to me both in the lead-up to and during the last election. He

referred to the winner of the George Watson Essay prize from 1979, an essay written by Prof. Gordon Reid, Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Professor of Politics at the University of Western Australia. The essay is entitled "The Changing Political Framework" and it is in my view, which I share with the Hon. Ren DeGaris, one of the most outstanding political essays written in the past few years, if not this century.

**Mr. Hemmings:** Have you read Hawke's stuff?

**Mr. LEWIS:** Who is he? He pointed out that Parliament is a "weakening institution", to use the phrase of Prof. Reid. The Hon. R. C. DeGaris stated:

The decline in the standing and the significance of Parliament has been compensated for by the growth in the authority of the Executive arm of Government. The concept that the Executive arm is responsible to Parliament is difficult now to sustain as a doctrine.

Prof. Reid states:

The contemporary state of the Australian Parliament, therefore, is an elected House of Representatives—in this case an elected House of Assembly, as the Lower House—

with its Parliamentary effectiveness undermined by the domination of the Executive Government—its Speaker is drawn from and owes allegiance to the Government Party; the "Leader of the House" is an Executive Minister of State advised by department officials; the Government determines when the House will be summoned and adjourned; the Government dominates the business of the House; it claims the Chairmanship of every Parliamentary committee; the Government claims a monopoly over financial initiative in the House; Ministers have important advantages and priorities entrenched in Parliamentary rules; the Executive Ministers claim extensive territorial rights in the Parliamentary building—

although that may be true in Federal Parliament, it is to a lesser extent, if at all, true here—

both major Parties when in Government show a preference for Party committees over Parliamentary committees. The elected Senate, on the other hand, has managed initiatives independently of the Executive Government but it is a threatened institution—

by the A.L.P.—

for so doing.

Honourable members opposite are committed to the abolition of the Upper Houses of all Parliaments in which they serve.

**Mr. Hemmings:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. LEWIS:** I know that the honourable member agrees with me, and I know that I know more of the platform of his Party than he would know of mine. Dr. Dean Jaensch also has something to say on these points and states:

You need to understand from the beginning that politics is not about morality.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! There are too many interjections. I cannot hear the honourable member for Mallee.

**Mr. Hemmings:** You're lucky.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable member for Napier. The honourable member for Napier will be named if he again interjects while the Chair is addressing the House. The honourable member has interjected far too often this evening and, if he again transgresses, he will not be here to hear the rest of the debate. The honourable member for Mallee.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I name the member for Napier.

**Mr. SLATER:** May I explain to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the member for Napier did not make any response to you: it was someone else who made a comment.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** If that is the case I will withdraw the decision. I was of the opinion that it was the member for Napier and if that is not the case I withdraw my decision. The member for Mallee.

**Mr. LEWIS:** Dr. Dean Jaensch goes on:

It is not about doing right for the community. Politics is about one thing: power. The sooner everyone realises that the better. Politics in Australia is a matter of power—seeking power, getting power, using power and losing power—members of the Opposition would understand that point—and that is all it is about.

Whether he is right or wrong does not matter very much. However, I think he is wrong. I think Parliament ought not to be so much about power as about representing people. That a person of Dr. Jaensch's standing is prepared to make that sort of statement indicates that those who have an attachment to Parliament at least ought to take it seriously and recognise it as a comment, however sorry, on the state of the institution as it presently serves the community.

It is regrettable that many of the committees that Parliament traditionally appoints have become, to use the words of a British M.P., Ian Gilmour:

So far from being a sword in the hands of Parliament it is a shield on the arm of Government.

If we look at the propositions that are put about Ministerial responsibility, which are held to be an important part of the function of this institution, Professor Reid had this to say:

There is no escape from the conclusion that if Parliamentary means for holding Ministers responsible are weak—as they are—then the alleged doctrine is an illusion; in our present Parliamentary circumstances it is a certain means for engendering frustrations and disillusionment about the system of government as a whole.

He went on to state:

By stripping our rank-and-file politicians of continuing responsibility in Parliament, the proceedings have degenerated into a continuous and elementary election campaign.

That comment could not be more relevant than it is in the present circumstances, as I have witnessed them during this Address in Reply debate. There have been far too many attempts at straight electioneering, and there has not been much commentary on the kinds of thing that will engender an improvement not only in the welfare of the citizens of South Australia but also in the performance of this institution in serving their needs.

Members of this institution are not only legislators: they are also expected from time to time to be arbitrators, sources of information, and educators. At other times they are expected to be representatives. Also, they are expected to take the cause of their electors before the bureaucracy and explain the difficulty that their electors are having with that bureaucratic arm of government, wherever it may be, in a department or in a QUANGO.

That brings me to the next point. The frustrations that members of Parliament feel on the one hand are matched if not exceeded by the frustrations that are felt by members of the general public. Whereas departments were first set up to do the bidding of Governments—

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr. LEWIS:** Whereas citizens feel frustration with the process which is at their disposal and by which their case can be put, I believe, nonetheless, that those people who

have a vested interest in retaining power within the institutions that are intended to serve them will ensure that their institution and department survives, regardless of whether or not it remains a functional and necessary part of the administrative structures within society.

Only recently, I heard a Minister of this Government point out that small business men, for instance, could have as many as 50 separate forms to complete before they could legally trade either in their chosen area of service in the economy or in their chosen profession or trade. If that is so, I wonder at the wisdom of retaining many of the regulatory bodies that bring disrepute on Government, Parliament, and its members, by virtue of their inadequacy to meet the needs of the people.

Earlier in my remarks, I pointed out how proud South Australians could be of their Parliamentary institution. I did so quite deliberately, for the simple reason that, as it stands at present, we have shown Western democracies that we can perceive the direction that needs to be followed by society at any given time. We have demonstrated that by the way in which we set up, at no cost to parents, universal education for children. We have also demonstrated it by the way in which we gave all women the vote. Indeed, we have shown it in so many ways.

The time has now come when again we can show a lead. We need to examine the way in which Parliament as an institution has functioned, the relationships between members of Parliament and the institution to which they belong, the Parliament and the Executive, the Parliament in its two-House form, the relationships between those Houses, and the relationship between any one of those Houses and the administrative arm of government and the statutory authorities that Governments set up.

If we look at all those things and realise that inadequacies and frustrations are inherent in them (I am sure that we all do), we will come to realise that the valuable fundamental role that we have always expected from the Legislative Council as a House of Review has in recent times been undermined by the method by which it is elected. It has now become (and happily, my political opponents would say) a House in which the politics of Parties will take predominance over its function and capacity to review legislation of Governments, regardless of institutional relationship.

Before the former Government abolished the electoral system that resulted in the election of the members of the Legislative Council, almost continually the members of that place were able to analyse dispassionately and independently any piece of legislation that came before that place and make amendments to it. The record will show that, on more occasions than not, suggestions made by members of the Legislative Council resulted in the improvement, through amendment, of legislation that had already been passed in this House, from which improvements the citizens of South Australia benefited.

That can no longer happen, and that is a consequence of the change in the voting procedures that have resulted in the election of a narrowly held majority, if ever a majority is held in that House. The time has come to review whether or not the Legislative Council, as a House a Review, needs to contain any Ministers of the Crown.

I believe that the time has come when the Legislative Council, as a House of Review, ought not to be charged with the responsibility to review just legislation alone, and that it should also be charged with the responsibility of reviewing the way in which the Government, and indeed its instrumentalities, be they Government departments or statutory bodies that are, in contemporary terms, known as QUANGOS, perform.

In that role, the Public Accounts Committee membership could well be transferred from this Chamber to another place, as a responsibility for that place, and, in addition, Ministers who are at present appointed in that place ought to be appointed in the commoners' House, the House in which the Government is made, in which money Bills are initiated, and in which the Premier sits. I refer, of course, to this House. With all 13 Ministers being selected from the Government's ranks in this House, no Party aspiring to Government could afford to endorse as many of the kinds of people who have been endorsed as candidates to represent that Party at the polls, as has been the case since the Second World War.

