LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, August 2, 1977

The Council met at 2.15 p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY PRESIDENT

The CLERK: I have to inform the Council of the unavoidable absence of the President.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health) moved:

That the Hon. R. A. Geddes take the Chair as Deputy President.

The Hon R. C. DeGARIS seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT took the Chair and read prayers.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to move a motion without notice regarding leave of the President.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS moved:

That five weeks leave of absence be granted to the President (Hon. F. J. Potter) on account of ill health.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS moved:

That the Hon. R. A. Geddes fill the office and perform the duties of the President as Deputy President during the absence on leave of the President.

Motion carried.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I am sure that I express on behalf of all honourable members our sympathy to the President, who suffered a coronary attack last Saturday. I am informed that he is making satisfactory progress at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and it is our earnest wish that he will soon be restored to health. Furthermore, I wish to inform the Council that it is my intention to ask for leave of absence from my responsibilities as shadow Minister of Mines and Energy so that I may devote my full-time attention to this office.

PETITION: CHRISTIES BEACH HOSPITAL

The Hon. C. M. HILL presented a petition signed by 246 persons alleging that the population growth rate in the city of Noarlunga was the highest in the State and that a public hospital was therefore urgently needed in the Christies Beach area, and praying that the South Australian Government would build a hospital in that area.

Petition received and read.

QUESTIONS

RURAL PRODUCTION COSTS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister acting for the Minister of Agriculture a question relating to rural production costs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Recently, I directed to the Minister a question in which I referred to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics figures regarding unit costs of production in the rural sector in South Australia. I have checked those unit costs and, although I will not give them all to the Council, I will quote some. For example, in 1970-71 the South Australian unit cost was given an indexed figure of 121, compared to the average for the whole of Australia of 121. In other words, our unit cost in South Australia was the same as the average for the remainder of Australia. However, in 1974-75, 1975-76 and 1976-77 the position in South Australia had deteriorated dramatically. The unit cost in South Australia in 1975-76 had an index figure of 263, while the average for Australia was 252. In the September quarter of 1976, the average cost in South Australia was 288 and the average for Australia was 272. For the December quarter of that year the figure for South Australia was 294 and the average cost for Australia was 280. As South Australia now has the highest unit costs for primary production in Australia, costs that are well ahead of the Australian average, will the Minister of Agriculture take the matter to Cabinet and emphasise the need to watch carefully in the forthcoming State Budget any escalation in rural costs?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the question to my colleague and doubtless he will bring back a reply.

PRESS REPRESENTATIVES

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Premier.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: What is the subject matter?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Access by members of the Opposition to press representatives in the State Administration Centre.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Yesterday morning I contacted the Australian Broadcasting Commission Parliamentary roundsman about a letter that had been sent by the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly (David Tonkin) to Mr. Phillip Lynch, the Federal Treasurer, urging the removal of the wine tax that had been applied, with disastrous effects, by the Whitlam Labor Government. After a short discussion, the A.B.C. representative indicated that he had no means of getting a copy of the letter, as he could not leave his office in the State Administration Centre. Members know that that is where all Parliamentary roundsmen are stationed in the mornings when Parliament is in session and when it is not. He asked me whether I could deliver a copy to him, and I agreed. Accompanied by the Leader of the Opposition's newly-appointed Press Secretary (Mr. Dunleavy), I duly delivered a copy to him in his office on the eleventh floor of the State Administration Centre. When I arrived, the A.B.C. representative was on the telephone, so I conducted light conversation with the *Advertiser* representative, while waiting for the A.B.C. representative to complete his call. During that time, the Premier's Press Secretary (Mr. John Templeton) came into the office and what I regarded as lighthearted remarks passed between Mr. Templeton and me. Mr. Templeton then left. By this time, the A.B.C. representative was disengaged from the telephone and was engaged in private conversation with Mr. Hehir on this subject and other subjects, when a red-faced Mr. Templeton burst through the doorway and in a somewhat rude and arrogant way made clear to me that I was in the A.B.C. office without his permission and that I had better get permission to be there in future. In the past, when members of the Opposition have had documents to deliver to press representatives in the State Administration Centre,

they have delivered them in a similar manner. It has always been assumed that those areas occupied by the press are neutral territory as far as the Government and the Opposition are concerned. Are A.B.C., *News* and *Advertiser* offices in the State Administration Centre under the total control of the Premier and his staff? Further, does this control mean that the various press representatives in the State Administration Centre can invite members of the Opposition to deliver information to them only with the permission of the Premier's Press Secretary and that Opposition members can visit these neutral grounds only with the same permission? If such permission is not granted, how is the Opposition supposed to contact the press? As the Minister knows, we do not have access to telex facilities. Will the Minister assure the Opposition that, when the press is stationed in the State Administration Centre, this attempt to quarantine the Opposition from the press will not have his support, and that Opposition members will not be abused, as well as restricted, by officers of the Premier's Department in the execution of our duties as the representatives of the people and this State?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am not sure what the honourable member meant by saying that the Opposition did not have access to telex. It has access to public telephones and can send telegrams—and the Opposition uses that facility freely and at public expense. As I have pointed out previously, at the time of preselection of Liberal Party candidates, the telephone bills in that area increased considerably.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The matter of making facilities available to Opposition members was raised, and I was merely telling them what those facilities were, not that they have been unaware of them in the past. No doubt the account of the Hon. Mr. Cameron, a country member, is fairly high at public expense. Regarding the other matters raised, I will seek information for the honourable member.

STUDENTS ASSOCIATION

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I desire to ask the Minister representing the Attorney-General the following questions relating to the recent elections for certain positions in the Students Association at Adelaide University: first, were some ballot-papers for the elections obtained by false pretences by person or persons unknown? Secondly, were those ballot-papers subsequently used for the purpose of making bogus votes in the elections? Thirdly, were some of those bogus votes handed to a polling official by a candidate endorsed by the Liberal Club at the Adelaide University? Fourthly, were the bogus votes all for endorsed Liberal Club candidates? Fifthly, is it true that a member of the State Council of the Liberal Party is implicated in the affair? Sixthly, what action has the Vice-Chancellor of Adelaide University taken in relation to this matter? Seventhly, does the Attorney agree that students are entitled to know how, and by whom, attempts have been made to rig their elections? Finally, has the criminal law of South Australia been broken by the culprits in this episode? If so, what action does the Attorney intend to take to ensure that the laws of this State are upheld?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I have also heard some of the allegations that have been referred to by the honourable member. However, I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

ETHNIC BROADCASTERS INCORPORATED

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Community Welfare, on the subject of a grant to Ethnic Broadcasters Incorporated.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: On Thursday last, the Hon. Mr. Hill claimed that I deliberately informed the Council that the South Australian Government was responsible for making an $8 000 grant to Ethnic Broadcasters Incorporated, knowing that this information was untrue. The honourable gentleman later conceded that I might have made an honest mistake and should check the matter further, despite the fact that my information had come from the Minister of Community Welfare. Can the Minister say whether his colleague in another place has been able to throw any further light on the matter?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I have raised this matter with my colleague, who has provided the information requested. As usual, it has proved that the Hon. Mr. Hill should check his facts before accusing an honourable member of providing the Council with information knowing it to be untrue. The Minister informs me that on May 5 this year the Premier announced that the State Government would provide a $250 000 block grant to the Western Adelaide Regional Council for Social Development to enable the continued funding of a range of community-based projects which had previously received Federal funding under the Australian Assistance Plan. The Premier pointed out that Federal funding for the Australian Assistance Plan would cease on June 30, and that the $250 000 provided by the State would enable the council to recommend grants for 1977-78, even if on a reduced scale. On June 21, the Minister of Community Welfare announced that the Western Adelaide Regional Council had completed its recommendations for the allocation of the $250 000 during 1977-78. The recommendations were approved by the Community Welfare Grants Advisory Committee, and subsequently by the Minister, and the 17 organisations that were to receive funding were informed. Among those organisations were Ethnic Broadcasters Incorporated, which was informed that $8 000 would be provided to enable it to continue its activities. The reason that the announcement was made before the end of June was to give the organisations concerned some notice that they would have funds available for operating in the new financial year. The timing was not an indication that the funds came from the Commonwealth. By June 30, all the funds previously provided from Canberra had been spent, and if it had not been for the State Government's $250 000 all the projects started under the Australian Assistance Plan would have been penniless.

ROOFING CONTRACTOR

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a short statement before directing a question to the Chief Secretary about a matter that comes within the Attorney-General's portfolio.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I draw honourable members' attention to page 11 of the report of the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs for the year ended December 31, 1976. Honourable members will note from that page that complaints were received about building and renovating

work. I draw particular attention to a firm known as Fibre Glass Roofing Pty. Limited, which has been robbing people blind for almost two years to my knowledge and, with the intention of escaping its responsibilities, has failed to complete contracts that it has entered into and, in such circumstances, has neglected to repay its clients sums of money representing at least half of the price of such renovations, roofing, reconstruction, etc. What can be done on behalf of those people who have been robbed by this unscrupulous company? The report of the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs states:

Fibre Glass Roofing Proprietary Limited, which was mentioned in last year's report, has again featured in complaints recorded by the branch. In the year, 22 complaints were received against companies and individuals operating from the address at 335 Port Road, Hindmarsh. The other firms are Fibre Glass Exports Proprietary Limited, M. and F. Enterprises, and W. and G. Borghesan.

I have attempted to communicate with the company and to telephone the management on behalf of people, including pensioners and small business people, who have contacted me about their need to recover large sums of money. Is there any way in which people can regain the money they have paid to this company, and does the present legislation provide that this kind of company can be prevented from carrying out such unscrupulous business activities?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Attorney-General.

DAIRYING RESEARCH

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture a question about the dairying industry.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The Minister for Primary Industry on July 27 approved an allocation of $935 618 for dairy farming and manufacturing research in 1977-78. The funds from the Dairying Research Trust Account would support 52 separate research projects by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, State Agriculture Departments, universities, and individual researchers. Can the Minister of Agriculture detail the break-up of that allocation among the States and perhaps indicate to us which sections of our department are to receive money for research?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the question to my colleague and no doubt he will bring back a reply for the honourable member.

PEST PLANT CONTROL BOARDS

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture about pest plant control boards.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: It is reported in today's *Advertiser* that Mr. H. P. C. Trumble, the Pest Plants Commission Chairman, said that about 60 per cent of rural councils are represented on pest plant control boards. As I presume that all rural councils should be vitally interested in such boards, why are only 60 per cent represented at this stage? Is the reason that further pest plant control boards have still to be formed or have some rural councils been excluded from representation on such boards?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

RAPE

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: My questions are directed to the Chief Secretary, and they concern an article in the Saturday Review section of the *Advertiser* of July 30, headed "The cruel aftermath of a brutal rape", by Bernard Boucher, and a subsequent reference to that article in an editorial in that paper on August 1, which stated, amongst other things:

Harrowing stories such as that published by this paper on Saturday about the experience of a young rape victim are cited as examples rather than rarities.

My questions are as follows: (1) Was the law relating to the taking and giving of evidence from rape victims extensively amended last year specifically to overcome ordeals such as those outlined in the article? (2) Was the failure to mention this fact in the article a gross breach of journalistic ethics? (3) Has the Police Department organised a group of female officers specially trained in counselling and supporting rape victims? (4) Is the maximum penalty for rape life imprisonment?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I, too, read the report. It is true to say that last year the law was amended in this regard. It is unfortunate that the press sometimes does not report responsibly, and this is one such occasion. Although it has happened previously, efforts have been made to correct the position, but the press has not done that on this occassion, and therefore it is not acting responsibly towards the public. The services of female officers are available to rape victims, and there is now a counselling department within the Police Force where people who have been raped can receive counselling. The maximum penalty for rape is life imprisonment.

ABORTION

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister of Health about reporting abortions.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I asked a question about this on July 20 last. The Mallen committee said it had reason to believe that not all abortions were reported. I may say that the major part of the legislation relating to abortion was that such abortions should be reported. The Mallen committee recomended that hospitals should be obliged to report as medical practitioners are already obliged to. The Minister of Health gave me a reply saying that he did not intend to introduce legislation in this session of Parliament to provide for the reporting by hospitals of abortions. Since receiving that reply, I checked the Act and found that the matter has been left to regulation. It does not require any change in the Act: the matter of how and by whom abortions should be reported is left to regulation. As this was initially a fundamental principle of the provision relating to abortions (that they be reported), as there is the facility to change by regulation the method of reporting, and as it is not intended to introduce legislation in this busy session, I ask the Minister of Health to consider introducing new regulations to require that hospitals report abortions.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: True, it was stated in the Mallen report that some abortion cases were not being reported by doctors, which is, of course, a breach of the Act by the doctors concerned. However, the report did not indicate which doctors were or were believed to be falling down on their jobs. Other than the inference drawn by the committee, we have no evidence that abortions are not being reported.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: They made the inquiry and were in the best position to know.

The Hon. Anne Levy: They didn't make inquiries; they collected statistics.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: If the committee conducted an inquiry, it would have been able to report which doctors were not obeying the law, but it did not do that.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: It made a recommendation.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: That is so.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Well, why don't you carry out its recommendation?

