

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 14 August 1980

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

## QUESTIONS

## ROCK LOBSTER FISHING

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Fisheries, a question about rock lobster fishing on the West Coast. Leave granted.

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** I have received some disturbing reports that rock lobster fishermen in the northern zone have lost the right to fish for scale fish, which has been a very important part of their income over many years. I believe that all members will be aware that the rock lobster fishery is really a part-time fishery and that those engaged in it are dependent upon some form of additional income, by fishing for either shark or tuna in the South-East or scale fish in the northern zone, to make their position more economically viable. The reports that I have received indicate that the rock lobster fishermen in the northern zone have lost the right to fish for scale fish under the new amendments that were passed to the Fisheries Act only a few months ago.

It is rather disturbing that these actions, which were predicted during the debate on that legislation, were taken so quickly. Will the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Fisheries, say whether all the rock lobster fishermen in the northern zone have lost their rights to participate in the scale fishery? If not, how many, and which ones, have? Also, what was the evidence of declining catches west of Port Lincoln on which the decision to take away these rights was based? How much notice was given to fishermen to rearrange their fishing enterprises (which often means a reduction of 25 per cent in their income)? Finally, what is the ultimate aim of the decision? In other words, what total reduction in effort does the Minister intend to achieve in the scale fishery west of Port Lincoln?

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** I will refer those questions to the Minister of Fisheries and bring down replies as soon as possible.

## VICTORIA PARK

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** I seek leave to make a short statement prior to directing a question to the Minister of Local Government concerning the lease of the racecourse area at Victoria Park.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** I trust that all members noticed that I used the expression "the racecourse at Victoria Park" and not "Victoria Park racecourse". The Victoria Park is part of the very precious parkland held in trust for the people of South Australia. The racecourse came later and is coincidental. Early in the week I was asked by Miss Jeannie Davison to inspect or acquire a copy of the lease agreement between the Adelaide City Council and the South Australian Jockey Club. Members will remember Jeannie Davison as the young lady who fought so valiantly to try to stop the large and very old trees in Victoria Park being butchered by the Jockey Club

in collusion with the Adelaide City Council.

**The Hon. M. B. Cameron:** Have you been to the races there?

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** I have not been to the races for a long time. I am very much a reformed punter. I do not go to casinos any more, either. This is a serious matter, and I should not allow myself to be deflected by the Hon. Mr. Cameron. I have discovered something quite extraordinary, which perhaps says something about the level of competence of the committee men of the South Australian Jockey Club and members of the Adelaide City Council. There is no lease in existence, and there has not been a lease for at least five years. The area of Victoria Park which can be used as a racecourse is, therefore, not defined in law, so far as I can discover, and is apparently held on a weekly tenancy basis only. Again, I repeat that I think this is quite extraordinary. It is certainly extraordinary that such a situation has been allowed to exist for five years. Even more remarkable, perhaps, in these circumstances is that the parties concerned have begun to construct a new track and to vandalise some of the magnificent trees in the park. Can the Minister confirm that at present no lease exists between the S.A.J.C. and the Adelaide City Council, and will he say whether it is therefore illegal for the parties concerned to be proceeding with any track construction or alteration in the people's park?

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** The last formal lease in the matter of the South Australian Jockey Club and the Adelaide City Council (or perhaps I should say the now disbanded Adelaide Racing Club, which was involved when the leases expired)—

**The Hon. J. R. Cornwall:** The last lease was with the A.R.C.

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** Thank you very much. The last lease expired in 1966. I understand that that lease included a 21-year right of renewal. At this time I cannot find within my department any record of any renewal being exercised. I have found that a draft lease with the former Adelaide Racing Club Incorporated was drawn up and completed in 1975. I understand that that lease was considered by the Government of the day, of which the honourable member was a member, and that, in keeping with most things with which that Government came to terms, it was not able to reach any finality at all.

So, during the term of the previous Government, which was served by the Hon. Mr. Cornwall, no approval or arrangements were completed in regard to any renewal. The present Government has tackled the matter, and I am in the course of doing what I can to pursue it and to bring the matter to some finality.

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** The only conclusion they reached was on 15 September last year.

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** That is right; it certainly was the end of the whole poem of disaster.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! This has nothing to do with the question.