All of us, if we were to be honest, would have to admit that the ability of a number of people who have been endorsed by political Parties (if not certain members ultimately elected to serve in the Ministry) since that time (and I will not speak about periods prior to that time, because I was not about then) has had certain limitations. However, if, of the possible minimum number in this Chamber required to form a Government (namely, 24) 13 had to be chosen as Ministers, then the Party concerned would need to be certain of the aptitude of those it endorsed in those seats that it was likely to win, enabling it to obtain office.

**Mr. Slater:** Is this Liberal Party policy or your own view?

**Mr. LEWIS:** Naturally, I speak as I believe, and I give examples of the sort of thing that I believe would relieve the frustration that I presently detect in the community at large, which is presently being served by the institutions of Parliament, as we know them, in our Commonwealth and elsewhere in Western democracies where the Westminster bicameral system is used.

I have described a relationship that would enable the House of Review to be constantly charged with that responsibility, and only that responsibility, in all of its forms, the House in which the Government is formed to initiate the measures for which that Government must then be held responsible. I believe that by that means Ministerial responsibility would begin to mean something once more and that Government departments and statutory authorities (as I have said, QUANGOES is the contemporary term) would also be compelled to perform somewhat better, because Ministers could be called upon by the other place to explain how and why the funds that have been appropriated by the Government had been spent, as also, in that case, could senior officers of Public Service departments.

I also believe that, in that instance, there would not need to be the traditional role of a Question Time as we know it in that place; therefore, Question Time in this place would become more meaningful. Question Time in that place would occur when a majority of its members decided that they needed information about the functions of a particular instrumentality or department and, accordingly, called upon the responsible Minister for an explanation. Naturally, amendments would have to be made to the Constitution, and I would suggest that, amongst those changes, there would need to be not only amendments that would facilitate the kind of structure that I have outlined but also amendments that would change the manner in which the institution was elected.

I believe it appropriate that the institution be elected by a majority of the citizens of South Australia in universal suffrage. It should be a full preferential system, each individual being elected only after he or she has obtained an absolute majority of preference distributed votes. Upon the election of the most popular candidate, that successful person's preferences would be distributed

amongst the remaining candidates until the next candidate was elected; then the preferences from the first two would be distributed amongst the remaining candidates until the third was elected, and so on until 11 members were elected.

**Mr. McRAE:** Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr. LEWIS:** I believe that the elections for that Chamber should not occur concurrently with elections for this place: they should occur at fixed time intervals, on dates well known in advance. The term of office of the members should be, say, only four years, with half retiring every second year. Perhaps a suitable occasion on which the election could occur would be the day on which we elect our local government representatives. After all, poll clerks are in attendance at polling places throughout the State on that day and thus the cost to the taxpayer of conducting the election would be reduced. Every second year, half the number of members of the other place could retire, giving them a term of four years.

Political Parties would cease to focus their attention on that Chamber in the circumstances I have described, and the members of that Chamber would comprise those citizens who have been seen to be competent in their chosen field of expertise and service to the community, whether as doctors, lawyers, business managers, trade unionists or prominent people distinguished for their service to local government, who understand the best interests of the community and how to comment on another political opinion, in their own time and in their own terms, without being biased in doing so.

There would be no necessity for Party discipline. This would enable an objective review of and a subjective (if not objective) commentary, at least, on every item of legislation that came before the Chamber, considering also the reasons given by Government and Ministers for that legislation. It would enable an examination of the necessity for such legislation and, furthermore, a more objective and perhaps realistic assessment of the consequences of implementing the legislation. The function of that Chamber was for many years as I have described it, apart from the variation involving Ministers in that place.

I also believe that, charged with those responsibilities, the Chamber should sit in continuous session, and that it would be necessary, in order to attract suitable people to that Chamber for a period of at least four years, to pay them the same kind of emolument as is paid to Ministers at present. Because the people concerned would be doing constant research into the effects of legislative proposals and the functions of various arms of Government, they would need adequate and appropriate assistance. They would be examining, as I said earlier, not only legislation and its effects but also the performance of particular departments *vis-a-vis* the allocations they received for the purpose of providing a certain service.

Naturally, the press, which presently focuses its attention on the nitty gritty of argument and political point-scoring in debates on whatever subjects arise, would be more inclined to pay attention to the kind of material presented in the other place in reviewing legislation, and in the functions of the Executive and the bureaucracy.

Therefore, the press would be inspired to lift its game. I am certain that that in no small way would effect an immediate improvement in the standing of the institution of Parliament and confirm the belief that it has a relevant function in the society of tomorrow that we are presently endeavouring to create for the benefit of the children of today. I make these remarks against the background and

tradition of responsible government in this State and the effective manner in which it has always represented the best interests of the citizens it serves, showing the way to so many other democratic institutions.

I see the functions of the Chamber to which I have referred in the instance of the Legislative Council as including sunset provisions in all legislation establishing Government departments, instrumentalities, statutory authorities, and *quasi* Government institutions or QUANGOES. As members may or may not know, sunset provisions are intended to control the proliferation of unnecessary agencies and programmes, and introduce clauses of self-destruction, as it were, involving those agencies. It causes them to be reviewed at regular intervals; that does not happen at the moment.

I have already referred to the necessity or otherwise of regulatory authorities and Government impositions on small businessmen who seek to provide a service to people in the community. For example, it is unnecessary to license auctioneers and ensure that they comply with any law (other than the law that requires them to have a licence), there being other laws which govern fair practice among them and to which they are subject. The only reason for ever introducing the law licensing auctioneers was to collect revenue, and it has never ever been reviewed. In this institution we all mean well enough when saying that things should be reviewed, but we never get round to doing so, and thereby hangs the tale: things just go on going on after they have long since served their purpose. As the name implies, sunset is the mechanism by which the sun sets on an authority or a department and it passes into history after, say, five years, having served its purpose.

I believe that any programme such as the type to which I have referred would automatically cease unless the Legislature acted specifically to give it a new lease of life. A review could be conducted by way of an examination by the other place of all Government instrumentalities, as that place is intended to be a House of Review. It should not be a review by any committee of members of this House, where the Government has the numbers and has a vested interest in retaining existing structures. A review undertaken by this House might be so politically

unpopular for the Government that, if it had a slender majority, it would never act. I do not say that that has necessarily ever been the case in the past, but nevertheless it could be the case in the future.

This is not a new idea: it was advanced some 45 years ago, in 1935, by William Douglas in the early days of the New Deal in the United States. He proposed to President Roosevelt that every regulatory agency be terminated at the end of 10 years (I suggest a shorter term than that), because by then that agency would surely have been captured by the very people it was supposed to regulate. We see examples of that happening all the time, where the people who are supposed to be regulated by an authority ultimately catch that authority and make it a servant of their own ends, rather than a servant acting for the benefit of the community at large.

At the time, Roosevelt apparently roared with laughter and agreed that it was a great idea, but he never did anything about it. In fact, nothing was done about the matter until April 1976, when the Colorado Legislature passed the first sunset law in the United States. Almost immediately after that, two other States (Florida and Alabama) followed suit. According to common cause (this is the provision in the American Constitution, common cause being the prime sponsor of the sunset idea), more than 30 States at that time were considering sunset legislation. I am happy to be able to report that already 34 States in the U.S. have sunset legislation operating at present. I have a table that I have extracted from the *Book of the States* which covers a summary of the sunset legislation operating in the U.S. at present. I seek your leave, Mr. Speaker, to have that table inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it, having shown it to you some months ago and being given your approval to do so.

**The SPEAKER:** Is it of a purely statistical nature?

**Mr. LEWIS:** It contains only some comments. It refers particularly to the number of instances in which sunset legislation is operating, and is statistical to that extent. It is self-explanatory.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member having shown it to me previously, I agree that it is suitable for inclusion.

Leave granted.