Members interjecting:

WESTERN REGIONAL COUNCIL

The Hon. C. M. HILL: My question, which I direct to the Minister of Health, is supplementary to the one asked by the Hon. Mr. Sumner. Regarding the $250 000 which the Minister said had been appropriated to the Western Regional Council in the 1976-77 financial year—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: It was in 1977-78.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It was granted in 1976-77. That is how I heard the reply. Unfortunately, I do not have a copy of the reply with which the honourable member was supplied.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Perhaps you should have listened, because the A.A.P. scheme was funded by the Federal Government until June this year. Their problem was the funding for the next financial year. It was not picked up by the Federal Government because the scheme had been disbanded. The State Government picked up the funding for the next financial year.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It was stated that $250 000 had been appropriated by the State Government to the Western Regional Council.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: For the financial year 1977-78.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I tried to obtain from the Minister a copy of the reply that he gave to the honourable member a few minutes ago. However, contrary to the usual custom, the Minister had only the original and did not have a copy of the reply for me.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It wasn't even your question. What right did you have to see it? You will see it in *Hansard* tomorrow.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a point of order. It seems to me the Hon. Mr. Hill, who has just resumed his seat, should ask a *bona fide* question and not waste the Council's time on matters on which he has no credible information.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: That's not a point of order.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It is, in view of the ruling that was given last week.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Will the Minister say under which line in the Estimates this money was or is to be appropriated?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I take exception to the Hon. Mr. Hill's statement that he should have had a copy of the reply given to the Hon. Mr. Sumner. Obviously the Hon. Mr. Hill was not interested in the truth last week when he made this accusation. Otherwise, he would have made inquiries before he made his accusation. I was not even to know that he was interested in the matter. As I said previously, the honourable member will be able to see what the answer was, because I will have a photostat copy made of it, *Hansard* having taken the original copy. The Hon. Mr. Hill knows that because, when he asked me for a copy, I told him that he could have one but that *Hansard* would want it first. Then, the honourable member gets on his feet and tries to imply that he is being denied the right to receive a copy of the reply.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Didn't you tell me to read it in *Hansard*?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes I did.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What was the first answer you gave?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: When asked whether the honourable member could have a copy of the answer, I said, "Yes, it will be in *Hansard* tomorrow."

The Hon. C. M. Hill: That's right.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I also said, as soon as *Hansard* had taken a copy of it today, that I would obtain a copy and give it to the honourable member. However, the honourable member gets up and makes an accusation similar to the one that he made last week.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What was that?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It is a complete untruth. I will ascertain for the honourable member on which line of the Estimates the allocation is made.

PREMIER'S PRESS SECRETARY

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I direct my question, which concerns the Premier's Press Secretary, Mr. John Templeton, to the Minister of Health. I have just been called from the Chamber by several people who were angry at the intemperate attack made under privilege by the Hon. Mr. Cameron on the person of Mr. John Templeton, who was presented as something of a bad-tempered ogre. Is it not a fact that, in the Chief Secretary's and everyone else's experience, Mr. John Templeton is by nature a pleasant and affable person?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Not only that but he is also most co-operative. I am wondering what the Hon. Mr. Cameron's statement is all about. What the honourable member said regarding Mr. Templeton's attitude is completely incorrect. Indeed, I do not think that much of what the honourable member said was true.

DEAFNESS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Health a question regarding deafness.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I noticed, as I am sure all other honourable members did, a press report on the weekend regarding the incidence of deafness among children in South Australia. It was stated that the incidence of deafness was much higher in South Australia than it was in other States; in fact, we are well above the national average. I think it most unlikely that there would be genetic differences regarding deafness between the children

in South Australia and those in other States, and I wondered whether the Minister had any comment to make on the possible environmental causes that might account for these differences. I realise, of course, that the figures quoted related to a survey that was conducted about 20 years ago, and it may be that the detection and reporting of deafness at that time was much better here than it was in other States, so that a higher incidence of deafness was reported, although not necessarily involving a higher incidence of occurrences. Will the Minister give the Council any information on the relative incidence of deafness in children in the different States, and will he comment on the weekend press report?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I did not see the report in Saturday's newspaper, and I thank the honourable member for drawing it to my attention.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I thought you might have heard about it.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I certainly will seek the report, refer it to my officers, and get from them a report on the position in South Australia.

S.G.I.C.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to the question I asked recently regarding superannuation for employees of the State Government Insurance Commission?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: My colleague states that superannuation benefits for employees of the State Government Insurance Commission are provided by the South Australian Superannuation Fund under the same terms and conditions as apply to members of the Public Service.

SECONDHAND DEALERS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to directing a question to the Minister representing the Minister of Local Government.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: My question also may be considered by the Chief Secretary, as the Minister in charge of the police, but perhaps it would be more relevant for consideration by the Minister of Local Government. It has been brought to my notice that secondhand dealers' licences are being granted in this State permitting and requiring licensees to carry on the business of secondhand dealers at specified locations, in accordance with the information in the relevant applications. However, some such locations are in areas zoned for residential use or for uses other than the purpose of a secondhand dealer's activity. I have been told by a local government officer of one case in which a secondhand dealer with a new licence spent much money establishing his site, which I believe was part of the front garden of his house, but then found that local government zoning prohibited its use for the proposed purpose. In order that such problems can be avoided, I ask whether local government approval could be attached to the licence application or sighted by the authority issuing such licences, or whether some other means could be found to avoid similar problems arising in future.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

RAPE OFFENCES

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to directing a question to the Chief Secretary, representing the Attorney-General, concerning a report in the *Sunday Mail* last Sunday on the question of rape.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: In this report, Dr. John Court, of the Festival of Light, presented a graph comparing reported cases of rapes in South Australia and Queensland. This showed a comparative increase in South Australia *vis-a-vis* Queensland. Is the Minister aware of the widespread publicity given to attempts by police and conservative politicians in Queensland to suppress reports of pack rape in North Queensland, particularly at Ingham, where so-called Ingham train rapes have taken place? Is the Minister aware that Mrs. Kyburz, a member of the Queensland Liberal Party, was so disturbed by the reports that she personally visited Ingham and conducted her own investigations? As a result of her visit and as a result of a letter of complaint by Mrs. Kyburz to the Queensland Premier (Mr. Bjelke-Petersen), did she receive a letter in reply detailing the sexual history of an alleged victim? In view of the different attitudes of the two Police Forces in the two States, is there any validity in comparing statistics? Despite an apparent early reluctance to do so, is the Queensland Government introducing legislation to amend the law relating to giving evidence so as to overcome ordeals of rape victims? Finally, has the Victorian Attorney-General recently indicated that he will introduce legislation, using the South Australian reforms as a model?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am aware that other States are interested in the South Australian reforms. I heard Mrs. Kyburz on radio one morning, and she was not pleased about the position in Queensland regarding rape. We cannot really compare the figures of the two States. In South Australia, we are encouraging people to report cases of rape, and I believe that in Queensland until now they have been discouraging the reporting of rape. I do not know just what has happened in the other two States, but I will try to find out.

S.G.I.C.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I ask the Chief Secretary whether he has a reply to my recent question about whether the State Government Insurance Commission had any plans to establish a building society in South Australia.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The S.G.I.C. has no plans to establish its own building society in South Australia.

RECREATION PROJECTS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I ask leave to make a short statement before directing a question to the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In this morning's newspaper there was an announcement of a large sporting project, which the Minister yesterday took some part in commencing, at Christies Beach, in the south-western area. It was stated that the total capital expenditure on this, the St. Vincent Recreational Centre, was to be $870 000. I may add that I was pleased to see that the people down

there would be served by the complex described. The report in the newspaper stated that, of the total capital involved, $580 000 was to be provided by the Minister's department. I ask the Minister two questions. First, has this $580 000 been obtained by the Minister's department from the Federal Government as Loan funds and, secondly, has the Minister any plans for a comparable sporting centre in the north-east or the Tea Tree Gully region of the metropolitan area?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The reply to the first part of the question is "No". The Commonwealth has completely bowed out of giving grant money to sport complexes throughout Australia. Under the previous Labor Government, of course, we got one-third of the total cost; the State provided one-third; and local government and the people of the area provided the other one-third. The present Federal Government has stopped giving all this money to the States and the result is that more money must be found by either local government or the State Government. The answer to the second part of the question is "Yes". A complex will soon be opened at Salisbury, and another one at Ingle Farm will be getting under way shortly. I hope that these complexes will fit into the areas that are sadly lacking this type of recreation and sporting complex.

MOTOR VEHICLES BUILDING

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE (on notice):

1. What was the total cost of the new Motor Vehicles Department building in Wakefield Street?

2. What will be the annual cost of maintaining indoor plants in the building and how many firms tendered for the supply of these plants and who was awarded the contract?

3. What is the purpose of the rope around the columns in the building and what was the total cost, including installation?

4. Why was it considered necessary to install a suspended stair-case from the ground floor to the first floor and was the difference in cost between this and one of conventional construction ascertained and, if so, what was that difference?

5. What was the cost of the copper used as a floor-skirting on the cubicle divisions, and on the external columns, including installation, and why was it considered necessary to use this material?

6. When were the carpets laid in this building?

7. Has it been necessary to clean these carpets since installation and, if so, how many times?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The replies are as follows:

1. It is $5 819 000.

2. It is $12 300; none; the Woods and Forests Department.

3. The black rope binding to the concrete columns in the public waiting spaces of the building was designed to protect members of the general public, and especially children, from skin grazing, or damage to clothing while in the area. In addition, the rope prevents soiling to the concrete which would be difficult to clean. The cost is about $3 000.

4. The design of the staircase was dependent on its location within the total building environment and the structural system of the building. The load of the stair had to be transferred either by tension supports above the landing or by compression supports under the landing to either the second floor slab or the ground floor slab, both of which are themselves suspended from the columns. The structural solution in either case was very similar. No cost comparison between the two methods was made, although the tension solution is considered slightly more economical.

5. The cost of copper floor skirting on cubicle divisions was $2 850. The cost of the chemically treated brass protection angles on external columns was $3 270. The choices of material, as with all other components and the individual design elements in the building, were an integral part of the total architectural design solution. They were a professional choice from a wide range of available alternatives.

6. The carpets were laid on successive floors between November, 1976, and February, 1977.

7. Yes. Normal cleaning service since July 17, 1977.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: ALLEGED STATEMENT

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I understand that, in my absence, certain statements were made indicating that I had attempted to defame the Premier's Press Secretary in a statement I made in support of a question, and it was indicated that perhaps the statement I made was not correct. I make quite clear that in no way did I intend to defame the Premier's Press Secretary. I stated the facts exactly as they had occurred. In no way did I provoke the said gentleman. I made no statement to him that could have provoked his actions in any way. If any verification of this is required, I am sure that the other people who were present would back me up in that statement. The man had no provocation whatsoever for the actions he took.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 28. Page 244.)

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: In rising to support this motion I join His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor and other honourable members of this Council in expressing regret at the death of the former members of another place. Mr. Stott, Mr. Clarke and Mr. Shannon I did not know, but I endorse the comments of the Lieutenant-Governor in placing on record his appreciation of their services to the State. Sir Glen Pearson I had known for many years, and I had the privilege of following him as the member for Flinders, the district he represented for 19 years. In my maiden speech in another place I referred to the fact that I was sure that all honourable members, whether politically opposed to Sir Glen Pearson or not, liked and respected him, and I am sure that all regret his passing and appreciate his services to the State and to Australia.

The Lieutenant-Governor's opening Speech was a perfect example of a Speech for the opening of a session which is leading up to an election. The Speech deals at some length with what the Government has done and with things for which it claims credit, but it contains little of what it intends to do this session. In fact, on the day after the opening of Parliament the *Advertiser*, in its editorial, described the legislative programme as "fundamentally an end-of-term tidying up exercise". Certainly, at first sight the

Lieutenant-Governor's Speech contains little of a controversial nature. There is nothing that will rock the boat too much, because that is the last thing the Government wants to do at this stage.

To show just how far the Government is willing to go to avoid controversy at this stage, I should like to compare this Speech with the Speech given by Sir Mark Oliphant when opening Parliament on June 8, 1976. Paragraph 6 of that Speech states:

A Bill to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act will be placed before you. It will give effect to the undertaking contained in the policy speech of my Government, before it was returned at the last election, that civil action for damages should not be taken in industrial disputes, but that disputes of this nature should be resolved in the tribunals specifically provided for the purpose. The Bill will also propose the removal of the present limitation on the power of the Industrial Commission to provide in its awards for absolute preference to members of trade unions.

That Bill, which was promised at the opening of last session, was never brought before us, and there is no mention in this Speech of a similar Bill to be introduced this session. The Government has backed off on these two issues, because it knows well that there would be strong public opposition to either of those measures.

The first, that civil action for damages should not be taken in industrial disputes, would have placed one section of the community—trade union officials—out of reach of the civil law with which the rest of us must conform. No thinking South Australian would countenance such unfairness. The second measure, which the Government euphemistically calls "preference to unionists" but which is compulsory unionism, as every honourable member knows, is another matter which the people of South Australia have shown that they do not want.