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** Regarding the arrangements as they exist at present in relation to the landlord and tenant in that area, it appears that a tenancy basis exists between the Adelaide City Council and the South Australian Jockey Club, and that must simply involve a normal weekly or monthly arrangement, the details of which I have not been told, because I have not yet been asked formally to approve a lease in writing.

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** The Minister has not answered the second part of my question. Is it illegal for the parties to be proceeding with any track construction or alteration in view of the fact that there is no lease agreement?

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** I certainly do not believe that it is illegal in any way at all if an arrangement between the landlord and tenant on a tenancy basis is in train. However, I shall be pleased to look into that point and bring back a further reply.

### ELECTORAL REDISTRIBUTION

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** Will the Attorney-General tell the Council whether there is any truth in the rumour that the Government intends to have an electoral redistribution during the life of the Parliament by changing the number of members in the House of Assembly? Also, will the Minister confirm his earlier advice to the Council that no such action is contemplated?

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** There is no substance at all in the rumour.

### REGENCY ROAD OVER-PASS

**The Hon. C. W. CREEDON:** Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, a reply to the question I asked on 30 July regarding the Regency Road over-pass?

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** My colleague reports that, following completion of the major earthworks on this project, work on the underground piling and foundations commenced in mid-April 1980 and is continuing at present. This work will be followed by the construction of the bridge superstructure, which is expected to be completed in mid 1981. Roadworks are planned to recommence early next year and be completed in time to enable the over-pass to be open to traffic in July 1981.

### COUNCIL VOTING SYSTEM

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** In view of the Premier's announcement yesterday that the Government intends to introduce legislation to amend the system of voting for the Legislative Council, will the Attorney-General tell the Council whether those amendments will involve the list system of voting or preferential voting?

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** I am not prepared to indicate to the Council at this stage what the extent of the amendments to the Electoral Act will be. I have indicated previously that the Government intends during the course of this session to introduce a number of amendments to the Act among which will be the question of the Legislative Council voting system.

### INTERPRETER SERVICES

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs a question about interpreter services.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I am sure (or should I say I hope) that the Minister appreciates the difficulties that certain people have in obtaining interpreter services when confronted with a court case. In fact, justice can certainly not be done (and I am sure the Minister will agree with me) unless the person involved fully understands what is happening and can put his or her case in a competent manner. It has been brought to my attention that a senior officer of the interpreter services provided by the

Government said that interpreters in the Industrial Court now will be available only to the extent of translating the evidence-in-chief, cross-examination and re-examination. I understand that an interpreter will not now be available to interpret any discussion between the parties involved or the evidence in the remainder of the proceedings.

So, in effect, it means that, apart from when the witness is in the witness box, he will not know what is going on in the court. That, I am sure the Minister will agree, is highly undesirable. It can be said that the alternative is for the person concerned to engage his or her own interpreter. However, the problem with that is the cost. It costs an enormous amount to employ a competent interpreter, and people should not be limited, because of lack of finance, in their understanding of what is going on in their court case. The interpreter service was set up to allow for that situation, or at least I am sure that that was the idea of it.

It has also been reported to me that the position regarding interpreters has changed considerably. Under the previous Government, interpreters were provided for discussions with clients before they had to appear in the witness box, and discussions between counsel and client were assisted by the interpreter. If this was not done officially, it was at least done unofficially. However, now, apparently, a senior person in the interpreter service has said that that practice must stop. Will the Minister outline to the Council his policy regarding the availability of interpreters in the law courts? Has the Minister issued any instructions that have had the effect of reducing the availability of interpreters in the courts? Given the obvious need for the interpreter service to be expanded, has the Government any intention of assisting our migrants in this way by so expanding the service?

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** Let me make perfectly clear that the present Government's policy is not to restrict or adversely affect the rights or the opportunities of ethnic people who are before the courts, in regard to interpreter services. We are not totally satisfied with the arrangements as they exist at present. When the Hon. Mr. Sumner was, I think, Minister, the former Government established a committee under Mr. Manos (one of our magistrates) to investigate this whole question. That was one of the committees established before the change of Government, and one that we are very satisfied to continue. Mr. Manos and one member of his committee came to see the Premier and me early in the term of this Government and explained that they would need more time to investigate this whole area.

It was concerning them, it concerned the previous Government and it concerns the present Government. We are bound somewhat to await the findings of that committee to see what improvements can be implemented to achieve our aim of providing a proper and adequate interpreter service for such people.