SUMMARY OF SUNSET LEGISLATION\*

State	Scope	Termination schedule	Preliminary evaluation conducted by	Other legislative review	Other oversight mechanisms in Bill	Phase-out period	Life of each agency	Other provisions
Alabama . . . . .	Comprehensive	28 in 1980	Select Joint Committee	—	Zero-base budgeting	180 days	4 years	2-hour time limit on floor debate on each Bill.
Alaska . . . . .	Regulatory	13 in 1980 1 in 1981	Standing committees	—	Performance audit	1 year	4 years	In addition to regulatory agencies, programmes in other broad areas terminate in 1980-83; specific programmes authorised for termination by Legislative Budget and Audit Committee.
Arkansas . . . . .	Comprehensive	113 in 1981 60 in 1983	Joint interim committees	—	Performance audit	1 year	Perma-ment	—
Colorado . . . . .	Regulatory	1 in 1980 14 in 1981 6 in 1983 1 in 1984	Legislative Audit Committee 12 months prior to termination	Standing committees	Performance audit	1 year	6 years	There is also legislation requiring a study of 20 principal departments of State Government on a schedule concluding in 1994.
Connecticut . . . . .	Primarily regulatory	19 in 1980 17 in 1981 16 in 1982 20 in 1983 22 in 1984	Legislative Programme Review and Investigations Committee	Joint Committee on Government Administration	Performance audit	1 year	5 years	—

## SUMMARY OF SUNSET LEGISLATION\*—Continued

State	Scope	Termination schedule	Preliminary evaluation conducted by	Other legislative review	Other oversight mechanisms in Bill	Phase-out period	Life of each agency	Other provisions
Florida	Regulatory	24 in 1980 36 in 1982	Select Joint Committee appointed by Speaker of House and President of Senate beginning 2 years prior to repeal date	Appropriate substantive committee of both House and Senate, sitting jointly, designated by Speaker of House and President of Senate	—	1 year	5 years	Provides for periodic review of limitations on the initial entry into a profession, occupation, business, industry, or other endeavour.
Georgia	Regulatory	21 in 1980 3 in 1981 18 in 1982 1 in 1983 2 in 1984	Standing committees	—	Performance audit	1 year	6 years	The termination dates of the 10 agencies reviewed and scheduled for termination in 1978 were extended.
Hawaii	Regulatory	8 in 1980 8 in 1981 8 in 1982 7 in 1983 2 in 1984 2 in 1985	Legislative Auditor	Not specified	—	None	6 years	Joint legislative review.
Illinois	Regulatory	7 in 1981 6 in 1983 9 in 1985 6 in 1987 7 in 1989	Bureau of the Budget and Governor; Select Joint Committee	Appropriate standing committees of the House Senate	Performance-evaluation; agency demonstrates need for continued existence	1 year	10 years	Upon receipt of report from Bureau of the Budget, the Governor may recommend continuation or abolition of agency. Governor may also submit Select Joint Committee's recommendations as a reorganisation plan.
Indiana	Comprehensive	25 in 1980 35 in 1981 52 in 1982	Legislative Services Agency, Office of Fiscal and Management Analysis	Joint Interim Sunset Evaluation Committee	Governor submits recommendations	None (a)	—	Each newly established agency subject to termination with 10 year life span. Terminates agencies established by executive order when a Governor leaves office. Terminates agencies established by concurrent resolution when a General Assembly adjourns after the 2nd session.
Kansas	Primarily regulatory	12 in 1980 8 in 1981 4 in 1982 7 in 1983 2 in 1984	Legislative Post Audit 9 months prior to termination	Standing committees	Performance audit	1 year	6 years	Act terminates in July 1981 unless re-enacted.
Louisiana	Comprehensive	2 in 1982 1 in 1983 3 in 1984 2 in 1985 1 in 1986 3 in 1987 1 in 1988 3 in 1989 4 in 1990	Standing committee of the two Houses which have usual jurisdiction over the affairs of the entity. Process begins 2 years prior to the termination date	Bill authorising recreation referred to the same committee that performed the initial review and evaluation	Zero-base budgeting	Statutory entities begin to terminate operations on July 1 of the year prior to end of legislative authority	9 years	Standing committees may conduct a more extensive evaluation of selected statutory entities under their jurisdiction or of particular programmes of such entities.
Maine	Regulatory	7 in 1980 23 in 1982 11 in 1984 14 in 1986 11 in 1988	State Auditor	To be defined	Performance evaluation	1 year	10 years	Performance reviews also scheduled for executive departments (no terminations).
Maryland	Regulatory	13 in 1980 16 in 1981 18 in 1982 15 in 1983	Department of Fiscal Services	Standing committees	—	None	6 years	—
Missouri	(b)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

## SUMMARY OF SUNSET LEGISLATION\*—Continued

State	Scope	Termination schedule	Preliminary evaluation conducted by	Other legislative review	Other oversight mechanisms in Bill	Phase-out period	Life of each agency	Other provisions
Montana . . . .	Regulatory, plus certain agencies within Depts. of Social and Rehabilitative Services, Community Affairs, and Institutions	22 in 1981 10 in 1983 11 in 1985	Legislative Audit Committee	Standing committees	—	1 year	6 years	—
Nebraska . . . .	Regulatory	7 in 1980 5 in 1981 5 in 1982 8 in 1983	Performance Review and Audit Committee	Standing committees	Performance review	1 year	6 years	Act terminates in 1983.
Nevada . . . . .	Selective/pilot	3 in 1981	Legislative Commission with assistance from Legislative Council Bureau and committees or subcommittees appointed to carry out review	Legislature	—	1 year	—	—
New Hampshire . . . .	Discretionary/comprehensive	All by 1985	Joint Legislative Committee on Review of Agencies and Programmes	Standing committees	—	9 months	6 years	—
New Mexico . . .	Regulatory	16 in 1980	Legislative Finance Committee	Not specified	—	1 year	6 years	—
North Carolina . . . . .	Regulatory	49 in 1981 34 in 1983	Governmental Evaluation Commission	Standing committees	Performance evaluation	1 year	—	Governmental Evaluation Commission with legislative and public members established to supervise sunset review; commission terminates in 1983.
Oklahoma . . . .	Comprehensive	18 in 1980 16 in 1981 20 in 1982 21 in 1983	Standing or interim committees	—	Zero-base budgeting	1 year	6 years	Rules and regulations of terminated agencies continue in effect unless terminated by law; includes agencies established by executive order.
Oregon . . . . .	Regulatory	9 in 1980 13 in 1982 8 in 1984 16 in 1986	Interim committee	Standing committees	—	None	8 years	—
Pennsylvania . . .	Selective	3 in 1980 1 in 1982	Standing committee	—	Performance evaluation	—	2 to 6 years	—
Rhode Island . . .	Comprehensive	25 in 1980 20 in 1981	Oversight Commission	—	Zero-base budgeting	1 year	5 years	Oversight Commission established to conduct sunset review.
South Carolina . . . . .	Regulatory	7 in 1980 6 in 1981 6 in 1982 7 in 1983 7 in 1984 7 in 1985	Legislative Audit Council	Reorganisation Commission, standing committees	Performance audit	1 year	6 years	—
South Dakota . . . . .	Selective/pilot	None in 1980	Special interim committee	—	Performance audit	180 days	None specified	The legislature, through a special committee, may also review for sunset an agency's authorisation to promulgate rules and the rules currently in existence.
Tennessee . . . .	Comprehensive	35 in 1980 12 in 1981 20 in 1982 66 in 1983 43 in 1984 46 in 1985	Special evaluation committee in each House	Standing committees (in case of tie vote in evaluation committee)	Limited programme review	1 year	6 years	Establishment of new agencies subject to review by evaluation committee.

## SUMMARY OF SUNSET LEGISLATION\*

State	Scope	Termination schedule	Preliminary evaluation conducted by	Other legislative review	Other oversight mechanisms in Bill	Phase-out period	Life of each agency	Other provisions
Texas	Comprehensive	28 in 1981 30 in 1983 37 in 1985 27 in 1987 29 in 1989 18 in 1991	Legislative Budget Board	Not specified	Performance evaluation	1 year	12 years	Initial review conducted by agencies themselves.
Utah	Regulatory	25 in 1981	Interim study committee	—	Interim committee's discretion	1 year	6 years	Applies to legislation not agency.
Vermont	Regulatory	All by 1985	Legislative Council staff	Appropriate standing committees	—	1 year	6 years	Act itself terminates.
Virginia	(c)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Washington	Comprehensive	22 in 1981 20 in 1983	Legislative Budget Committee	Standing committees	Programme review	1 year	6 years	Select joint committee prepares termination legislation. Act itself terminates in 1984.
West Virginia	Selective/ pilot	3 in 1980 11 in 1982 11 in 1984	Joint Committee on Government Operations	Legislature when in session	Performance audit	1 year	6 years	Joint Committee on Government Operations composed of 5 House members, 5 Senate members and 5 citizens appointed by Governor.
Wyoming	Selective	11 in 1981	Legislative Service Office	11-member committee appointed by Management Council	—	1 year	6 years	—

While they have not enacted sunset legislation in the same sense as the other 33 States with detailed information in this table, the legislatures in Delaware, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, and Wisconsin have included sunset clauses in selected programmes.