The results of polls taken on this matter have been remarkably consistent, the most recent poll I have seen indicating that 68 per cent of people believe that membership of trade unions should be voluntary. Obviously, when preparing the policy speech in 1975 and the Governor's Speech last year, the Government misread the wishes of the people because, after making these firm promises on at least two occasions (and probably on other occasions), it then realised that the people of this State valued their freedom and would not accept such compulsion. Therefore, we have yet another addition to the long and growing list of broken promises, although I am not complaining that these matters were not brought forward, because the two measures to which I have referred would have interfered with two fundamental rights of citizens—the right to sue any person who one thinks has caused one injury, and the right to please oneself about whether or not one chooses to join an association or trade union.

Last week in this debate the Hon. Mr. Sumner quoted from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in relation to his speech on ethnic affairs. I cannot remember the exact quotation, but it was along the lines that there should be no discrimination on account of race, creed or country of origin. I am sure that the honourable member also knows the remainder of that declaration, in particular, Article 20, paragraph 2, which states succinctly that no person should be compelled to join an association.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You have not completed that. This is a typical dishonest Liberal pronouncement. Go ahead and quote the rest of it.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: That is the rest of it. I am not complaining that the Government made no move to enact these two measures and that apparently it is not going to enact them. Nevertheless, the Premier firmly undertook in his 1975 policy speech that he would enact them, and the Government deserves to be condemned on that account. Paragraph 21 of the Governor's Speech at the opening of Parliament last year promised another Bill which we did not see and which is conspicuous by its absence this year. That paragraph states:

A Bill to amend the Public Service Act to provide for the grant of maternity and paternity leave and for other matters will be laid before you in the forthcoming session.

On June 9 last year I asked how much such a scheme would cost in terms of time and money, because I assumed that the Government would not be so irresponsible as to introduce such legislation if it did not have an estimate of its cost. I received a reply from the Chief Secretary on July 27, 1976, and I stress that the time interval between my question and the reply does not indicate any criticism of the Government because, after one sitting week last year, Parliament adjourned for a period. July 27 was the first occasion the Chief Secretary had to give a reply, which was as follows:

Because of so many unknown factors, it is virtually impossible to make an accurate estimate of the annual cost to the Government of the maternity-paternity leave scheme. However, some two years ago the Public Service Board estimated the annual cost at about $800 000.

Here was an apparent case of the Government's planning legislation without having any real idea of what it would cost. Was this indeed a fact? In his reply, the Chief Secretary said that, two years before, the Public Service Board had estimated that the scheme would cost $800 000 annually. If the Public Service Board had been able to estimate the cost in 1974, why could it not do so in 1976? And why was it that the only reply the Government could give was that, because of so many unknown factors, it was virtually impossible to make an accurate estimate? I do not accept this, because, two years before, the Public Service Board had been able to provide an estimate. I believe that, as a result of my question, the Government did some sums and found that, because of large wage increases in the two years following the Public Service Board's previous estimate and because of the growth in the Public Service, the cost had escalated to the point where the State Government could not afford to implement the scheme. The matter was dropped, and it appears that it will remain dropped, because there is no mention of it in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech this year, unless it is included in the long list of measures in paragraph 21. Yet another broken promise of the Dunstan Government!

This State Labor Government is running out of steam. It is no longer an innovator: it has become a follower. We have seen many examples of this tendency in recent months; one such example is shopping hours, which I will not canvass at length, as it is the subject of a Royal Commission. In any case, most of us have had plenty to say about it. The Royal Commission was set up because the Minister of Labour and Industry was afraid to make a decision. I am proud that it was my action last year which brought this matter to a head. Predictably, my Bill was lost, and some members of my own Party in another place voted against it. However, those members very soon saw reason, and it was soon adopted as Liberal Party policy.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: The whip cracked.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: No. It was adopted as Liberal Party policy following reasonable discussion. What did the Minister do then? He had earlier publicly stated that extended trading hours were a good thing. He should have had the courage of his own convictions and introduced

a Bill providing for extended trading hours but, because he did not want to take that responsibility, he tried to pass the buck and put the matter in the hands of the Industrial Commission. This Council, believing that the matter belonged in the hands of Parliament, not in the hands of the Industrial Commission, rightly did not pass the Bill.

This action of the Council again put the Minister in a quandary. He had thought that he would get off the hook, but he was still faced with the fact that he might have to decide and take some responsibility. He then set up the Royal Commission and announced that he would legislate according to the commission's findings. Again, he was passing the buck and getting someone else to make a decision that should have been his decision. Undoubtedly the Minister hopes and believes that the Royal Commission will recommend an extension of trading hours. He will then be able to say to unionists who criticise him, "I had no choice. I had to follow the Royal Commission's recommendations." To those who want extended trading hours (and, according to an opinion poll, more than 80 per cent of the community wants extended hours) he can say, "My Government gave you extended trading hours."

The Minister is certainly having two bob each way. That is what I mean when I say this Government no longer leads; it has become content to follow and, therefore, it should no longer govern. Another example in this connection can be found in the Hon. Mr. Sumner's speech on ethnic affairs. I agree with most of what the honourable member said. I agree with the idea of setting up an ethnic affairs branch and translator services. I should agree, because this idea is a straight copy of Liberal Party policy, which had been announced some weeks before and which the Premier criticised.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: There is a slight difference between the branch and our proposed commission.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Yes, but generally, it was the same; it was just a small question of detail. We have now had a Labor Government in this State for seven consecutive years, and South Australia can no longer afford a Government like this. I accept that many measures brought forward have been desirable (it would be foolish to say otherwise); but many other measures brought forward are far from desirable.

Honourable members opposite are fond of saying that South Australia is the best governed State in the Commonwealth; I believe that the adjective "best" should be changed to "most". Actually, South Australia is the most governed State in the Commonwealth. We are slowly but surely being stifled by controls. Becoming the most governed State has meant that we have gone from being a low-cost State to being a high cost State. No amount of false advertising by the so-called Committee for Good Government will alter that fact. The first advertisements from the committee were broadcast on radio a couple of weeks ago. They were issued by Mr. Leo Burnell, 162 Halifax Street, Adelaide, and authorised by Mr. K. Neighbour. This committee claimed to be a non-political organisation, yet the advertisements heavily criticised the Fraser Government but made glowing references to the Dunstan regime. Among other things, the advertisements referred to the lower costs in South Australia, as compared to those in all other mainland States.

Last week and again today the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, through questions, referred to the unit costs affecting the rural community in South Australia, citing the Bureau of Agricultural Economics figures. The unit cost figures paid by the farming community were the highest in Australia, including Tasmania. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris referred to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics figures issued on March 29, 1977. As these figures are rather long, I seek leave to have them incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS FIGURES OF UNIT COSTS

	September, 1976	December, 1976
Australia	272	280
New South Wales	262	272
Victoria	270	279
Queensland	280	286
South Australia	288	294
Western Australia	275	284
Tasmania	285	293

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I will refer to them briefly. They show that South Australia has the highest unit cost as far as rural expenses are concerned, being about 8 per cent to 10 per cent higher than in Victoria or New South Wales and, as I mentioned, even higher than in Tasmania. I wonder whether the Premier, in the cause of truthful advertising, could slip these figures into his telex machine, or even get the Police Department to deliver them to Mr. Neighbour or Mr. Burnell, because the Committee for Good Government must be critical of the fact that because of Government policies followed in the past seven years in South Australia, we have gone from being the lowest cost State to the highest, as far as farming is concerned; and we are even higher than Tasmania, which has a vicious freight cost to contend with. Its freight costs are about 25 per cent higher than South Australia's, and yet we still manage to be the highest cost State as far as the rural community is concerned.

Other figures are much the same right through South Australia: in seven years we have gone from being a low cost State to being the highest in Australia. This committee, with its false advertising, is being as dishonest as the Government, and I have no dougt that the information used by Mr. Neighbour comes direct from the Premier's Department. We have seen in the last week or so how the Government has no compunction about using Government instrumentalities, paid for out of public funds, for Party political purposes, and that is a matter for which the Government should stand condemned. I support the motion.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I support the motion and in doing so endorse the remarks made by previous speakers regarding Sir Douglas and Lady Nicholls. I, too, regret their untimely retirement from South Australia and wish them well for the future.

I was interested that the speech by the Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. Crocker, included reference to a statistical survey being undertaken on women in the South Australian work force. I am sure that this will reveal much of interest, both in providing more comprehensive and current information than is presently available and in revealing situations perhaps unexpected and unforeseen which will require public attention and action. We know that, as of March this year, women made up 35 per cent of the work force in Australia, and in South Australia they then constituted 37 per cent of our work force. This proportion has been rising rapidly over the past 15 years but still does not equal that found in other comparable industrialised nations, in many of which, such as the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and France, women constitute 40 per cent of the work force.

One statistic which cannot be revealed by a survey of women working, of course, is the extent of unemployment amongst women. Official figures from the Commonwealth

Employment Service indicate greater unemployment rates among women than among men, both for adults and for juniors. Indeed, to be young and female is virtually a recipe for disaster in the employment market today, and the damage to morale and self-respect which result from unemployment will be particularly severe in this section of the community. I doubt very much whether the schemes for improving employment prospects via apprenticeship subsidies and training programmes which have been aired recently in the press will do much towards relieving unemployment for this group in the community. Such ideas, inadequate as they are, as they create no jobs, are anyway geared more to the males in the work force and reflect the conservative notion that the right to a job and the self-respect and independence that go with it is a right primarily for men, and that such rights for women are secondary and of much lower priority.

It is certainly true that for many people, employers and politicians among them, women constitute the Marxist "Industrial Reserve Army", to be called on when needed by the economy as a labour force, or discarded and left as a pool of unemployed when not required: this female industrial reserve army can be used to attempt to depress wages and working conditions for other workers, with never a thought for the feelings and needs of the people concerned. I cannot reiterate too strongly that to me a woman has just the same right to a job as a man has, the same rights to training and assistance, and the same right to unemployment benefits when out of a job. I was most interested to note that one of the recommendations of the Myer inquiry into unemployment benefits was that all people should be eligible for unemployment benefits when they lose their jobs, regardless of sex or marital status. The recommendations of this committee of inquiry have been rejected by the Federal Government, as we all know, despite the committee having been set up and hand-picked by the coalition Cabinet, which obviously expected suggestions that would make life even harder (or, should I say, less easy!) for the unemployed.

For the sake of the ever-rising numbers of unemployed, I hope all members of the Opposition would join me in urging the Federal Government to implement the recommendations of its own expert committee, including the availability of unemployment benefits to those with a working spouse, to relieve the misery, poverty, and criminal humiliation engendered by unemployment resulting from its own economic mismanagement. One point, which is not often commented on publicly but which is readily acknowledged by those concerned with unemployment statistics, is that the figures quoted for female unemployment are likely to be an under-estimate of the true situation.

Single women and those who are the only breadwinners for their families will certainly register for work, as otherwise they are not eligible for unemployment benefits; but married women know that they cannot qualify for benefits if their husbands are employed, and the record of the Commonwealth Employment Service in finding jobs for them is not very good—and cannot be, when job vacancies are only a tiny fraction of the jobs required. Hence, many married women do not bother to put their names down even though they desperately wish for employment, preferring to try employment agencies and the classified advertisements section of the newspapers. The official statistics certainly show greater unemployment rates for women than for men, even though leader writers and commentators rarely comment on this injustice; but only if the recommendations of the Myer inquiry are implemented in this regard will all unemployed women genuinely desiring work be encouraged to register as unemployed, and so the full extent of female unemployment be discovered.

One result from the current survey of working women which I can predict with confidence will be confirmation of the fact that maternity leave schemes are virtually non-existent in South Australia—indeed, in Australia as a whole. It is perhaps not generally known that in this country we are sadly lagging behind most of the industrialised countries of the world in the provision of maternity leave, paid or otherwise, and I feel a brief summary of the legal situation in other countries will emphasise this point. First, I should like to read a few sections from the International Labour Organisation Convention on Maternity Protection, which sets out the internationally agreed upon principles relating to maternity leave. I should add this convention was drawn up in 1952 (that is, 25 years ago) and came into force when ratified by a sufficient number of countries in 1955 (22 years ago). I quote from articles 3, 4, 5 and 6:

A woman to whom this convention applies shall, on the production of a medical certificate stating the presumed date of her confinement, be entitled to a period of maternity leave. The period of maternity leave shall be at least 12 weeks and shall include a period of compulsory leave after confinement. The period of compulsory leave after confinement shall be prescribed by national laws or regulations, but shall in no case be less than six weeks. While absent from work on maternity leave, the woman shall be entitled to receive cash and medical benefits. The rates of cash benefit shall be fixed by national laws or regulations. The cash and medical benefits shall be provided either by means of compulsory social insurance or by means of public funds; in either case they shall be provided as a matter of right to all women. Where cash benefits provided under compulsory social insurance are based on previous earnings, they shall be at a rate of not less than two-thirds of the woman's previous earnings. Any contribution due under a compulsory social insurance scheme providing maternity benefits and any tax based upon pay-rolls that is raised for the purpose of providing such benefits shall, whether paid both by the employer and the employees or by the employer, be paid in respect of the total number of men and women employed by the undertakings concerned, without distinction of sex.