Recently I inquired as to the reasons for the apparent delay in the committee's bringing its recommendations to me, and I was told that there had been some delays in regard to the Police Department's contribution towards the committee's activities. Certainly, I have not given any instruction, nor has there been any Government instruction, restricting or adversely affecting the rights or opportunities of such people in obtaining adequate interpreter services.

Indeed, it is my aim to see that such people in those circumstances are provided with adequate interpreting facilities. We are at present in the course of waiting upon recommendations from an expert committee which has been established and which I hope will suggest some improvements. In the interim, the interpreter contracting service operates, and people who require the services of an

interpreter can of course contact the Ethnic Affairs Branch, and they will be provided with such an interpreter.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** On a very limited scale.

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** If the honourable member has any specific instances where he thinks an injustice is being done, in that any South Australian citizen coming from an ethnic community is not being provided with proper interpreting facilities, I would certainly like to have details of those instances.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** Don't you read your mail? A specific case was put to you by the Hon. Mr. Sumner on my behalf two weeks ago. The court case is due for hearing on 25 August.

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** That particular matter has not as yet been brought to my notice. I will have to find out when the letter was received in my department.

**The Hon. J. R. Cornwall:** That's not good enough.

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** You do not know when the letter was received in my office.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** As I say, I am happy to investigate the particular instance, which by way of interjection the Hon. Mr. Blevins has brought forward, and to give it my urgent attention. I repeat that it is my wish, and the Government's wish, that proper and adequate services be provided in such instances.

#### SEX DISCRIMINATION ACT

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Attorney-General a question about the Sex Discrimination Act.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** Last October I asked the Attorney-General whether he was considering any amendment to the Sex Discrimination Act, particularly in view of the recommendations by the Commissioner of Equal Opportunity in her annual report. At that time, the Attorney said that he was not considering any amendments but indicated that he would let me know whether he was contemplating any future amendments. On 6 August 1980 (*Hansard*, page 77) the Attorney indicated that he was undertaking a review of the Act, with particular attention to the question of sexual harassment, but he did not suggest in his reply that only this question was being looked at: he certainly left me with the impression that he was undertaking a complete review of the Act.

At this stage, can the Attorney-General inform the Council whether he is considering in this review the three areas—a couple of them on more than one occasion—that have been recommended by the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity as areas that should be included in the Sex Discrimination Act? I refer to protection from dismissal on the grounds of pregnancy, sexual proclivity, and facilities at clubs and sporting organisations. Is the Attorney-General considering those three areas and amending the Sex Discrimination Act accordingly?

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** At this stage I am not in a position to say what sort of amendments are likely to be made to the Sex Discrimination Act, because Cabinet has not yet considered any recommendations from me with respect to that Act. On 6 August, in relation to the specific question referred to by the honourable member (that is, sexual harassment), I indicated that I was undertaking a review of the Act. As part of that review some attention will be given to the very real problems the honourable member highlighted regarding sexual harassment. How-

ever, other matters have been drawn to my attention that need some investigation in relation to the way in which the Sex Discrimination Board works and to deficiencies or suggested deficiencies in the legislation. Some comments have been made by the Minister of Consumer Affairs, who is responsible for the office of the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity. The matters raised by the Commissioner in her reports over the years will be included in the matters that will be considered during the review.

When the review has been completed, I would expect that the Government would then decide whether or not to act on those matters upon which suggestions have been made by the Commissioner. At this stage, I cannot add anything further. I am hopeful that the review will be completed some time during this session and, if decisions are made, legislation may be introduced during this session. However, I cannot give an unqualified assurance that that will be the case.

#### GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** I wish to make a short statement before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Premier, a question about Government employees.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** I was very concerned to see a report in an Australian Government Workers Association newsletter, which was also referred to in this morning's newspaper, on a statement made in another place by the Premier on 4 June in relation to Government employees. The newsletter is quite lengthy and, in part, states:

On Monday 11 August, a cleaning contractor, Nipper Van Buren, was invited to take over the cleaning of the Local Court and the Magistrates' Court. Government weekly paid staff employed in these buildings were transferred the same night to other buildings cleaned by the Public Buildings Department.