(a) Through executive order, the Governor may provide a terminated agency with one year to wind up its affairs.

(b) Most legislation carries requirement that any rule or regulation adopted under authority of the Bill being enacted will expire 2 years after promulgation unless formally approved by legislation prior to that time.

(c) By joint resolution, Senate and House of Delegates establish a schedule for review of "functional areas" of State Government. Programme evaluation is carried out by Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission. Agencies are not scheduled for automatic termination. Commission reports are made to standing committees which conduct public hearings.

**Mr. LEWIS:** The provisions to which I refer are not so novel as to be outrageous or outlandish; they are practical and are working, and they are seen to relieve the frustration which common citizens feel regarding the instrumentalities and other authorities that Governments have created. Being subjected to such pressure from the various regulations affecting their very lifestyles, people now feel utterly stultified in trying to go about their business and doing their day's work. We have heard in this debate members challenging Ministers to do something about their various departments, expanding the services being provided to the point where we will all eventually be servants of the State, and none will be doing anything about providing the food and other essential services to keep the outfit going.

It is well known that all these things cost money and money represents effort, but where does money come from? It comes from the effort of citizens. Governments certainly do not create wealth; they merely tax the citizen and instrumentality of commerce and redistribute the money, thereby reducing the incentive of people, according to the amount to which they are subject by that taxation, to do anything. If there is a small measure of taxation, there is a large measure of incentive; if there is a large measure of taxation there is no measure of incentive.

The sunset approach is amazingly straightforward. It re-examines every programme or agency every five years or so and, if the organisation is no longer needed, then off with its head for six months, and wind it up. By that means, we can be fairly certain that we will be better off.

I refer to today's *News* to illustrate the very considerable benefit that such legislation would be if it were introduced at present. An article on page 15 points out that every Australian household donates \$900 a year towards the running of the country's business regulations, and that is a fair bit of money. The article states:

"For every dollar the Federal Government spends on business regulations, the private sector must spend at least \$3 just to comply with those regulations," the federation says in its newsletter, *Employers Report*, released today. "Overall, the private sector must reserve 13 cents in every dollar of income just to comply with wasteful Federal and State business regulations."

The federation said a 1978-79 survey showed the direct and secondary costs to the private sector of Federal and State business regulations amounted to about \$3 720 000 000. When State regulations were added to Federal laws, 54 000 private sector employees were needed full-time to cope with the "bureaucratic paper war."

The federation said Governments needed to be goals-orientated rather than rules-orientated. "Such a move would release the shackles and encourage greater enterprise—and save the whole community vast amounts of money," the federation said.

In effect, people are enabled to be employed more productively than by having them shuffling bits of paper and checking whether the i's are dotted and the t's are crossed. That is a regrettable preoccupation with some members opposite, if they have the ability to read. For the benefit of members opposite, I have another table that I would like to have inserted in *Hansard* without reading it.



It simply outlines those States that have passed, or are considering passing, sunset legislation, some of them being in addition to those already contained in the tables taken from the American *The Book of States*. I seek leave to have that table inserted in *Hansard*.

**The SPEAKER:** With the assurance that this again is purely statistical?

**Mr. LEWIS:** It is, Mr. Speaker.

Leave granted.

### SUNSET OVERVIEW—1978

States which adopted Sunset Law—in chronological order.

Colorado	1
Florida	2
Louisiana	3
Alabama	4
Arkansas	5
Georgia	6
Oklahoma	7
Utah	8
New Mexico	9
South Dakota	10
Indiana	11
Montana	12
Nebraska	13
Rhode Island	14
Hawaii	15
Tennessee	16
Connecticut	17
Washington	18
Texas	19
Alaska	20
North Carolina	21
New Hampshire	22
Maine	23
Oregon	24
Vermont	25
Kansas	26
Maryland	27
Arizona	28
South Carolina	29

The following States have since passed sunset legislation, but not sure in which order:

Illinois  
Missouri  
Nevada  
Pennsylvania  
Virginia  
West Virginia  
Wyoming

Whilst Legislatures have passed Bills introducing sunset provisions on Government agencies and authorities, some have been subsequently vetoed by their Governors.

They were vetoed not because the Governor, in each case, saw them as either inappropriate or irresponsible in principle, but because they were hastily drafted with such heavy handed abolition provisions, that it was considered impractical by the Governor to implement them.

The States in this group, to date, have been:

Iowa  
Kentucky  
Mississippi  
New Jersey  
Virginia—since passed  
West Virginia—since passed.

All these Legislatures have reviewed, or are, in the immediate sessions of sittings reviewing, with a view to

including appropriate clauses for administrative procedures for abolition.

**Mr. LEWIS:** I believe that the sunset legislation functions, if we were ever able in this Parliament to show the way to the rest of Australia, perhaps to the rest of the world, in defining—

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr. LEWIS:** If we could show to the rest of the world the way in which we could more adequately and effectively dispose the relationship of each of these Chambers to the other in the provision of a Parliamentary service to the community we are supposed to be representing, we would show that there is a role and a place for a bicameral Parliament in the future, and we would ensure that executive Government was accountable to elected representatives of the people but still not stripped of its capacity to sustain its majority on the floor of the House in which it generated the money Bills that are essential in providing the service of Government to meet the needs of citizens. That could be done by using the other House as a House of Review of functions. That is the kind of example I give of how this can be done, where not only the instrumentality would be subject to review but, as is my belief and conviction, so also should the senior public servants. At different times to the review being conducted into the department or instrumentality, those senior executive members (divisional head or higher) might be able to have their future purpose justified and, accordingly, demonstrate their ability to serve the community, rather than their self-interest.

It is not that I consider that they are doing that now. I regard the Public Service of this State as having the highest standard of professional service that anyone could expect. We must ensure that it is sustained and is seen to be sustained by the kind of scrutiny given to those individual servants in their respective roles. If they were to be employed on contractual terms, that would enable and facilitate a greater exchange between public and private sectors of management expertise. Heaven knows (if heaven does not, no-one ever will), we presently do not administer our affairs, our organisational structures, at all well in this latter half of the twentieth century. We have mastered the professions of good health, law abidance, and engineering, and we have all the benefits that those professions and others, and the trades that support them, can bring. However, the one thing that we have not learnt to understand is the science of industrial relations, and the present state of scientific evidence that supports a particular view of organisational theory. Therefore, I say that an exchange greater than now provided for (or possible) would be facilitated if we were to use a system of contractual employment for our senior public servants in Government departments as well as in Government instrumentalities.

These are my own views. I will illustrate that, in addition to organisational structure and management on the part of the instrumentality and the staff member serving that instrumentality, there are other aspects of instrumentalities and their functions that need to be reviewed. I give as an example the kind of difficulty that private contractors have had with Government departments where tenders are called for public works. There is a plethora (that means many of, in different kinds, colours, shapes, forms, and almost languages) of kinds of contract presently in use in this State, and the previous Government neither recognised that problem nor attempted to do anything about it, despite the number of

occasions on which I personally brought it to the attention of Ministers.