In no case shall the employer be individually liable for the cost of such benefits due to women employed by him. If a woman is nursing her child, she shall be entitled to interrupt her work for this purpose. Interruptions of work for the purpose of nursing are to be counted as working hours and remunerated accordingly. While a woman is absent from work on maternity leave in accordance with this convention, it shall not be lawful for her employer to give her notice of dismissal during such absence.

From this, we can see there are four important aspects to maternity leave provisions, and I suggest that each can be considered separately without necessarily involving the other three. The main provision, relevant to any pregnant woman in the work force, is that of job security. A working woman who has a child should have the right to return to her employment, if she so desires, up to a certain time after confinement. If we truly believe that a mother has the right to make a choice whether to continue in employment or to stay home with her child, then the job security embodied in the right to return to her job is an essential element in that free choice. Hence, the provisions in the International Labour Organisation convention for prohibition of dismissal while absent on maternity leave. Many countries have given this the force of law, and also prohibit pregnancy *per se* as a ground for dismissal.

Secondly, the provisions relating to payment when absent from employment due to childbirth need to be considered. Most countries regard childbirth as a category of sickness, preventing employment in much the same way as any

other illness, though the analogy is not an exact one and cannot be pushed too far. Only in some communist countries is paid maternity leave available for the full time away from work, most Western countries providing for a few weeks leave with pay, with a further period of unpaid leave available without threat to the job security inherent in the right to return to one's employment. One justification for at least a portion of the maternity leave being a paid leave is, of course, that the woman is often prevented by law from working shortly before and shortly after her confinement.

Laws relating to compulsory absence from employment derive from concern about the health both of the woman and of her child, but it is surely reasonable to suggest that, if a woman has no choice whether she works for a few weeks or not, she should receive some sort of compensatory payment for this compulsory absence. The unpaid part of maternity leave has a different origin and rationale, and acknowledges that many women wish to devote themselves on a virtually full-time basis to caring for a young baby. By keeping the job open for an extended period, the woman can then make a genuine choice whether to resume employment or stay at home once the baby has passed through the vital first few months. The length of time available for unpaid maternity leave varies in different countries, probably reflecting different compromises between the humanitarian concept of a woman being able to care for her child without loss of job security, and the requirements of employers for employees not to be absent for too long a period. Countries differ, too, in the conditions imposed on the paid part of maternity leave. In many, a certain length of time in a job before pregnancy is mandatory before paid leave is a right, and other legislation around the world provides that any payment is not made until the woman has resumed employment for a stated period, exception sometimes being made for cases of exceptional hardship.

A third aspect of the I.L.O. maternity protection convention is that relating to time being available for a nursing mother to breastfeed her child during working hours without loss of pay. Although for many years early weaning has been common in our society, there is now a growing trend for later weaning and, of course, in many communities later weaning ages have been the accepted norm for a long time. However, it must be realised that the right to time for nursing a child during working hours is fairly meaningless unless creche facilities are provided at the place of employment. Many Western countries, unlike the communist ones, do not make legislative provision for paid nursing hours when employment resumes. I presume the unpaid maternity leave provisions would permit a later weaning to occur before employment resumes, though a mother without another breadwinner will still have to make a difficult and perhaps unfair choice as to whether to breastfeed her baby beyond a few weeks on a minimal income, or to wean early and return to a more adequate income. Certainly, there are no I.L.O. conventions on provision of creche facilities at the work place, and Australia is not exceptional in the Western world in the virtual complete absence of such facilities, either as a legal right or as part of an agreement between individual employers and employees represented by their union.

The fourth aspect of the I.L.O. convention on maternity protection involves the methods of payment for any paid part of maternity leave. I concur completely with the I.L.O. convention that any charge should not be borne by the individual employer. This would be manifestly unfair to small employers, and also would militate against the employment of women. In fact maternity leave payments in the Western world are usually paid for by social insurance schemes, similar in many respects to our workmen's compensation insurance, with all employers contributing according to the number of employees, both male and female, that they have.

In some countries there is also a contribution from employees, both male and female, and also there is often a contribution from general revenue. However, the latter is more usual where payment for maternity leave is handled by the same social insurance agency as that involved with unemployment benefits, sickness benefits, pensions, health insurance, and so on. France is an example of this latter type of scheme, where the agency known as *Securité Sociale* handles much that in this country is funded from general revenue alone. In the United Kingdom, on the other hand, there is a special maternity pay fund, contributed to by all employers on the basis of total number of employees, male and female. It may indeed surprise honourable members opposite to know that the United Kingdom has a system of paid maternity leave for all women in the work force, in the private as well as the public sectors, as indeed applies to all maternity leave schemes throughout the industrialised nations.

I should like to summarise briefly the provisions of some of the current maternity leave schemes in countries with a standard of living comparable to that in Australia. In the United Kingdom since 1975 every woman in the work force is entitled to six weeks paid maternity leave, receiving 90 per cent of the wage she would receive if working, and to a total of 23 extra weeks unpaid leave after confinement, provided she has been with the one employer for two years before taking the leave. She may not, by law, be dismissed on grounds of pregnancy or childbirth, and the employer must re-employ her up to the twenty-ninth week after confinement, or be sued for unfair dismissal. An industrial tribunal can order that she be reinstated or, if this is not practicable, she may receive cash awards in compensation or be entitled to redundancy payments.

In West Germany, since 1972 all working women have been entitled to 14 weeks paid maternity leave on full pay, being for six weeks before confinement and eight weeks after. The payment is made from the sickness insurance funds to which employers and employees contribute. Job security is ensured by it being illegal to dismiss an employee while she is pregnant, or up to four months after confinement. A number of large private firms do extend the unpaid maternity leave beyond the statutory four months after confinement, as do some agencies in the public sector, but this is not general throughout the economy. All nursing mothers are legally entitled to one hour a day for breastfeeding without loss of pay, but few firms provide creche facilities that would enable women to take advantage of this right.

In Italy, since 1971, a pregnant woman has had to take maternity leave from two months before confinement to at least three months after confinement. During these five months she receives 80 per cent of her normal pay paid by the Sickness Insurance Agency, I.N.A.M., largely financed by employer contributions. If a further period of optional leave is offered, she receives 30 per cent of normal pay during this time, but few Italian firms offer this extra leave. On the other hand, all employers must either provide creche facilities or contribute to those provided by local government authorities. No woman can be dismissed while pregnant, while absent on maternity leave,

or if she returns to work up to the child's first birthday, thus ensuring job security.

In Denmark, since 1973, all women working full time for at least six months before confinement have been entitled to 14 weeks paid maternity leave, receiving 90 per cent of their normal pay up to a ceiling of about average earnings. The payment is provided by the social security system. In addition, non-manual workers are entitled to maternity pay for a total of five months and the right not to be dismissed during pregnancy or while absent on maternity leave. Many private firms, and the Civil Service, provide better schemes than the statutory minimum requirements, these including unpaid leave up to 12 months or paid leave for more than 14 weeks.

In the Netherlands, since 1976, women have been entitled to 12 weeks maternity leave on full pay, payment being from the National Health Insurance System. Dismissal on grounds of marriage, pregnancy or confinement is null and void. The article in the *European Industrial Relations Revue,* from which this information was obtained, complained bitterly that few private firms offered more than this legal minimum, though one large firm offered part-time work as an option to full-time work for those mothers who chose to return to work after their maternity leave.

In France, paid maternity leave has recently been extended from 14 to 16 weeks for all women in the work force, at 90 per cent of normal wages. Furthermore, the provision set up in 1975 for job security enabling women to have unpaid leave of up to one year, with the right to their job back, has only three months ago been extended to a right of two years unpaid leave with the right to be re-engaged at the end of this time. This is the most extensive right to unpaid leave in the Western world, and it will be interesting to see whether it affects the proportion of the French work force which is female. I could suggest reasons why it might decrease female participation in the work force, and also reasons why it might result in an increase.

In Belgium there is provision for 14 weeks paid leave, at 60 per cent of normal wages, and in Finland there is 10 weeks paid leave at 50 per cent of normal wages. In Japan, women receive 12 weeks paid leave at 60 per cent of normal wages. In Sweden, women receive 90 per cent of their earnings from two months before confinement to six months after confinement. An interesting provision in Swedish law is for parental leave to care for a child. This is available for seven months after confinement at 90 per cent of earnings, for either the father or mother, but not more than six months of this seven can be taken by one parent. This has been deliberately introduced to encourage fathers to stay at home with their children for at least a short period, so involving them more in the care and nurture of children, and stressing that child care is a paternal as well as maternal function. I can guess what the reaction would be to a similar proposal in this country, though I applaud it as positive governmental action to break down sex role stereotyping.

I have not so far discussed the provisions for maternity leave in any of the communist countries. They all have such schemes but they vary, as in Western countries.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What about China?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: They have it there, too, on full pay. The communist country schemes vary, providing up to 26 weeks on full pay and different periods of unpaid leave before re-employment in the same job or a similar one. The maximum unpaid leave available is in Hungary, where three years leave is available for child care. Someone told me recently this three-year leave had been changed to full pay in an effort to increase the birth rate, but I have not seen confirmation of this assertion.

In contrast to the legal provisions I have just outlined, there are no statutory entitlements to maternity leave, paid or unpaid, for most women workers in this country, and, as far as I am aware, there are no schemes in the private sector of the economy. The Commonwealth, New South Wales and Victorian Public Services provide for 12 weeks paid maternity leave, on full wages, with up to 40 weeks extra unpaid leave available as job security. The other State Public Services have no provisions for paid leave, but unpaid leave as job security varies from 26 weeks in Tasmania to 39 weeks in Queensland and 52 weeks in Western Australia. In the South Australian Public Service there is currently provision for only 26 weeks unpaid leave, but I understand the matter is under review, with an opinion poll being taken among members of the Public Service Association, and recommendations being considered by the Equal Opportunities Advisory Panel. Hopefully a decision will be reached soon, though I think my remarks so far illustrate that there is indeed a long way to go before women in our community generally enjoy the same rights as their sisters in comparable nations.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What about women in the Northern Territory?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I presume that the Commonwealth Public Service provisions apply to them.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I am talking about women and the right to representation.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: What has that to do with maternity leave provisions around the world? I do not think it is a relevant comment, with all respect. I should like now to consider a different matter that is of immediate impact to many South Australians. I refer to the recent pronouncements on educational policy by the Federal Minister (Senator Carrick), and the tremendous implications which these have for all concerned with education, from pre-school to post-graduate tertiary level. The full implications of this latest zig in Federal policy are only just beginning to be appreciated, and one wonders what the next zag will produce.

One thing which is clear from Senator Carrick's statement to the Senate is that the concept of a rolling triennium is dead. The Whitlam Government introduced triennial funding for schools, following the highly successful triennial funding for tertiary education which had so markedly assisted universities and colleges of advanced education since 1958. The rolling triennial programming was introduced in 1976, for both the Schools Commission and the Tertiary Education Commission, and as to what this means I can best quote from the Universities Commission report of 1976, as follows:

> The commission's understanding of this system is that each year it will be given guidelines in real terms which will consist of firm expenditure figures for the following year and guaranteed minimum figures for the succeeding two years. The commission will report annually, with recommendations for the following three years: each year the triennium will roll forward one year and a new third year will be added.

The same report also states:

> The guidelines for the 1977-79 triennium specify a minimum growth in expenditure for the second and third years of the triennium. Unless this is a guaranteed minimum rate of growth, forward planning will not be possible and the arrangements would not constitute a triennial system.

We all know that 2 per cent of real growth of money had been promised to both the Schools Commission and the Tertiary Education Commission for 1978 and 1979, and much forward planning had taken place on this basis. Now, suddenly, that commitment has been dishonoured and no real growth at all is to occur, despite an expected increase in school enrolments. All educational planning on this premise is shown to be a waste of time and effort. Who can ever trust this current Federal Government again, when it can so readily and brazenly break its promises in this way? Obviously, any future commitments on education will be taken with large helpings of sodium chloride by all those involved in education, and a return to annual funding ad hocery will put the educational clock back by decades.

Equally serious is the fact that the Federal Liberal Government has destroyed the independence of the Schools Commission, despite its election promise to maintain this innovation of the Whitlam Government. The Schools Commission is no longer able to consider its own priorities, or determine financial allocations on a needs basis. This whole concept of needs funding in education was hailed by all sections of the community when proposed by Mr. Whitlam, and it healed serious breaches and rifts in society at the time. No-one has yet come out opposing this needs basis of funding, and it has worked to the obvious benefit of all Australian children since 1973. Yet, now this concept has been destroyed, with the Government instructing the Schools Commission to transfer funds from one area of education to another, regardless of whether this is justified on a needs basis, as indeed it cannot be! The pruning of $4 000 000 from service and development programmes and from special projects such as the innovation scheme means great damage to very sensitive areas affecting teacher morale and the participation of parents and the community in schools, particularly in schools situated in lower socio-economic areas of our cities. But, even if such cuts could be justified, the very fact that such an instruction has been given means that the Schools Commission has had its independence destroyed, and that funding on the principle of needs has been abandoned by this cynical and unprincipled Federal Government. I would hope that all parents will be incensed by this reintroduction of sectarian and elitist philosophies into education, and castigate the Federal Government accordingly.