If honourable members recall, I have spoken on this matter previously. I am in possession of the documents issued by the Minister of Labour and Industrial Affairs stating that before any transfer occurred consultation would take place with the employees. The newsletter continues:

Three contract cleaners have replaced the 10 weekly paid staff who formerly cleaned the Magistrates' Court. How good now is the Government's much vaunted "People's Participation Policy"? Their loyal Government workers were transferred without any form of consultation or, indeed, any prior notice at all. What shabby, shoddy, treatment to mete out to honest, devoted and defenceless workers, who have served them faithfully for decades. What price loyalty?

The Government's "jobs for the boys" policy is also shown, by them by-passing the usual means of advertising such contracts:

- (a) by not using the Supply and Tender Board;
- (b) by not advertising and calling for tenders by using the most popular medium, the *Advertiser* newspaper;
- (c) by not using any other recognised public medium for advertising and calling for tenders;
- (d) by using a method of selective contracting, whereby only a few firms were approached on a private basis.

On 4 June, the Premier denied in Parliament that within the Engineering and Water Supply Department employees were sitting around doing nothing. At that time the Premier stated:

We are making sure there is a constant flow of work. Either the Premier or the Public Accounts Committee, when it reported on the surplus of employees, was

misinformed. As members know, the Public Accounts Committee has indicated that there is a surplus of employees sitting around doing no work, whereas the Premier has said that all employees are gainfully employed and that there is plenty of work. That statement was reinforced on last night's television news when Mr. Wotton said that no-one was sitting around doing nothing, and that everyone was fully employed.

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** What did your Government do?

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** Thank you, Mr. Davis. I will assist you if you listen. In reply to the Hon. Mr. Davis's most welcome interjection—

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I remind the honourable member that this is not a debate, but that he is explaining a question.

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** I tried to ignore him, Mr. President, but you know how persistent he is. Every time I stand up the Hon. Mr. Davis is at me. I worry about blokes like that.

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** Is that sexual harassment?

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** I do not know, but it certainly worries me. In a further article reported in this morning's *Advertiser*, under the headline "Blame Liberals, say unions", three South Australian union leaders spoke out. The article states:

Mr. R. W. Fairweather called for an Auditor-General's inquiry into the Government's alleged mismanagement of public money . . . The P.A.C. report also said the cost of wages for surplus employees from February 1980 for the next 2½ years would be about \$13 000 000.

That should be worth a public inquiry. If the position were reversed and my Party was sitting on the Government benches, the Hon. Mr. Hill would not be off his feet. Last year a couple of sausages were missing from Northfield Hospital, and talk about the Jam Factory—

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I ask the honourable member to continue with his explanation.

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** The article continues, first quoting Mr. Fairweather:

"Any surplus is mainly caused by the Liberal Government's policy of handing out Government work to private contractors." Mr. Fairweather said that, through Government policy, taxpayers were having to pay "double wages" for E. & W.S. work. The Government was trying to uphold its pre-election promises to cut costs without retrenchments. While it was handing out work to private enterprise, Government tradesmen were "sitting around on their backsides because the work they would normally do has gone to private contractors". "There should be a serious inquiry in the way the Government is misusing the State's funds," he said.

The Secretary of the United Trades and Labor Council is very well respected in the community. He is very active and has often consulted and reached agreement with the Government. Mr. Gregory is reported in the article as saying:

It was the clear intention of the Government to wind down E. & W.S. operations. Union members at the Ottoway workshops had reported that cartage jobs had been given to private enterprise contractors while Government trucks and drivers had been left idle.

The Premier informed Parliament that that was not occurring, but responsible trade union officials and the Public Accounts Committee have said that it is occurring. For that reason I am calling for an inquiry.

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** You made your Address in Reply speech yesterday.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I ask the Hon. Mr. Davis to cease interjecting. This explanation has gone on long enough.

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** The Hon. Mr. Davis cannot help himself. I do not know what is wrong with him. Will the Attorney-General, first, ask the Premier to accede to the requests of the State Secretary of the Plumbers and Gasfitters Union for the Auditor-General to set up an inquiry into the Government's alleged mismanagement of public money in relation to the Government's transferring of work from daily-paid employees to private contractors? Secondly, will the Attorney-General ask the Premier to call a moratorium on the Government's policy of transferring jobs to private enterprise until such an inquiry is completed?