The regrettable point about that is that, in relation to the private contracting construction industry, there are variations in such things as site and other information, ground conditions, the security and retention requirements, the practical completion, and other definitions, who insures and who pays, and where it will be insured, the powers and responsibilities of the superintendent of the constructing authority in relation to the project engineer, the time for notices to be lodged and claims to be made, provisional sums and bills of quantity—variations in all of these areas, yea and more, such as extensions of time and the costs of delays, the penalty clauses, the payments, cost adjustments that need to be made—variations there and yea, still more, such as default in principle, variations in the meaning of words used in different instances, and provision for the appointment of arbitrators. I could go on. Those kinds of thing cause frustration. They increase cost, and they do nothing to bring the Government or the Parliament into the sort of standing in which I believe both should be held. We not only continue to degenerate, but we fail to recognise it. The means by which I have described we could improve this is a means which, I believe, should be examined and pursued. Indeed, for as long as I am a member of this Chamber, I shall try to get some rational consideration of those questions I have raised tonight so that some improvements, as I perceive them, may be made according to the examples I have given.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer):** I move:

That the time for the moving of the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

**Mr. WHITTEN (Price):** I support the motion. I have been interested to hear, in particular, the expose on the alternative structure of the Legislative Council given by the member for Mallee. Before I deal with that, I point out that I was interested in the honourable member's recitation of the significance of the Constitutional Museum, and I compliment him on it, because the museum is something of which we should all be proud. I will spend some of my time on specific parts of the Governor's Speech. In paragraph 3, he said:

My Government is determined to maintain its low taxation policy, initiated with the abolition of succession and gift duties, pay-roll tax and stamp duty concessions, and most recently the abolition of land tax on the principal place of residence.

I recognise that the abolition of these taxes was one of the Liberal Party's election promises and one of the few promises that have so far been kept. I suggest, though, that the present Government has no intention of honouring many of the promises made prior to 15 September 1979.

**Mr. Mathwin:** That's a bit hard.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** No, it is not; it is true. The abolition of succession duties, gift duty and land tax has removed the last vestiges of the wealth taxes, where those with the ability to pay did pay, as none of these taxes placed a great burden on the majority of the South Australian community. Two-thirds of all estates attracted no succession duties whatsoever. So, those who are now wealthy can expect to inherit more wealth in the future, without any contribution to the State, but the \$16 000 000

to \$17 000 000 that the State would have received each year will now have to be found by some other form of taxation imposed on the less fortunate.

We have already been made aware of some methods the Government has adopted to ensure that the financial loss the State has suffered will be recouped. It has raised electricity tariffs, of which a percentage is directly paid to the State, bus and train fares have been increased 25 per cent and water rates have increased 12½ per cent.

Prior to 15 September last year, the now Premier promised incentives for economic development. He said that industry would receive benefits through lower charges for water and electricity. Now that these charges have been increased across the board, he will be able to make reductions and remissions as incentives, but who will be paying?

Since this Government took office less than 12 months ago, it has caused inflation to rise more rapidly in South Australia than in any other State. Housing Trust rent increases have been a contributing factor to the 8.8 per cent rise in the consumer price index. I wonder how much higher it will go when the increased bus and rail fares, electricity charges, and water and sewerage rates are taken into account.

Recently the Premiers met in Victoria, at the invitation of the Victorian Premier, to consider the future financial commitments from the Commonwealth. It would appear that, although all States agreed on the need for more funds to enable them to finance their States, it is unlikely that Prime Minister Fraser and Federal Treasurer Howard will assist in any way. It is significant that after the Premiers' meeting, Mr. Fraser said, "If the States want more money, they can raise their own taxes."

I would suggest that this Government is now considering some form of retail sales tax or a value-added tax which, along with the increased fares on public transport, increased electricity tariffs and increased water rates, will hit the wage and salary earners hardest.

We have already seen where the Minister of Water Resources has also tried to hit the Upper Murray primary producers a little harder, by increasing the water charges for irrigators by another 12½ per cent.

**Mr. Mathwin:** You're getting a bit heavy, George.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** I put it to the member for Glenelg that it may also be placing a surcharge on income tax; that is another way in which the Government might increase taxation.

**Mr. Mathwin:** Which little magic bag are you getting them from?

**Mr. WHITTEN:** There is more in the bag yet. The Governor, in paragraph 19 of his Speech, said:

My Government has pursued its policy that Adelaide be linked directly to the standard gauge railway systems of Australia. An agreement has been reached with the Commonwealth Government to build a standard gauge railway from Adelaide to Crystal Brook, including freight terminals at Mile End, Port Adelaide and Islington, with provision for a future link to Outer Harbor.

I compliment both Governments on this move. It is certainly time that the Fraser Government has at last agreed to this necessary proposal. The previous Minister of Transport (Geoff Virgo) fought with his Federal counterpart (Mr. Nixon) for years to enable this vital link to come to fruition, but without avail.

**Mr. Mathwin:** That's the best you've done tonight.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** I have complimented the Government on being able to convince Mr. Nixon that this should happen. We have been denied rail services to all parts of the Commonwealth, without change of gauge, for far too long.

I remind the House that when the container berth was built at Outer Harbor provision was made for a standard gauge link, so I can assure honourable members that the previous Minister of Transport (Geoff Virgo) had this in mind, as did the previous Government. If they could have reached some agreement with that awful fellow Nixon, the previous Government would have had a standard gauge line to Crystal Brook and other places in operation much earlier.

**Mr. Hamilton:** Geoff Virgo had a great deal of foresight.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** As the member for Albert Park said, Geoff Virgo had a great deal of foresight. I am pleased that the Labor Government's proposal to establish freight terminals at Mile End—

**Mr. Olsen:** That's rubbish.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** I did not catch what the honourable member had to say about "rubbish", but he would certainly be well aware what rubbish is. I am pleased that the Labor Government's proposal to establish freight terminals at Mile End, Islington and Port Adelaide has been adopted by this Government. The standard gauge line will enable the bulk of heavy freight to be transported by rail, which is the fastest, most efficient, energy-saving, cheapest form of transport available anywhere in the world.

I hope that the Australian National Railways will not further increase freight charges, as it has done in the past few years, because that may affect South Australia and stop our manufacturers from transporting their goods interstate. When these new railway terminals are built for the Adelaide to Crystal Brook standard gauge rail link, they will enable South Australian manufacturers to forward their goods to all capital cities in Australia, as well as to the Northern Territory, without the need for those heavy semi-trailers with their huge loads, which damage the roads, as the member for Alexandra is so well aware.

Perhaps the Federal Government may give consideration to honouring a promise made more than 60 years ago to build a railway line from Darwin to Alice Springs. We now have a rail link from Tarcoola to Alice Springs. I remind the House that that rail link to Alice Springs came to fruition at the behest of the Whitlam Labor Government. Without the foresight of that Government we would be still battling to get a line from Tarcoola to the Alice.

During the last election campaign, the Liberals promised that all work on NEAPTR would be halted while the O'Bahn system was investigated. That is another promise this Government has kept—it has certainly halted that project, and it has certainly made some sort of investigation. But, after nearly a year, no decision has been reached. I can fully understand the dilemma of the Minister of Transport. There are four options for the type of public transport to serve the northern suburbs of Adelaide. Option one would be to adopt a do-nothing policy and to continue using buses that will be competing with other traffic for limited road space.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** What are you on about, George?

**Mr. WHITTEN:** If the Minister of Agriculture chose to tune in now and again, he would know, but I do not think he is very interested. If he listens he will learn something.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair would welcome the Minister of Agriculture using the member's electorate title when addressing the honourable member.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I apologise, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. ABBOTT:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr. WHITTEN:** To adopt option one would be adopting a do-nothing policy and would result in the use of buses which would be competing with other traffic for limited road space, causing more congestion and problems, and probably a lot more road accidents. That would not reduce the time of the journey and, probably, commuters would have to spend extra time travelling to and from the city. Not only that, but diesel buses have a road life of about 7 to 8 years, and after about five years they pollute the atmosphere considerably. The member for Todd can laugh. If he wishes to swallow that awful carbon-monoxide and allow it to be inflicted on his constituents, he is welcome to do that, because his constituents will wake up and say that the member they have is useless and is supporting a useless system (a do-nothing policy), because that is what option No. 1 is—using the same old diesel buses without there being improved transport for the north-eastern suburbs. The second option is the extension of the Northfield railway line.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** What do you think about that?