Not only has the $4 000 000 been removed from service and development programmes, but a clear instruction has been made to transfer about $14 000 000 from Government schools to private schools. It would have been hard to complain if $14 000 000 extra were shown to be needed by the private schools, and the funds provided as an extra for them from the Treasury. But no, this $14 000 000 is to be taken from the Government schools, improved though they are compared to their condition before the Whitlam Government recognised Federal responsibility for their standards, yet still far from the adequate educational institutions that we would like them to be. This $14 000 000 is to be snatched from Government schools, where it is urgently needed, and given to private schools, and mainly to the wealthy private schools at that—$2 000 000 straight out to class 1 and 2 schools, presumably for much needed third and fourth swimming pools! How can anyone suggest that their need is greater than that of the Government schools, or the class 6 schools of the private sector? The weak justification is some statement made by Mr. Fraser in 1972 during the late unlamented McMahon Government, and not repeated since despite Senator Carrick's unsubstantiated assertions in the *Advertiser* last Monday. I was indeed glad to see his misrepresentations on this score nailed by Dr. Hopgood in yesterday's paper. What greater evidence could we have that the whole needs basis of education funding has been jettisoned and abandoned?

Furthermore, we have $3 000 000 being transferred from Government to private schools for new school construction, despite the recommendation of the Schools Commission that consolidation and not expansion should apply in the private sector. The rest of the transfer from Government to private schools, some $9 000 000, results from the State's having been willing to put extra effort and finance into improving their own schools, over and above what is expected by the Federal Government. As Federal grants to private schools are linked to average resources in Government schools, an increase by the State Governments to the latter results in more Federal money for the private sector, to maintain the relationship of resources. Again, no-one would object in the slightest if extra money were provided by Treasury for this purpose: but, no, it must be taken from the Government schools. The State school systems are thus penalised because the State Governments have done their utmost for their schools, as has been advocated constantly by the Teachers Institute, and parent and other educational bodies. Is this yet another example of the so-called new federalism, where the reward for effort and responsibility is a kick in the teeth?

Let us make no mistakes regarding the efforts being made by our own South Australian Government: total expenditure of State funds on primary and secondary education has risen steadily from 22·53 per cent of total State funds in 1973-74 to 24·87 per cent in 1976-77. Taking Commonwealth funds into account as well, the proportion of Commonwealth and State funds for primary and secondary education through Revenue and Loan funds has risen from 24·28 per cent in 1973-74 to 27·65 per cent in 1967-77, as a proportion of all funds available to the South Australian Government. Revenue expenditure alone has risen from 24·11 per cent in 1973-74 to 28·31 per cent in 1976-77, as a proportion of total revenue funds in the State. There could be no greater proof of the commitment of this Government to the education of South Australian children than these figures, and the net result of this concern and care is to have Federal money removed from the State school system by fiat from Senator Carrick.

One other comment I should like to make concerns the extraordinary article in last week's *Advertiser* by Senator Carrick. He purported to prove that it was necessary to transfer resources from State schools to private schools to prevent an increasing proportion of children attending the Government schools. He completely ignores the fact that ever since 1968 attendances at private schools have been falling, as a proportion of all children at school, a trend which pre-dates the Whitlam or even the Gorton or McMahon Governments. The reasons are doubtless many and varied, and I should be most surprised if the transfer of resources he has ordered would have much, if any, effect on this long-term trend. Furthermore, he claims that the increasing proportions in Government schools would cost the taxpayer an extra $9 000 000 next year, though his logic has been justly and severely criticised both by Dr. Hopgood, and by Stephen Downes in the Melbourne *Age*. But, even supposing this figure of $9 000 000 were correct, which it manifestly is not, he plans to save this $9 000 000 by giving $14 000 000 of taxpayers' funds to the private sector—an arithmetical *non sequitur* that astounds me. It is a piece of logic straight from *Alice Through the Looking Glass*!

The implications of other aspects of Senator Carrick's pronouncements are equally frightening. The lack of indexing of capital costs will hit both schools and tertiary institutions hard, particularly when new buildings such as the new Medical Science building at Adelaide University are already under construction. Old nineteenth-century inner suburban schools, with pocket-handkerchief asphalt yards and grim forbidding buildings, will have to wait even longer before they can be brought to the twentieth-century standards demanded by parents. I can assure honourable members opposite that such antiquated schools cater for the children of many Liberal-voting or, should I say, hitherto Liberal-voting parents, as well as Labor-voting ones.

All members of this Parliament will have received a letter from the Vice-Chancellor of Adelaide University detailing the disastrous effects on his institution of the broken promises of Senator Carrick regarding money for tertiary education. The promised 2 per cent growth in real terms is not to occur, capital costs are not to be indexed, and no allowance for inflation is to be made for any recurrent costs other than salary payments arising from national wage decisions. Does Senator Carrick imagine that library books, equipment, and maintenance costs are standing still? The costs of books and periodicals have been rising far more rapidly than the general inflation rate; repair costs for broken equipment likewise; and much needed new equipment for both teaching and research now retreats beyond the sunset for the hard-pressed institutions. Are the laboratory rats to manage on 20 per cent less food and care?

I know from discussions with students and ex-colleagues how standards are falling in our tertiary institutions, and will fall further despite the greatest efforts of dedicated staff. My own son tells me that only every second mathematics exercise paper is being marked, the alternate ones being done by the students but never assessed, owing to lack of staff to mark them. This is the current situation, due to the education economies last year, and the Vice-Chancellor's letter makes clear that next year will be much worse. If the children in class 1 and class 2 private schools were not having their work even looked at by a teacher owing to insufficient money, there might indeed be grounds for complaint by their parents!

The Federal Government is callously ignoring the plight of the tertiary students and staff, and morale in tertiary institutions must suffer disastrously as a consequence. One is led to the conclusion that the current Federal Government is conducting some sort of vendetta against the youth of this country. Schools, universities, and colleges of advanced education are all being crippled and, if young people react by ceasing their education, they are thrown on to the dole in ever-increasing numbers. Surely our young people deserve better than this, instead of being made to bear the brunt of stupid economic mismanagement.

Federal policies which transfer resources from the young and poor of our society to the rich are misconceived and unjust, and Australian youth is being unfairly penalised. The final straw is the announcement late last week that grants for pre-schools are being effectively cut by 12 per cent, as no allowance for inflation is to be made in next year's grants. Even the three-year-olds and four-year-olds are not immune from attack by this Federal Government! Their rights to social development and education count less than jet-setting visits to the opera and profits to the shareholders of Conzinc-Riotinto Australia!

I challenge the members of the Opposition in this Council to declare publicly whether or not they support the education cuts of their Canberra colleagues and the tatters of an educational policy as expressed by Senator Carrick, as well as the overall attack on the youth of this country by their Federal Government friends. I support the motion.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I support the motion, and I thank the Lieutenant-Governor for his Speech and for his dedicated service to the people of this State. It is unfortunate that Sir Douglas Nicholls was unable to complete his term of office, because of ill health, and I convey my sympathy to him and Lady Nicholls. I express my condolences to the families of former members of Parliament who have died since the opening of the previous session. The Lieutenant-Governor stated that the Government was intensifying its efforts to promote the sale of local products here and overseas, and I wish to suggest some way to revive our manufacturing industry and thereby create more employment.

Each of the advanced countries has during its period of development established strong secondary industries and has made sure to maintain these. Their leaders pay lip service to free trade and lowering of tariffs at meetings of GATT and elsewhere but, when crises arise, they quickly revert to higher tariffs, import quotas, exchange control restrictions, or outright embargoes, as the European Economic Community recently wished to impose against Australian steel products, even though 95 per cent of the steel used by them was made within the E.E.C. If Australia is to continue to develop and become one of the most prosperous and influential countries, it must restore the strength of its manufacturing sector which has declined in recent years.

To start with, we must encourage the Australian people to buy Australian products. In 1961, during the last economic recession, employer associations and the Federal Government organised a "Buy Australian" campaign. It was successful, and I suggest that both the Federal and the State Governments should give urgent consideration to launching another "Buy Australian" campaign. Although the quality of Australian goods may have deteriorated in some areas a few years ago, manufacturers in this country are now paying great attention to quality standards. We shall always have the knockers in our midst, who delight in finding something wrong, but I believe that today in Australia they will find as many or more faults in imported products as they do in local ones.

Mr. Chapman, the Chief Executive of General Motors-Holden's, said in a speech in Adelaide recently that General Motors has a common method of measuring quality standards in its plants throughout the world. These are compared regularly and in recent months the standard in some of its Australian plants has climbed towards the top. That is the best news we could hear and it should be publicised far more widely.

The leaders in this country, and I include Parliamentarians in this group, should set an example by buying Australian products. I recall that the head of a large Australian company said some years ago that he not only drove an Australian car and persuaded his family to do likewise but also tried to ensure that every product or appliance in his home had been made or assembled in this country. As he said, "How can I expect the thousands of fellows working for me to use Australian-made products unless I do likewise?"

It is a pity, especially during this period of recession, that the Governor-General, our own State Governor, and Gough Whitlam and Malcolm Fraser, as Prime Ministers, should feel compelled to move in public in foreign-made

vehicles when there are perfectly adequate Australian cars to take them from A to B. They do not need to drive in a costly and exclusive motor vehicle to maintain their status.

Charles de Gaulle, Georges Pompidou and Giscard D'Estaing drove or drive in middle-size Citroens without resorting to a Rolls Royce or a Mercedes. The French are intensely nationalistic and would demand this example from their Presidents, and it is no doubt one reason why France has now the fastest growing economy within the Western world. I mention as an aside that Mr. Brezhnev is reported to use a Rolls Royce to move from the Kremlin to his country lodge, but I doubt whether this fact fully explains the fairly static productivity rate existing in the Soviet Union at the present time.

I wish now to refer to the significance of exports. We all know that Australia, because of its small population, offers a limited domestic market for its manufactured goods. There are in fact six separate markets, because the consumers are distributed in the main amongst six seaboard cities, which are geographically remote from one another. We also suffer from extremely high interstate freight costs whether moving goods by road, rail, sea or air. For example, the freight cost of moving a large domestic appliance 2 000 miles by rail in the United States is 25c (Australian) a kilogram, whereas the cost of moving a similar appliance about 2 000 miles from Melbourne to Perth is 45c a kilogram. I believe that the Federal and State Governments should give urgent consideration to subsidising the movement around Australia of selected goods where freight is a significant factor in the overall cost. This could, in some instances, be of more benefit than increased tariff protection.

Australian manufacturers who attempt to sell their goods nation-wide are handicapped further by the short-sighted attitude of most State Governments, which give preference when letting Government contracts to goods made within their own territories. This practice may win a few votes in a local election from time to time but it is bad from a national point of view and should not be permitted to continue. Interstate freight costs themselves should provide sufficient State protection for local goods.

State Governments have also increased inward and outward harbor dues significantly in recent years. Such action affects low price per tonne basic materials and this cost being at the source escalates by the time the finished product reaches the consumer. The worst culprit in this regard is South Australia. For example, the outward harbor dues for general cargo moving by sea from South Australia to other parts of Australia are three times as high as the comparable charges imposed in Victoria and New South Wales.

Because of the inherent difficulty of selling goods throughout Australia it is all the more important to export in order to revive the manufacturing sector. For some 20 years after the last war, Australia had a low wage structure compared with the United States, and I use the United States as the yardstick because so many of the new products which we copy and use emanate from there. Our relative wage advantage has changed dramatically during the past 10 years and, to give an example, I shall compare the average weekly earnings as issued by the Australian Bureau of Statistics and by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, expressed in Australian currency.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: That is not strictly comparable.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I am using average weekly earnings.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: You know there is a lot more to cost than just wages—certain pensions, and things like that, almost non-existent in Australia.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I will come to that. In 1966, the average Australian wage was $60·70 compared to $101·15, so the average wage in the United States was 66·6 per cent higher. This margin reduced steadily during the next six years and in 1972 the average Australian wage was $96·80, compared to $130·15, a difference of 34 per cent. Within two years of the Whitlam 'Government coming to power, the margin had been reversed. By 1974, the Australian average wage of $137·90 exceeded the average in the United States by 2·2 per cent. This margin increased to 4·3 per cent in 1975 but declined to 2 per cent above the United States last year.

We must accept that the Australian wage structure, having reached a high plateau by world standards, is likely to remain in this category and manufacturers must try to adapt to this situation. It is a tragedy that the upward trend occurred so rapidly, because it shattered the confidence of many resourceful Australian executives. The Liberal and Labor Parties in this country must now restore that confidence.