**Mr. WHITTEN:** I will certainly tell the Minister what I think about that. First, I say that that is the Walkerville council's baby. If the Minister of Transport (the member for Torrens) did not have Walkerville in his electorate, I am sure he would be much saner in his thinking. A person who thinks about one little suburb with its silver tails and blue-rinse people, and looks after them only, does not have the interests of the State in mind.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** You will never win Torrens while you keep that up.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** I have no wish to stand in the electorate of Torrens, because the people in that electorate would not be people I would want to represent. I am a socialist and wish to work for the interests of workers, and there are not too many workers in Walkerville. As I was saying when I was so rudely interrupted—

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** What about Prospect? What about your colleague, the member for Gilles? He is in that crusty category.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** I will take the advice just given to me by the member for Baudin, and ignore rude interjections. When I was so rudely interrupted, I was saying that it is the Walkerville council's baby to keep public transport out of Walkerville. The railway extension would also satisfy those who see the Torrens Valley as something untouchable in any way whatsoever.

The main objection to the rail line is that it would not service the same area that the l.r.t. would serve, and the length of the journey would be longer, with a resultant increase in time spent on that transport by passengers, who would be dumped at the Adelaide Railway Station. With the l.r.t. system we would have a system that could run along King William Street and connect with the Glenelg tram, and we would have a cross-city transport system which would be very efficient.

The third option is a guided busway in the Modbury corridor. Should we opt for guided buses, or the O'Bahn system as someone has called it (yet in Germany it appears in most of the reading material that I have seen as the U-Bahn system), what we would be doing is taking part in an experiment, because that system has not been tried fully or tested anywhere in the world to any extent.

**Mr. McRae:** It has not been tried at all, has it?

**Mr. WHITTEN:** It has been tried to a limited extent. It is a system that is not yet operational on a commercial basis. I understand that the Daimler-Benz company has recently completed a 1.3 kilometre test track at Essen.

Think about that—a 1.3 kilometre test track in Essen is all that Daimler-Benz has!

As a result of the good graces of this House and the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, I shall be travelling overseas in the near future. I have made arrangements with Daimler-Benz to inspect its installations at Stuttgart and Essen, where it has 1.3 kilometres of test track.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Where else are you going?

**Mr. WHITTEN:** I intend to go to Munich, which is the home of M.A.N. Diesel. That company is also experimenting with the O'Bahn and guided bus systems. I intend to examine that facility.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Are they nuclear powered?

**Mr. WHITTEN:** Mr. Speaker—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Price does not require assistance from members on either side of the House.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** The M.A.N. Diesel Company is not, I am sure, interested in nuclear-powered trams.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Where else are you going?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister of Agriculture is included in "members on either side of the House".

**Mr. WHITTEN:** I do intend to go to Goteborg, Sweden, to visit the Volvo factory. Again, I thank the Managing Director of C.M.V. in South Australia, Mr. Jim Crawford, who has been of great assistance to me in making those arrangements to visit the guided bus system manufacturing plant at Goteborg and 100 miles south of Goteborg at Halmstadt, where that company is also experimenting with guided bus systems. If we have to be inflicted with a guided bus system, I believe the Volvo company would be the better company to consider.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Where else are you going?

**Mr. WHITTEN:** I will come to that when I deal with public transport. The final and only other logical option for the l.r.t. in the Modbury corridor is the only system that will provide the north-eastern suburbs with adequate public transport to which they are entitled. Although the people elected the member for Todd and the member for Newland, they may have been a little misguided at the time of the election. They certainly will not support a guided bus system, and they are entitled to a light rail transit system, which is what they should get. The l.r.t. will be the fastest system. True, the l.r.t. will cost more initially, but it would be the cheaper system over a longer period, because there will be no need to replace the polluting diesel buses every seven or eight years.

Honourable members can call it what they like—a tramway or a light transit system will last for many years. Indeed, the vehicles will still be going when the Minister of Agriculture is dead and gone. I do not wish him an early retirement, but they will be there a long time. Some of the Glenelg trams are 50 years old.

Further, the l.r.t. would be the fastest system; although it would initially cost more, it would be cheaper over a period of time. A link could be made with the Glenelg tramway, thus providing a fast service across the city, which is something that we do not have presently. It would also relieve the State of a dependency on expensive fuel oil and would not pollute the atmosphere as diesel buses do.

On running time alone, the l.r.t. is far ahead of any other transport system. For the complete journey from Tea Tree Plaza to the city centre, the expected time would be 19 minutes for the l.r.t.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Are you going to—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Price will resume his seat. The Chair has been more than tolerant about unnecessary interjections from both sides of

the House, particularly from the right. That will not be tolerated any longer. The honourable member for Price.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** As I said, the estimated journey time for the l.r.t. would be 19 minutes. The bus journey to the east end of Walkerville Terrace would be 26 minutes, and probably the bus times would be greatly extended in peak hours. I intend to inspect the l.r.t. system in Cologne, West Germany, and the newly completed Newcastle light rail system in Great Britain. I understand that that system has been completed now and will be officially opened in September this year. The system has 34 miles of light rail. I intend to spend a couple of days inspecting the Newcastle-on-Tyne system.

I now refer to the report by the Director-General of Transport (Dr. Derek Scrafton). This report has not been greatly publicised, but it may be of use to honourable members. The former Minister of Transport (Hon. G. T. Virgo) went overseas with the Director-General of Transport to examine the various overseas systems. This report was written by Dr. Scrafton, who is still Director-General of Transport and who states:

Following Dr. Scrafton's visit to the test track in 1975 to see the then new prototype l.r.t. cars for the Tyneside Metro, the Tyne and Wear Passenger Transport Executive arranged a full-day itinerary for the Minister to describe and view progress on the new system.

He goes on to say what they looked at and the various people they met. The report continues:

Tyne and Wear County Council has established the following objectives for public transport for the period up to 1982:

1. Complete planned construction of Metro by 1980-81 with parts of the system brought into use before then.
2. Reorganise bus services in the areas served by Metro by 1980-81, to provide a developing integrated public passenger transport service in these areas.
3. Provide higher standards of bus services and new Fastline (express bus) services in areas not served by Metro.
4. Provide interchange facilities at strategically sited Metro stations by the time each comes into use.
5. Ensure that adequate public transport services are available to those who do not have access to cars, including the physically handicapped.
6. Ensure that the less well off can afford to use the public transport services for work, shopping and leisure journeys.
7. Improve bus stations and provide more bus shelters.
8. Reverse the trend of reduced ridership on public transport and the promote an increase in ridership.

The final comment by the Director-General of Transport on that page of his report is as follows:

A variation on these eight items could well become the South Australian Government's public transport policy if the north-east l.r.t. line were to be constructed.

Honourable members can see that the present Director-General was advocating an l.r.t. system in the Modbury corridor, and he had plenty to say about why that should be. His report covers many pages.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** What is it going to cost? You have not told us that yet.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** I did not say; I said it would be fairly expensive and would cost much more than the guided bus system, the other alternative. I also said it would be much cheaper in the long run, because there would not be the high replacement costs.

I will not bore the House any further by reading what the previous Minister and the present Director of Transport had to say in support of l.r.t., but I advise those people who are interested to refer to the Public Transport Systems in the Urban Areas report, because it is very

interesting. After seeing both these systems in operation, I believe that the l.r.t. system is the best one for the north-eastern suburbs. I support the l.r.t. system and I hope that the present Government will also support it for the benefit of users of public transport.

Last year the Premier made several election promises, some that he recycled from his Federal Leader, Mr. Fraser. In his main policy speech, the Premier promised that major pay-roll tax cuts could mean more than 7 000 jobs. In the costing document it was stated that 7 000 additional jobs was very optimistic. In the *Sunday Mail* of 9 September 1979 a Liberal advertisement stated:

Liberal employment incentives will create 7 000 new jobs.

Also on that date a headline in the *Sunday Mail* stated:

Liberal plans for development of mining and resources will create 10 000 more jobs.

That is a total of 17 000 jobs.

**Mr. Mathwin:** Good stuff.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** Yes, but as I said, that is the same as the promises that Fraser made, and it will not be honoured.

**Mr. Lewis:** How do you know?

**Mr. WHITTEN:** The Government has had 12 months to do something. How many jobs did you get out of the pay-roll tax deductions? Fraser went much further with his promises. In November 1975 he said:

Under a Liberal-National Country Party Government there will be jobs for all those who want to work.

At that time unemployment was running at 4.8 per cent, but it has kept increasing ever since. Malcolm Fraser made many promises in 1975 and again in 1977, but he had no intention of keeping them. I hope that the Premier will keep some of the promises that he has made. Mr. Fraser will be remembered by historians as the Prime Minister who was the greatest prevaricator that has ever been, whose promises meant nothing and will mean nothing. I do not believe that Premier Tonkin could break as many promises as has Prime Minister Fraser.

**Mr. Hamilton:** He won't have time.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** He has a possible 2½ years to do so. I am indebted to Mr. Alan Austin who, in the *National Times* of April 1980, listed 40 broken promises. I will not read all of those broken promises, because I believe they have received enough publicity already. The first promise related to honesty and integrity in Government. The Prime Minister said, "I would like to have a Government which people can trust." That is what the people of Australia have been saying ever since, because they would like to have a Government that they can trust. However, they certainly cannot trust the Federal Government run by Fraser at the present time.

**Mr. Mathwin:** You are not being very nice to our Prime Minister.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** I have no intention of being nice to a fellow like Fraser who has done such a poor job for Australia. Mr. Fraser also said:

After a Liberal National Country Party Government there will be jobs for all those who want to work.

Rather than improving unemployment, it has steadily worsened. As I have said, the figures went from 4.8 per cent of the workforce unemployed in 1975 to 7.1 per cent at the end of 1978. At the moment, over 8 per cent of the workforce is unemployed in Australia. Mr. Fraser also said:

We will be generous to those who cannot get a job and want to work.

Unemployment benefits have substantially declined in real terms. Juniors are receiving \$5.15 a day. What did Mr. Howard do yesterday when he delivered the Budget? He increased unemployment benefits by a lousy \$2, but the

cost of living has risen dramatically. He did not give unemployed persons under 18 years of age one cent. As members well know, there has been no increase in unemployment benefits for persons under 18 years since the Whitlam Government era in 1974.

**Mr. Mathwin:** Where would you increase taxation to get those funds?

**Mr. WHITTEN:** It is not my business to tell the Treasurer how to get the money. He does not need to be told. The Prime Minister has burgled and thieved from petrol users. He used world parity pricing of oil to burgle and thieve the motorist without putting a shilling back into roads. That is why the cost of living is so high.

**Mr. Mathwin:** We have the third cheapest petrol in the world.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I have heard sufficient from the honourable member for Glenelg.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** All members in this House would fully realise that the cost of living increases are mainly attributable to world parity pricing of oil by this present Federal Government. Therefore, there is no need for me to say by what amount taxation should be increased. I turn now to the Commonwealth Employment Service statistics for June 1980, which are the latest figures I have been able to obtain. In June 1977, when this Federal Government was elected, there were 332 793 people unemployed and registered for work. In 1980 there has been a large increase to June this year to 427 429. The largest increase occurred in the figures for young unemployed, which went from 126 900 to 158 484. National unemployment in percentage terms was 5.22 per cent in June 1977 and 6.43 per cent in 1980.

A couple of weeks ago the Premier was rather keen to discuss the reduction in South Australia's unemployment rate. He wanted to compare July figures with June, and June figures with May. All members would know how crook that type of thing can be, because one cannot compare one month with the previous month. One must look at the figures 12 months apart. In June 1979, 43 265 persons were unemployed in South Australia. In June 1980, 46 222 were unemployed, which is a great increase. There was also an increase in the number of young unemployed persons. The proportion of unemployed in South Australia has increased from 7.25 per cent to 7.71 per cent.

So much for the Premier's figures, comparing one month with another. He was certainly kidding people along. The figures to which I have referred reflect the way in which the Liberal Party's policies are not working. Also, they do not take into account the many thousands of people who are not registered as unemployed. Many of those people have given up. They have become so frustrated that they say, "What is the use? I cannot get a job." Certainly, employers are not being fair dinkum with them.

Last Monday, a young fellow came to my office complaining that he was unable to find a job. He said, "I think that I will have to give up. I am sick of travelling around the place trying to get jobs. Why don't I sit on my backside and take unemployment benefits?" I said that he could certainly do so, in reply to which this young man said, "That is not my way. I want a job and I want to work. I want to have some dignity." I asked whether he had been out looking for a job that morning, in reply to which he said, "Mr. Whitten, I left home before 6 o'clock this morning to answer an advertisement for a job in Saturday's *Advertiser*." The advertisement stated that persons should apply at 7 o'clock at Manchester Street, Mile End South. This young man, who lives down Port Adelaide way, left home before 6 o'clock, arrived at

Manchester Street at 6.45 a.m. and bowled straight in, despite a couple of other people telling him that he could not do so until 7 a.m.

However, this young man was so keen that he went straight in. He came out two minutes later, having been told that the job had gone. Many other people fronted up at Mile End wanting to get a job. However, the employers were crook by not honouring what they had advertised in the press. They stated that persons would be interviewed at 7 a.m. However, when this young man to whom I have referred arrived at the place in question before 7 a.m., the job had already gone.

**Mr. Oswald:** If you had not destroyed the manufacturing base five years ago, that would not have happened.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** I will refer to the member for Morphett in a minute. I now refer to the Port Adelaide Commonwealth Employment Service office figures relating to my electorate for May and June. At the beginning of May, 3 013 persons were registered as unemployed at the Commonwealth Employment Service office at Port Adelaide. So much for the extra work that is supposed to be about and how much costs are increasing! In two months, do we see a reduction? We do not. Indeed, there was an increase of 36 persons registered as unemployed during the period from 2 May to 26 June.

I now refer to the number of job vacancies that exist. Perhaps the situation has improved a little in this respect. On 2 May 1980, 66 persons were chasing every job that was available at the Commonwealth Employment Service at Port Adelaide. The ratio has improved quite a bit since then, as now only 44 persons are chasing every available job. I should like to be able to give a break-down of the various trades involved in these figures. I used once to be able to get those figures. However, members of Parliament have now been denied any information regarding the various categories. It does not suit this Government for members to know whether, for example, 100 fitters are chasing every job that is available.

**Mr. Hamilton:** Open government.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** There is nothing open about it. They hide what they can.

**Mr. Evans:** And they can what they hide.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** Certainly, some canning is going on. How high must unemployment go before this Government acts? The member for Flinders, who is not now in the Chamber, recently spoke at his Country Party conference. He said, "How much longer should South Australia be held back? The Liberals have been in office for 10 months; the honeymoon is over." Only the week before last, in a reply to a question from my Leader, the Premier referred to many companies that, by their investments, were creating jobs. He gave the example of Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, that great employer of labour in South Australia.

The Premier stated that B.H.P. is to spend between \$90 000 000 and \$100 000 000 on its Whyalla steelworks and that that investment is in addition to the \$30 000 000 being spent by that company in relation to its new coke ovens. He stated that 30 extra workers would be employed—after an expenditure of \$130 000 000! If his figures are correct (and I do not say that they are), the Premier is saying that every job has cost \$4 000 000. The B.H.P. will certainly ensure that the consumer pays: it has already increased its steel prices by 20 per cent without having to go to the Prices Justification Tribunal.

**Mr. Evans:** And it is still the cheapest in the world.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** I have doubts about that, but if that is the case, there is no reason to exploit the Australian people. Recently, Mr. Don Laidlaw, M.L.C., acknowledged that the number of days lost through industrial

disputes in the Adelaide area continued to be about half the national average. Mr. Laidlaw, with his long history in industry, would be able to assess the situation. I have known Mr. Laidlaw for many years before he came into this place, and I am sure that he has a good knowledge of the industrial situation; he would probably make a much better Minister of Industrial Affairs than the present Minister. The reason for lower figures in regard to industrial disputes over the years is that South Australia has had a Minister of Labour and Industry who would always talk to unions and employers. However, that situation does not seem to exist now. I can cite two examples where the trust between employers, employees and unions has deteriorated.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Since when?