Union leaders argue that Australian workers should be given wage increases at least in line with the movement in the consumer price index and that the Federal Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, by restricting quarterly wage rises below the movement in the C.P.I., has during the past year or so been reducing the standard of living of the Australian worker. There have certainly been some restrictions.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Reductions, too.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I remind honourable members, and especially the Hon. Mr. Blevins, that over a 10-year period from July, 1967, to June, 1976, the C.P.I. rose by 100·7 per cent, average Federal awards by 178·36 per cent, and average weekly earnings by 198·5 per cent. These figures were published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics bulletins 6.16, 6.18, and 9.1. I believe that most workers will be prepared to tolerate lower wage rises if they can be convinced that other sectors of the community are also prepared to act with restraint. In this way, we could probably maintain a wage structure comparable to wage structures in the other developed countries

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: You mean cuts in real wages?

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I have said they might tolerate lower wage rises compared to the C.P.I. increase.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Why don't you say what you really mean?

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: You don't want wage rises.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: What I say is that we should not get a wage structure above that of the United States and the E.E.C. In this way, we could probably maintain a wage structure comparable to those of the other developed countries and give confidence to manufacturers to re-equip and strive to enlarge their product lines through exports.

I wish to refer now to the question of why the young in Australia apparently do not wish to work in factories. When the manufacturing sector revives, there will be a demand for labour and it will be a pity if we have to collect thousands of migrants to fill these jobs when a pool of unemployed young exists within the country. There

are several factors contributing towards this apparent reluctance amongst the young.

First, there are generally insufficient wage margins for skill in Australia and, although it is easy to attract apprentices, many leave their trade after completing their training to take more highly paid jobs as salesmen, truck drivers or even builder's labourers.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: They are not getting enough money.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: That is what I am saying.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Then spell it out a bit more clearly. You are advocating an increase in wages.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: In recent years, the wage rates granted to the semi-skilled or unskilled workers, within the transport, building and maritime industries have risen far too much. For example, a builder's labourer is paid considerably more than a first-class machinist or fitter. This is due to the success of the militant unions in extracting high over-award payments from employers within these industries and then having these over-award payments absorbed into the official award rates. The metal trades in particular have suffered because a large percentage of the work force comes within this category and for many years the fitter's rate was taken as the yardstick by which to settle margins for skill. Whenever the metal trades unions sought increases, they attracted much publicity and opposition from employer associations. In contrast, far larger increases granted in smaller industries often passed unnoticed. Steps must be taken to restore an adequate margin for skill in order to hold the young tradesmen.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Will the Metal Industries Association support the Australian Council of Trade Unions in relation to indexation?

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: It would be impractical to do this at present because our trademen's rates are already comparable to those in other developed countries.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: You say one thing here and another thing outside.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will have an opportunity to make a speech.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: The rates for the semi-skilled and unskilled workers within the maritime, transport and building industries must in some way be contained, while the margin for skill is reasserted in the metal trades and other skilled trades.

Secondly, many of the young apparently resent the rigid union control that exists within many factories. They are probably quite prepared to join a union, but in my experience often object to being told by their elders when to strike or being accused of being a scab if they question the recommendations.

Thirdly, the manufacturing sector has declined in Australia in recent years. There have been retrenchments in many factories and, because of the union principle of last on first off, the young with fewer years of service are usually among the first to be retrenched. This principle undoubtedly serves the interest of the older workers, but it is time for the trade unions to review it and give more consideration to the young within their ranks.

Fourthly, most factories in Australia start work at about 7.30 a.m. I think that is too early. This time was set years ago when cities were smaller and employees did not have such long distances to travel to work. This factor has been recognised in Japan, where it is now common for factories to start at 8.15 or 8.30 a.m. I think the earlier start in Australian factories deters many young people, especially those who have an option of working in a factory or in a Government department or commercial office where they can begin at about 9 a.m. Remember also that young married couples are more likely to live in the outer newly-developed suburbs and, therefore, will have longer distances to travel to work.

Traffic authorities argue that starting and finishing times in factories and commercial and Government offices should be staggered to avoid added congestion on the roads. I accept that argument, but it should still be possible to put back starting times in factories to 8 or 8.15 a.m. without interfering with the traffic flow to commercial offices.

The concept of flexitime has proved reasonably successful when tried in offices in the public and private sectors, not necessarily to improve output but to keep the staff more contented. Flexitime is impractical in most factories, but some variation of starting and finishing times could appeal to the young and attract them to factory work.

The Government should conduct a survey of school leavers to determine whether and why they dislike working in factories, because the Government is unlikely to get the correct answer by asking those who are already employed, many of whom are, presumably, willing to accept existing conditions.

I have spoken so far about manufacturing in Australia generally, but I now wish to comment specifically on certain problems in South Australia. I remind honourable members that there is no-one more keen than I to see a revival in manufacturing activity and a rise in the level of factory employment in this State. The Hon. John Cornwall, when speaking last week in the debate, quoted figures issued by the Bureau of Statistics (Bulletin 5.16) regarding the premiums and claims for workmen's compensation insurance. They indicated that the cost of claims and premiums in South Australia during the two-year period from 1973-74 to 1975-76 increased by 60·3 per cent and 111·2 per cent respectively, and that this rate of increase was far lower than occurred in New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia. I remind the Hon. John Cornwall that I have at no stage suggested in this Chamber, either when moving a private member's Bill or amendments to the Government Bill on workmen's compensation, that premiums or claims are higher here than those in other States.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Your colleagues do so, fairly frequently.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I do not speak for my colleagues.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: You're one out.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I am involved with engineering works operating in other States employing the same categories of labour and I am well aware of the premiums paid. In fact, the variations in premiums quoted by different insurance companies in this State and elsewhere based on a known accident experience are quite staggering.

I have objected to the basis for compensation whereby a person receives the same payment when injured as his mates at work and, because he is saved the cost of travelling to and from his job, he can be financially better off by staying at home. The basis of compensation in New South Wales and Victoria is less than in South Australia, but this affects mainly workers under State awards because there are make-up agreements between employers and employees in the main Federal awards in those States. The lump sum compensation for specified injuries is also higher in South Australia than it is elsewhere.

The Hon. John Cornwall will be aware that he quoted overall amounts of premiums and claims State by State and took no account of the increase in the work force or the amount of overtime worked in each State during the period from 1973-74 to 1975-76. There was a substantial industrial boom in the other three States during this period which South Australia unfortunately missed. It would be interesting to see the figures quoted by the Hon. John Cornwall updated to June, 1977, because the recession suffered by the States, which previously enjoyed boom conditions, has been more pronounced than in South Australia. I suspect that total premiums and claims for workmen's compensation will presumably alter in relation to booms and recessions.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: The recessions have been far greater in Victoria and New South Wales.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I said that. They had a boom on which we missed out, and their recession has been greater than ours. Although the figures quoted by the Hon. Mr. Cornwall are the latest available, I should be interested to see the next lot of figures.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: But you have validated my point that we have been significantly better off than the other States in the past 12 months.

The Hon. D H. LAIDLAW: With one qualification: that the honourable member did not take into account how many extra workers there are in Western Australia or how much overtime they worked there. I should like to see how many more people there are and how many more hours are worked there, because that is the gap that exists in the honourable member's figures. I have stressed already that we should hold our wage structure in line with and preferably a little lower than applies in the United States and the E.E.C.

In order to export our manufactured goods this need for restraint applies as much to fringe benefits as it does to direct wages. The Lieutenant-Governor said in his Speech that the Government intended to legislate regarding long service leave during this session. I point out that workers under the South Australian Long Service Leave Act already receive the highest benefits of any in the Western world. This is not too hard to achieve, because Australia is the only country that has legislated for long service leave. It is, however, a burden on South Australian employers because they have to provide up to $50 000 000 more to cover this commitment than if those same workers were employed elsewhere in Australia.

Let me explain how this amount is calculated. Long service leave was introduced initially in the private sector in New South Wales by Statute in 1951 and then into the other States, the Australian Capital Territory and Northern Territory, and into various Federal awards relating to the metal, vehicle, maritime and aircraft industries. If employees are engaged under Federal awards which include long service leave provisions, their entitlements are calculated according to those awards because Federal legislation of course prevails over similar State legislation.

The intention regarding long service leave was to reward service with a single employer and to enable a worker to have a substantial holiday part-way through his working life. The concept has been widened during the past year or so within the building and construction industry in South Australia and some other States to permit portability of long service leave for time spent within that industry rather than with one employer. Under South Australian Acts, an employee receives 13 weeks leave after 10 years of service at current rates, which includes over-award and production bonus payments. By comparison, workers under Federal awards and the Acts in other State must remain for 15 years before becoming entitled to 13 weeks leave, but they receive pro rata leave generally after 10 years, and after five years in New South Wales.

This means that after 10 years a worker in South Australia receives 13 weeks leave compared to eight and two-third weeks leave under other Acts or awards. If an average worker receives pay of $150 a week, he will be entitled to $1 950 in leave under the South Australian Act and $1 300 elsewhere, a difference of $650. According to Bureau of Statistic figures there were, in April this year 298 000 workers in the private sector in South Australia, excluding those in agriculture, defence and private domestic service. Therefore, if one-quarter of the workers in the private sector become entitled to long service leave under the South Australian Act they will receive at current rates up to $50 000 000 more than if they worked elsewhere in Australia.

In conclusion, I wish to refer to the question of redundancy payments, because the right to such was adopted by the Labor Party at its 1975 State Convention and also adopted at the recent Federal Labor Convention in Perth. I quote from its working environment committee report as follows:

> Decisions to reduce production, to introduce new machinery, to develop new lines of production, are not lightly taken . . . No redundancies (should) take effect without a minimum of one month negotiation . . . If redundancies are unavoidable there must be reasonably comprehensive redundancy provisions. These should be based upon a number of weeks pay in respect of each year of service and in relation to the employee's age and the likelihood of re-employment or retraining. The minimum pay should be not less than four weeks pay for each year of service . . . *pro rata* long service leave and annual leave entitlements should be preserved . . . together with accumulated sick leave and any pension or superannuation benefits.

In monetary terms this resolution means that a worker on $150 a week who is declared redundant would receive $6 000 for 10 years or $12 000 for 20 years of service. Understandably, the concept of redundancy pay is part of the Labor Party platform, because many European countries, including the United Kingdom, have legislation for redundancy and termination pay. It is significant that compensation is based on length of service.

Although such legislation may be socially desirable, Australia, unlike the European countries, has already legislated for long service leave and that is also calculated on length of service. I do hope the Labor Party and trade union leaders will realise that the prime need is to keep Australian wages and fringe benefits in line with, or slightly less than, the level of those in the United States and the European Economic Community. By all means retain the concept of redundancy payments as a goal, but do not seek to introduce them until the manufacturing sector has revived and the pool of unemployed has been reduced. With those comments, I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I join with other members of the Chamber in expressing regret that the Governor has retired, and I wish him and his wife the very best for the future. I also join with other members in extending sympathy to the former members of the Parliament who passed away recently.

Today I should like to speak about youth, the young people. As I have heard it often enough and been told it often enough, I suppose I should believe that young people are different from adults, but I ask in what way are

they different. Are they lazier than adults, more energetic than adults, or better educated than adults? Do they do more or less than adults do for the community?

Adults are fond of criticising young people. Young people are supposed to be susceptible to drug addiction. I have heard young people called bikies, simply because they ride motor cycles. In other places, they are called dole bludgers and louts. Other people say that they are permissive and appallingly selfish. They have been called almost everything under the sun, and not only by uninformed members of the community. In an address in 1963 to the Service to Youth Council, Incorporated, Professor W. A. Cramond, Director of Mental Health in South Australia, stated:

Adolescent spontaneity, by reason of its impulsiveness and strength, frightens and enrages. There are many adults in our society, be they parents, judges, teachers or irate citizens, to whom anything unplanned or disorderly is terrible, simply because it is uncontrolled. Friedenberg goes on to note that we envy the life of youth "not yet squandered". "It is excruciating to watch a youngster especially one who refuses to listen to you, making what you are quite sure are serious mistakes, but at a deeper level it may be even more painful when he does not make them, or when they turn out to be mistakes; when he grasps and holds what eluded you or what you dared not touch and have dreamed of ever since."

As adults we tend to deal and think in stereotypes and in over-simplifications. It is interesting how groups, if they fall under authoritarian censure, seem to possess common characteristics, or we attribute to them these characteristics. For example, what group do you think is being described here?

> "A people that are usually carefree, exuberant, long of limb and fleet of foot, noted for athletic and (it is whispered) sexual prowess. They are nonetheless essentially child-like; they are irresponsible and given to outbursts of unrestrained violence; they are undisciplined. With the aid of jazz that they seem to have almost in their bones, they work themselves up to erotic frenzies in which they abandon themselves to utter licence." Negroes, or adolescents in a downtown dance hall? Almost never a day passes but eager readers of the press will find their eye alighting on some reference to youth and their activities. These references seem to me in the majority of cases to come from people who hold what might be termed authorotarian roles in our society.