**Mr. WHITTEN:** One involves private enterprise, and the other, a Government department. Members may be aware that a company called Schrader-Scovill has a plant in the Elizabeth area. That company has destroyed all of the trust between itself and the unions. Schrader-Scovill manufactures valves that are used in motor tyres and tubes and supplies these components to the motor industry throughout Australia. Unfortunately, the workers of Schrader-Scovill have either worked too hard or, because of the downturn in motor vehicle sales, have produced more components than the motor vehicle industry could absorb.

The workers were told by the management that, if they took some of their accrued leave and then worked a four-day week, all their jobs would be saved and all employees would be retained. This would happen, provided some of the built-up stock was disposed of, leave was taken, and less was produced because of only four days a week being worked. Because the workers were united and had a common interest, they decided to work a four-day week.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** That sounds like a pretty honourable move.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** Yes, it was; it was a fair move. I may not agree with the move, because I do not believe that people should work short time; there should be full employment.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** You don't agree with a 35-hour week then?

**Mr. WHITTEN:** I can talk about the 35-hour week, too. The workers believed what they were told; they took their leave and agreed to work a four-day week in the hope that the economy would brighten, more cars would be produced and sold, and all jobs would be saved, so that these workers would then go back to a five-day week. However, that is not to be the case. The management did not honour the agreement and sacked several workers. The combined unions involved put out a screeed after about four weeks of picketing the company. The four unions involved were the Amalgamated Metal Workers and Shipwrights Union, the Storemen and Packers Union, the A.A.E.S.D.A. and the Miscellaneous Workers Union.

The screeed put out by the shop stewards, also endorsed by John O'Neill, one of the organisers of the A.M.W.S.U. states:

On behalf of all members of Schrader-Scovill we would like to thank all of our fellow workers for their magnificent support in our current struggle against a management that is belligerent and with total disregard for human dignity. We are not a bunch of militants with excessive wage demands. We only ask for a fair deal and for the management to stand by its word.

Surely that is not too much to ask. It continues:

Our workforce is 51 plus about 30 in the office staff. We have never had a strike of more than a few hours previous to this for nearly 20 years of operating in Elizabeth.

Only a few hours of stoppage in 20 years, so they are certainly not militant communists, as the Liberals like to say. It continues:

We know that the cause of this over-stock problem was bad management. Most people have known for the last six months at least, that the motor vehicle industry, to which we are affiliated, have had a downward trend, yet somehow our management have failed to notice this and still kept thundering on with double shifts until about two months ago. They were about four months late in their observations and, as a consequence, we have to pay for their mistakes in the dole queue.

To Save Jobs?—We took a week's leave and started a four-day week as they proposed in order to save jobs and they still came down on us and sacked nine people—mostly young folk—and we all know how hard it is for the young ones to get work. After taking a week's leave it means that these young people go with literally no money, and we feel that this is quite inhuman after wasting a week's holiday. So we are insisting on severance pay which we feel they are entitled to as it is not their fault in any way. Some of these people have two, three or more years service with the company and have given good and loyal service to the company. Is this the way to treat good workers who have helped to make millions of dollars for the company?

I would like to make it quite clear that this is not—I repeat not—a union-inspired strike. It started on the shop floor. The strike and the demands were all made before the unions even knew about the dispute. They are all backing us 100 per cent as they know we are getting a raw deal. The people who know all the facts have donated most generously, over \$1 000 so far, to keep us going, but we have been handicapped by the total disregard by the news media to give us any publicity because we are peacefully picketing. We thank you for your time and attention and hope that you will see fit to help us in our struggle for a fair deal.

There is a note from John O'Neill which states:

Workers at Schrader-Scovill have been conducting a 24-hour round the clock picket for six weeks now. The issue is "the right to work", after management sacked seven unionists. The same management had promised no sackings if a four-day week was introduced. The company did not keep their word, and are attempting to starve the pickets back to work.

There was also an appeal for people to support that situation. With regard to trust concerning management, I refer to the Engineering and Water Supply Department at Ottoway, where employees have been greatly concerned about the likelihood of retaining their jobs. They have produced the first issue of a publication, the *Ottoway Oracle*, put out by the Combined Union Council at Ottoway. Mention is made of positions of trust as follows:

Currently, there is a problem relating to trust. You'll remember it was said that people who transferred to private enterprise could return to their Government department, on completion of the project. We have just learnt officially that in the case of the Little Para job that is now not the case. Once a person transfers, his continuity of service is broken and he cannot get his old job back. Changing the rules in that situation does nothing but harm.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Give us eight minutes off the cuff.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** The Minister of Agriculture, a short time ago, baited me about the 35-hour week.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I am just trying to protect the honourable member.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** Thank you very much for your protection, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Are you going to—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister of Agriculture will cease interjecting.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** The Minister of Agriculture requested me to give him some details about the 35-hour week and my attitude to it. I do not hide my attitude to the 35-hour week: I have always supported a reduction in hours and will always do so. Let us look at countries where fewer than 40 hours a week are now worked. In Prime Minister Fraser's departments, more of those work fewer than 40 hours than do not. I wish the Minister would not run away; I thought he could take a little bit of truth. I have a notice entitled *The Hard Cold Facts about a 35-hour Week*, which states:

Globally, working hours are being reduced. The Federal Government keeps on telling us that, if working hours are reduced, we will no longer be able to trade with various nations around the world. So, we checked some facts. Over the past 10 years, there has been a major reduction in working hours all over the world, except for the majority of blue-collar workers in Australia.

That is a fact, because the blue-collar workers produce the wealth of this country and have to work the longest hours. Let us look at what has happened in the past 10 years in about 12 countries. In Austria, the working week has come down 4.8 hours; it has come down 3.9 hours in Belgium; in Denmark it has been reduced by 4.8 hours; in Finland, by .7 hours; in France, by 3.9 hours; in Germany by .8 hours; in Greece by 1.9 hours; in Iceland, by 2.3 hours; in Italy by .2 hours; and in Luxembourg by 4.2 hours.

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** How many hours a week do they work in Italy? It is no good talking about reductions. To what were the hours reduced?

**Mr. WHITTEN:** I am not supposed to answer interjections. In deference to the Chair, I will not answer the interjection. I do not have much time left, and I have much more to tell the house. In The Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom, hours have been reduced in the past 10 years. We have not had a reduction in hours in Australia in 35 years.

I was involved in a struggle to get a 40-hour week and the only way we finished up getting it was by taking it, refusing to work Saturday mornings and accepting lower wages; we struggled on until we got it. At that time, it was said that the country could not afford it, that the country would go broke. However, there have been increased production and increased profits. I know that profits are all that companies worry about—how much they can pay the shareholders.

**Mr. Randall:** Tell us how much annual leave they had.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** When I started work in industry, I had two weeks annual leave, and that was because I was fortunate.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is too much competition for the honourable member for Price.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. If they want some facts, I will give them some facts. Only because of the strength of unions were we able to increase our entitlement for leave. What used to happen under the Liberal Country Party Government was that we used to get sick leave. If you were off a full day, and could produce a doctor's certificate, you got half a day's pay, because you were entitled to 12 half days a year (we were working six days a week). When I look across the floor of the House, I doubt whether there are too many Government members who have done an honest day's work in their life, and I am talking about manual labour—the sweat of their brow.

**Mr. Mathwin:** Just because you've been a panelbeater.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** I was never a panelbeater.

**Mr. Mathwin:** You were a boilermaker.

**Mr. WHITTEN:** Yes, and I certainly worked hard. I am getting too many interruptions. I have so many things about which I would like to speak.

To conclude, I have talked about distrust of workers in private enterprise for their employers, and about distrust because of what has happened in Government departments. Even the Minister of Water Resources admits, as does his Director-General, that morale in the Engineering and Water Supply Department is extremely low. I have received a letter, signed by D. J. Alexander, Acting Director-General and Engineer-in-Chief. He says, in a letter addressed to all weekly paid personnel:

I know that in some areas of the department morale is not high, and this is largely due to the changed working situation and the feeling of uncertainty about the future.

Certainly, I am pleased that the present Minister is in the Chamber, because the writer of the letter blames the Minister of Industrial Affairs. Mr. Alexander went on to say—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

**Mr. MATHWIN** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### **SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### **PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)**

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

At 10.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 21 August at 2 p.m.