It is not often that the opinions of youth on serious matters are canvassed or receive much publicity. With the kind help of a young lady on the *Advertiser* staff here, I selected some recent press comments for quotation this evening. Not all the references are to the local scene but they are about young people. In January this year, we begin with a short item called "Problems of Teenagers", where an American lecturer on social problems said in Adelaide that "the problem of couples marrying too young was most acute" and he was shocked with the number of teenage couples he had confided with who had not even considered approaching their parents or pastors if they had a "secret". Also in the early part of the year was a report from New South Wales suggesting that hooligans (the result of their misdirected energies were not defined so that one was left to make one's own assumption as to what was meant by the word "hooligans"), that these people should be put in gaol over the week-ends and released during the week so that their jobs could be kept open for them, thus enabling them to work, to pay fines or whatever other financial commitments they might have. In June of this year a citizenship convention in Canberra was told that youth organisations should be given a shake-up, that too many come to exist for themselves alone, and forget the purposes for which they had been created. I wonder how many adult organisations follow that course. One little paragraph noted that delinquency sprang from a lack of desire or opportunity to participate in sport. The speaker was, perhaps not surprisingly, the President of the Amateur Athletic Union of Australia. However, in March of that year under the headline "Nations Youth Apathetic", the immediate past-president of the International Chambers of Commerce said that young Australians were becoming mentally apathetic and could not care about anything except what would benefit them financially. He also noted that they were physically strong, but that they indulged in sport to the detriment of their other activities. It was quite a relief to learn in April of this year of the comment from a senior policewoman that the majority of Australian adolescents were fine young people, interested in school, hobbies, sport and art, while in May of this year, an assistant Deputy Commissioner of Repatriation in another State was quoted as saying that the younger generation today probably was better than the generation that went before it. It is all very confusing.

I, too, find it confusing. I now refer to *Youth Work in Australia*, Australian National Commission for Unesco, 1974, which at page 3, paragraph 23 states:

It seems to be a common feature of many human societies, particularly those undergoing substantial change, to believe that the youth generation is a problem. Priests writing on the walls of Egyptian tombs, Socrates and Shakespeare are all commonly quoted to show that young people are likely to be dissolute, profligate, and a nuisance to all respectable people. A look at the mass media in any modern society shows that this belief is still widely held today.

Paragraph 29 states:

Adolescents achieved increasing recognition during the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Significantly, the vanguard of this recognition came in the establishment of distinctive fashions in dress for the young. Publishers tended to follow by producing literature specially geared to a youth market, while educators and social legislators were much slower to appreciate and to incorporate into their own thinking the implications of the changing nature of adolescence. Even today it is probably reasonable comment to suggest that commercial entrepreneurs of clothing, records, magazines, and entertainment are much more quickly sensitive to the changing nature of young people's interests than are educators and legislators.

The sad thing about those who criticise the young (and some criticism is justified in regard to a small number of young people), is that the criticism is all-embracing. I refer to an *Advertiser* report of two years ago (June 26, 1975), that quoted Miss Davey, who was prominent in community work and who had received an award for her work, as saying:

"I find myself a member of a dying race." . . . She said it was becoming harder to encourage younger people to enter voluntary organisations.

I find it hard to believe that that is all she said. However, that is her quoted statement and I have no alternative but to take up the matter from there. On the next day (June 27, 1975), an article headed "Are the young unwilling to help others?" by Christabel Hirst stated:

Are Adelaide's young people unwilling to do charitable work unless they are paid? Five voluntary work organisers say this is not the case, and that the majority think of others before their pockets . . . Mrs. Heather Crosby, executive director of the Y.W.C.A. is behind the young people. "I think this is an utterly misleading comment that the young will not work voluntarily unless paid—we know this is not so at the Y.W.C.A.," she said. "We have a wide range of age groups working voluntarily for us, from 14-year-old girls to elderly pensioners—but there is certainly no lack of young workers.

"One group of young people, aged between 16 and 20 years, regularly goes to the Strathmont Centre to work with retarded children. It is very demanding work but they have persevered. Other voluntary work that young people are involved in includes running a drop-in centre at Thebarton, painting our premises and youth leaders organising camping programmes." The publicity officer for the Red Cross, Mrs. Neila Foggo, was surprised by Miss Davey's claim. "We have a wonderful lot of young volunteers and our numbers are steadily increasing," she said. "Perhaps a lot of the young may join the Red Cross to have a bit of fun, but we find after 12 months or so that they are the ones who work the hardest."

"We find them rostered to work at the Red Cross Blood Bank in their spare time, or giving up a Sunday to take children from an orphanage on a picnic or to the Zoo. The Glenelg Younger Set have been doing marvellous

unheralded community work for months, working with Kesab doing a survey of litter on the beaches." Constant streams of young people walk in off the street seeking voluntary work at the Woodville Spastic Centre, according to the organiser of their voluntary worker programme, Mrs. Jill Wiltshire. "I have found them willing and co-operative and certainly not seeking any financial gain," she said. "However, we are still desperately short of voluntary workers in the winter months and are looking for mature people who can handle responsibility." For the Director of the Adelaide Citizens Advice Bureau, Mrs. M. L. Disney, it is her experience that it is more difficult to find voluntary workers in the "above-30" age group. "We have no trouble with a constant supply of school children and university students seeking voluntary holiday work—of course they drift away or lose interest but there are always more to replace them," she said. "For one reason or another we have difficulties in getting voluntary workers over 30—perhaps they are tied down with children." "I think it would be unfair to say that young people are not forthcoming and only interested in financial gain," said the acting director of Cope, Mr. R. Freak. "Of our 80 volunteer workers about 35 per cent would be under 30, and for each person there is a pay-off, but it's not financial. "Most of our workers are progressive and want the sort of experience our type of agency can bring, be they general practitioners, social workers, typists or laymen."

Of course, I can speak from personal experience in my own community, where, with other organiser-inclined people, we have been able to enlist the services of hundreds of people of all ages. From my experience about 80 per cent of those people could be termed as young, but they were involved in all kinds of community projects. Their time has been given voluntarily, with enthusiasm and with no thought of personal gain. In fact, it is a pleasure to ask these young people to assist because, mostly, they are so willing to give it a go. I believe that adults are responsible for the attitudes of the young because the young, until they become experienced in their own right, tend to copy the actions of adults.

There is no doubt that the young tend to be influenced by adults, not necessarily by the example of parents or teachers, but more by what seems to be the going thing so far as adults are concerned. In the case of drunken parents it does not necessarily mean that that family's young will be so afflicted. If a young person is a thief or vandal it does not necessarily indicate that his or her parents were tarred with the same brush. However, young people learn quickly, especially about things of which it would be better that they remained unaware. Youth sees the deceitful things that happen around it.

There is no better way of teaching the young how deceitful and mean some adults are than to ask them to undertake a doorknock, although the young people who face up to such activities are not usually influenced by the meanness around them. Pornographic literature can be said to be another influence on young people, or so it is claimed by adults. Yet adults publish and sell such rubbish at huge profits. Also, I refer to television advertising. Such advertisements are designed to work on the young from an early age. They teach youngsters to demand of parents and even encourage the children to covet—"If Johnny and Mary over the road have it, why can't I?" The young do not produce these advertisements. Once again it is the adult who produces the product in the first place, the manufacturer, storeowner, advertising man, film producer, and generally the television station or radio station that keeps saturating the air waves with the kind of rubbish that drives wedges into families, and drives wedges into the pockets of the working youth to diminish his hard earned pay packet.

Adults, of course, are out to make a profit at anyone's expense, and youth is the biggest single market in the world. Youth is gullible and compassionate and can be easily misled, but they soon catch on, and in no time at all they are mimicking the activities of their elders. Because there are some young people who get into trouble and have problems with the police, the adult has no hesitation in blaming all the young. Adults conveniently forget the sins of their youth. Most people would be guilty of lying if they said that they had never got into mischief. Of course, the mischief of young people is viewed differently nowadays from the way it was viewed in years gone by.

There are other influences at work and I would like to mention one of these. The Police Force is a body of people supported by the State for the maintenance of law and order and, by and large, I think, they do a pretty good job. From reports circulated in the press from time to time, it is clear the South Australian police are considered the best in Australia. Certainly the scandals that appear in the other States do not seem to materialise here. Police can be a valuable community asset and a great influence on our young people if they exercise or display moderation, bend over backwards to be fair, never hold grudges, never try to victimise and in no circumstances are seen to be harassing groups within the community. If police are seen to be doing these things, opinion of them becomes very low in the eyes of the public. A very senior officer of the department recently said to me that the police who were involved in trying to control a brawl—the kind of fracas one can see from time to time at a sporting event or adjacent to a hotel—got little or no public support; sometimes the public is inclined to barrack for the brawlers. I wondered why. There had to be more to it than distaste in the minds of some to the authority in uniform. I wondered if incidents like those I will narrate could cause some ill feeling.

Consider Mr. Citizen needing to go to a shop and, seeing what he is looking for in a fairly busy suburban street, a vacant parking spot close by, he parks. Seeing a conglomeration of signs, he says, "Never mind, I'll be in and out of the shop in the time it takes me to work out what they are all about." When he did come out he had a parking ticket. He cast his eyes along the street, and the parking inspector was some way down. Mr. Citizen drove down the road to the traffic lights and did a U turn to come back to the inspector on the opposite side of the road. A police car materialised and the policemen were quite rude. They were reported to a higher authority; the report was dealt with by an internal tribunal and dismissed.

Take another incident where a police car followed another Mr. Citizen's car; that made him nervous. He knew he had had a couple of cans of beer, and eventually he made the mistake they were waiting for. This is a practice indulged in by a few police; then one is pounced on as soon as the white line is crossed (in most cases by a couple of centimetres) or one moves too close to the edge of the road or kerb. He did consider a plea of not guilty and checked with a solicitor on the cost, but thought the fees too costly and decided he would probably get off fairly lightly with a plea of guilty. He was so shocked and distressed by what he called the lies of the police in their court statement that he appealed, and I believe his penalty was substantially reduced. I refer now to the case of two senior high school boys, one of whom was placed on a drinking charge. The other boy had not consumed sufficient alcohol and was apparently over 18 years of age. Abuse and filthy language were used. One of the boys claims that the police struck him. He has X-rays and evidence of hospital treatment to prove it. He had damaged ribs and a cheekbone injured. However, the police denied his allegation and charged him with

assaulting them. In his judgment, the magistrate supported the police. The matter has been to the High Court and it may later be referred back to the Magistrates Court for a further decision.

I refer now to a complaint made by a person regarding the behaviour of police officers while she was being interviewed ostensibly with respect to a breach of the Road Traffic Act. At about 10.30 one night she was driving a friend to a railway station car-parking area. She was on her way home and was wearing her seat belt. The lights of her car were burning although, as she later realised, they were on the parking range. When she was just past an intersection she noticed a police car travelling in the same direction behind her and in the same lane. The car followed her for a short distance and she was then ordered to pull over to the kerb, which she did. Two uniformed police and another man in plain clothes, probably also a police officer, then alighted, whereupon she was spoken to by the men. Most of the conversation which she had was with a uniformed member whom she described. She was facing the officer as he approached the car. She was still in the driver's seat of her car. The officer then said, "Would you turn side on, please?" She did as she was directed, although no reason was given for the officer's request. After a short period he directed her to get out from her car. She said to him, "Do I have to?"; he replied "Yes". When she alighted she was instructed to walk to the back of her car, which she did. The same officer followed her and looked at her for a few moments.

In what followed it appears that she was asked for her licence, and a series of personal questions were asked of her. Among the conversation, which she remembers, were the following: "You've been to Elizabeth, haven't you?" "Where have you been?" "Where are you going?" "Is this your car?" "Are you married?" "Do you go to work?" At the same time, while examining her licence, "What's the 'B' for? Barbara?" A number of other highly personal questions were asked, but she was most distressed by this time, being an extremely nervous woman. She does not remember them in detail. The officer did at one stage refer to the fact that she was driving with her lights on the parking range, but only after she had asked him if that was the reason why she had been stopped. He said on leaving, "You'll get a letter of caution about this."

She was so upset by this experience that she broke down and cried on the way home. She is a married woman, with two grown-up daughters, and is extremely attractive for her age. I wish to quote the following letter from a solicitor:

As arranged between us in our telephone conversation, my client may be interviewed by a commissioned officer only upon the condition that the interview takes place in my rooms at the above address or otherwise in my presence. Likewise, all communications should be directed to me, as her legal adviser. I have approached you directly in this matter, in this initial stage, on the understanding that a proper inquiry into this complaint will be made by officers of your department. If your inquiry reveals that there is substantial truth in her allegations, my client will not take the matter up at any other level, upon receipt of a signed letter of apology by the officer or officers responsible for the alleged incidents which have caused this lady so much distress.

Then followed a communication from police headquarters, as follows:

Further to your complaint in which you made certain allegations about the conduct of police officers when they spoke to your client, this matter has been investigated. Our inquiries have revealed that the members concerned were quite justified in speaking to your client, who had been detected committing a breach of the Road Traffic Act. There is no evidence that the police officers acted other than in a correct and proper manner and I am satisfied that the complaint is without foundation. In all circumstances, no further action will be taken in this matter by the Police Department. The report concerning the traffic offence committed by your client has been examined by our adjudication panel, with the result that it has been decided to caution her for the offence. This decision was made as normal policy and not as the result of her complaint.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Who is the Minister in charge?

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: The Minister does not see these things. I am complaining about certain elements in the Police Force, not the Police Force. The Leader should have been in here when I was begining my speech.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Give it to him, mate.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I suggest the Leader reads this report in *Hansard*, if he wants to know more about it. The solicitor replied:

Informed client of its contents, as a result of which I have received further instructions. My client wishes to convey, through me, the apology offered by your senior officer to her when interviewing her earlier, in my presence, for the upset caused to her by the behaviour of the officers. The senior officer was aware that my client was most distressed by the incident, and now she becomes fearful even upon sight of a police car driving in close proximity. There is little more I can convey on her behalf except to say that it seems a pity when there are so many frivolous complaints made against the police which are rightfully dismissed, that a genuine approach, such as this, is treated in like manner. I am reminded of one of the basic canons of our legal framework that, "No man shall be judge in his own cause." Finally, I am perturbed that your inquiries reveal that the officers acted "in a correct and proper manner", in light of the fact that my client was ordered from her car and told that she must comply even when she had asked the officer if she could remain inside. I know of no law which allows such power to a police officer, and it is disturbing that you regard this as a correct and proper manner of behaviour by your officers.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Did you take it up with the Minister?

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: Not yet.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You should; it is a very serious allegation.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: It is all in writing and it will all come out in due course, but I have not finished yet. Then there is the attitude of one policeman in Gawler. Now, of course, there are half a dozen police permanently stationed in Gawler, and there are probably another half a dozen from Elizabeth and Para Hills that spend some time in the Gawler area each day. I merely want to bring this to honourable members' attention, and I do so because there are some policemen like this.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: A very small minority.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: Yes.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Have you given the name of the policeman to the Minister?

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I have only just decided to bring this matter up.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: But you will inform the Minister?

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: Don't worry about what I shall do. I shall tell him what he should know if I have complaints. This is my way of doing it. The attitude of this policeman is that, to further his own cause, he is prepared to add a little extra to a statement, as he did on one occasion that I know of. Now the Hon. Mr. DeGaris has made me lose the piece of paper I was reading from.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: He is always doing that.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I hope I can pick it up again. The policeman makes remarks to people such as, "We'll get you eventually" and "I've been waiting a long time to get you." In one case, I am led to believe that he went to the landlord of one person whom he thought he had trouble with and the landlord a day or so afterwards asked the person to remove himself from the premises. Further the policeman in question had not much compunction about telling friends that they should not be seen in the company of such a person. Also, he was constantly plaguing someone to "pimp" on another person.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: If you have complaints, why don't you tell the whole story? These are all snide remarks.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You shut up.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I am complaining about individuals whom, at this moment, I do not intend to name. I shall have something to say at the end of this statement which should be taken into consideration. This is the place in which I should make these remarks. The Hon. Mr. Hill is the first to complain about things; he is always doing it; he is always full of complaints.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: No, I am not. I do not know what the Chief Secretary thinks about all this. He is in charge of the Police Force. This is almost a vote of no confidence in the police.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: The Chief Secretary is in charge of the Council, but he does not control what you do.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C. M. Hill: The Chief Secretary will take the honourable member aside after we rise.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I make this particular complaint because it is something that happened on Sunday last, when this same policeman spotted a newly licensed member of a family out driving, and he drove his car in such a fashion that he cut her off twice by pulling sharply across in front of her. This was done in locations that were a reasonable distance apart. The first time could be excused as careless driving, but a second time shortly afterwards seems inexcusable and the sort of thing that he would certainly report someone else for. Again, there was the old ploy of following the driver up the road; she turned into her driveway and he turned into the one next-door; then he hesitated, reversed and drove on. Without even talking to him, I know what excuse he would use for following if he was challenged on the matter. These sorts of incident involve no doubt small numbers within the Police Force, who use their uniform or their badge to display their authority. Some of this small number have every intention of harassing, and there really is no place for them in a service that wields such great power over the populace. The others, probably like the rest of us, have home problems—a fight with the wife or girl friend or money problems—but they should not take their problem to work and take their ill humour out on the citizens.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You reckon that boy friends and girl friends are problems?

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: They can be. Governments all over the country have set up independent tribunals, such as Ombudsmen and Consumer Affairs Departments, to deal with the complaints of the public against certain individuals or bodies. Complaints against the police, on the other hand, are dealt with by the department and I have already read to honourable members the type of reply we may expect. A senior officer's complaints I have already told honourable members about—that the public will not help the police. Maybe, if there were fewer of these incidents that I have been talking about, more people would be prepared to support the police. I am not suggesting, of course, that these actions take place only against the young, but that is where they leave the most lasting impression and it could be another of the causes why some young people go off the rails.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: This is a vicious attack on the Police Force; you should be ashamed of yourself.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Rubbish! I rise on a point of order. I think the honourable member who has the floor is attempting to raise a matter in this Chamber which he has already stated was brought to his knowledge by a constituent; he has every right, and indeed a duty, to perform in this Council in the manner in which he is performing. It is quite wrong for Opposition members to interject, saying this is bashing the Police Force, or something of that nature. I expect you, Sir, to afford the Hon. Mr. Creedon every protection to enable him to express the views that he wants to express in this Chamber, and particularly to castigate your mate, the Hon. Mr. Hill.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: He ought to be made to withdraw his remarks.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I thank the Hon. Mr. Foster for his advice, and ask the Hon. Mr. Creedon to continue with his speech.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: Thank you, Sir, and I thank the Hon. Mr. Foster for supporting me. However, I have been here long enough to realise that the Hon. Mr. Hill rambles on.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I do not ramble on. I have respect for the Police Force.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: A major problem facing the youth of our country is the higher unemployment rate. As other honourable members have referred to this matter, I do not intend to dwell on it. However, school leavers looking for their first job, and anxious to prove that they are responsible members of the community, must become very despondent when they are continually knocked back when applying for jobs. Unemployment creates many social problems, and in this respect I refer to a report in the *Advertiser* of June 8, 1976, as follows:

> Long-term unemployment among young people is creating social problems so diverse the shock waves are being felt by just about every welfare agency in the community . . . Mr. Max Kau, director of the Service to Youth Council, said:
>
> > Of about 160 young unemployed who passed through S.Y.C. support programme in 1976 only six needed special counselling for emotional problems. Young people seemed to be taking unemployment in their stride. However, during March and April this year, 21 young people out of 130 have presented a wide range of emotional problems.
> >
> > These include being very withdrawn, lacking in personal confidence, personal insecurity, poor social and mixing skills, and low self-regard. Some of these young people have had nervous breakdowns, others have expressed suicidal feelings and most are seriously depressed.
>
> Mr. Kau's attitude is repeated, with differing degrees of pessimism, by other voluntary agency workers, State and Federal social workers, and employment "experts".

A hard-hearted attitude has been adopted by the Federal Government in denying unemployment benefits to school leavers from the end of the school year until the beginning of the next school year. This denies those young people the opportunity of maintaining their independence after they have left school and are looking for a job. If they are unable to get a job, they are entitled to be supported by the Federal Government. These people do not want to be a further burden on their parents. We have a

back-up to what I am claiming. In this respect, I refer to the court action taken out by Miss Karen Green, of Hobart. She took court action to try to ensure that the Federal Government faced up to its responsibilities. I do not know whether she has been successful. Although the court gave judgment in her favour, the Fraser Government flatly refused to pay.

I believe that Miss Green has gone back to court and taken further legal action, in which I hope she is successful. She is doing it to help not only herself but also the people who come after her. Many of the thousands of young people who will soon be leaving school will need this support, because unemployment is far worse now than it was last year, and the Federal Government is doing nothing to correct the situation. I still have faith in the young, and would like to quote what Socrates said about them in 400 B.C. His opinion was not that much different from that of some people in today's society.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You should tell them opposite that—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I remind the Hon. Mr. Foster of the point of order that he raised a little while ago. A little peace and quiet would be appreciated.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: That's quite right, Sir.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: Socrates said:

Our youths now love luxury, they have bad manners, they have contempt for authority, disrespect for older people. Children generally are tyrants. They no longer rise when adults enter the room . . . they gobble their food and tyrannise their teachers.

I can well understand that that would be the attitude of some honourable members opposite to the young. I prefer to adopt the different attitude, as expressed by Plato in about 300 B.C., as follows:

So long as the young generation is, and continues to be, well brought up our ship of state will have a fair voyage; otherwise the consequences are better left unspoken.

I support the motion.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (NARCOTIC AND PSYCHOTROPIC DRUGS AND JUSTICES) BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health) I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed to rectify a problem that has arisen in the administration of the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act following upon a recent decision of the Supreme Court. In 1972, an amendment to the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act introduced a provision under which all offences under that Act were to be dealt with as if they were minor indictable offences under the Justices Act. Subsection (2) of section 129 of the Justices Act provides that "Except where justices or a special magistrate have or has independently of this Act power to punish by longer imprisonment or higher fine . . . the court shall not inflict any punishment exceeding, in the case of imprisonment, imprisonment for two years, or in the case of a fine, $200."

It had previously been assumed that the provision for a higher fine in the special Act (in this case the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act) would constitute an independent power to punish by longer imprisonment or higher fine within the meaning of this provision. Indeed, that appears to be the view taken by Mr. A. J. Hannan in his book entitled *Summary Procedure of Justices* in his commentary on section 129. However, the recent decision of the Supreme Court is contrary to that view, and consequently it is now necessary to ensure that the penalties prescribed by Parliament in the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act are not to be read subject to the limitations prescribed by the Justices Act.

Accepting the correctness of the Supreme Court's interpretation of section 129, one might perhaps have thought that section 122 of the Justices Act answered the problems of sentencing raised by section 129. Section 122 provides that if "it appears to the court that the offence, by reason of its seriousness . . . ought to be tried on indictment, it shall not proceed to convict the defendant but may commit him for trial upon indictment". Be that as it may, the Government has decided to deal directly with the problem by amendment to the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act and the Justices Act.

The present Bill accordingly divides the offences under the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act into two categories. The more serious offences, which now may carry penalties as high as $100 000 or imprisonment for 25 years, are designated indictable offences. The less serious offences are designated minor indictable offences. The salient difference between the two categories of offence will be that the indictable offences will, as a matter of course, be disposed of upon indictment before a judge and jury, while in the case of a minor indictable offence the defendant will have the option of being dealt with by a court of summary jurisdiction or, if he so elects, by a judge and jury. The provision regarding penalty in the case of minor indictable offences is redrafted so as to ensure that the penalties prescribed by the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act will prevail over the limitations in section 129 of the Justices Act.

In his judgment the Chief Justice drew attention to the fact that the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act is a somewhat antiquated document that has been the subject of a great many amendments in recent years. The Government has had in view for some considerable time the need to make a general revision of the law relating to narcotic and psychotropic drugs. With this end in view, it has established the Royal Commission into Non-medical Use of Drugs. It would, of course, be premature at this stage, before the report of the Royal Commission is to hand, to embark upon a full-scale revision of the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act. However, the Government can assure honourable members that, as soon as the report of the Royal Commission is available, it will deal with the revision of the drug laws as a matter of urgency.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 amends section 5 of the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act. The effect of the amendment is to provide that a person who knowingly has in his possession any drug to which the Act applies, who smokes, consumes or administers to himself any drug to which the Act applies, or who has in his possession any appliance for use in connection with the preparation, smoking or administration of any drug to which the Act applies, shall be guilty of a minor indictable offence. The graver offences under subsection (2) of section 5 which relate to producing or trafficking

drugs to which the Act applies will under the terms of the Bill be indictable offences and thus in every case will be dealt with by judge and jury.

Clause 5 removes sections 6 and 6a of the principal Act. These provisions are now obsolete. Clause 6 amends section 8 of the principal Act, which relates to offences against the regulations. The offences under this provision are to be minor indictable offences. Clause 7 amends section 9 of the principal Act. The provision to which the amendment relates deals with obtaining by false representation prescriptions for drugs to which the Act applies. This offence is to be a minor indictable offence. Clause 8 amends section 10 of the principal Act. This offence is similar to the offence under section 9 (2) and relates to a person obtaining from a pharmaceutical chemist, wholesale chemist, or manufacturer, any drugs to which the Act applies. The offence is designated as a minor indictable offence by the amendment.

Clause 9 amends section 13 of the principal Act, which relates to delaying or obstructing inspectors who are acting in pursuance of the principal Act. The offence is to be a minor indictable offence. Clause 10 amends section 14 of the principal Act. The amendment prescribes a maximum penalty for a person who is guilty of a minor indictable offence against the Act of $2 000 or imprisonment for two years, or both. The provision states that these penalties are to apply notwithstanding the provisions of section 129 of the Justices Act. The amendment also provides that, if any person attempts to commit an offence against the Act or solicits or incites some other person to commit the offence, he will be guilty of a minor indictable offence. The amendment also removes subsection (8) of section 14, which is no longer necessary in view of the earlier provisions of the Bill.

Clause 11 provides that the offence of promoting by advertisement the use of drugs to which the Act applies is to be a minor indictable offence. Clause 12 corrects an error of numbering in the principal Act. Clause 13 is formal. Clause 14 amends section 120 of the Justices Act to provide that offences declared to be, or designated as, minor indictable offences in other Acts, are to be cognisable by a court of summary jurisdiction constituted of a special magistrate.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.24 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, August 3, at 2.15 p.m.