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** I will refer those questions to the Premier, but I will not ask him to do the things that the honourable member has asked that I request of the Premier. The Engineering and Water Supply Department was under the direct responsibility of the previous Government for some 10 years. The Public Accounts Committee's report deals with all of the problems of the Engineering and Water Supply Department during the time the previous Government had responsibility for it. The present Government accepts no responsibility for the plight of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, which was foisted on it. Nor has this Government in any way misused public funds.

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** How do we know that?

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** The Auditor-General has a statutory responsibility to inquire into the accounts of all Government departments, and many statutory authorities. If, in the process of reviewing annual accounts, the Auditor-General finds that there has been any misuse of funds he is required by Statute to draw attention to that misuse. I have no doubt that, as a result of this Government's policy, the Auditor-General will not be able to find that there has been any misuse of funds.

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** I seek leave to ask a supplementary question.

**The PRESIDENT:** Yes, provided there is no explanation.

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** Is the Attorney-General aware that the improvement of departmental efficiency had engaged the attention of the previous Government? Is the Attorney-General aware that the previous Labor Government had set up an organisational review in 1977-78 to undertake major structural changes in the Engineering and Water Supply Department? By the time the Liberal Party came to power many changes had been made.

**The PRESIDENT:** This question must be supplementary to the question previously asked by the honourable member. No explanation can be made.

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** Is the Attorney-General aware of this? I am helping him. He does not know.

**The PRESIDENT:** I want this supplementary question to relate to the question first asked by the honourable member.

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** This is to stop the Attorney-General telling untruths. Problems had been compounded when the present Government—

**The PRESIDENT:** Will the honourable member ask his question or resume his seat.

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** Sewerage projects will not be undertaken.

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** That was a lot of nonsense. There is not much point in answering "Yes" or "No", because that was such nonsense.

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** Mr. President, I seek leave to ask another supplementary question.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** Is the Minister aware that

the present Government decided that \$7 000 000-worth of plant construction in the water supply and sewerage area would not be undertaken?

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** The present Government has undertaken a review of the E. and W.S. Department.

**The Hon. J. E. Dunford:** You don't answer my question—\$7 000 000.

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** I will answer the question how I wish. The Minister of Water Resources has already implemented the Government's policy with a view to reducing the work force in that department. He has also taken other initiatives which relate specifically to water supply, not just for the metropolitan area but also along the Murray River. He has announced a number of projects, including the Noora drainage system.

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** That was on the books for two years.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! Honourable members will hear the Attorney's reply in silence.

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** In conclusion, there have been a number of projects which the Minister of Water Resources has sponsored, which the Government has improved, and which not only involve the employees of the E. and W.S. Department but contract labour as well.

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** I seek leave to ask a supplementary question.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** When can the public of this State expect a reduction and not an increase in fees under this present Government, because the Government's intention and stated policy is to reduce expenditure on wage and salary earners in that department, thereby invalidating the proposed increases of the Attorney's Government by as much as 200 per cent?

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** I am not sure what the honourable member is asking.

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** Of course you aren't; you don't want to be.

*The Hon. L. H. Davis interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Hon. Mr. Davis is not adding anything to this situation by interjecting, and I ask him to desist from provoking honourable members opposite by way of interjection.

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** The Government's policy is one of low taxation.

**The Hon. J. R. Cornwall:** And high charges.

**The Hon. J. E. Dunford:** And no jobs, and record unemployment in the history of South Australia.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** This Government has already, in its first year in office, abolished some State taxes and granted a number of concessions, particularly in the pay-roll tax and land tax areas.

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** That is general, and not specific to the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** Those reductions affect the ordinary householder in South Australia. This Government abolished from 1 July this year land tax on the principal place of residence.

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** That's \$13 a year to the average householder.

**The Hon. J. E. Dunford:** The Attorney-General must be embarrassed to lead a Party like this.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! We are not going to get many questions asked if interjections continue.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** We are not getting many answers.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I will have to take action if honourable members do not restrain themselves when I call for order. The honourable Attorney-General.

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** The Government has honoured its promises to reduce State taxes, and that is something that is unique in the past decade, because the previous Government had high taxation and it constantly increased State taxes, including succession duties, which it reviewed during the decade it was in power, and it increased them overall. The previous Government constantly increased pay-roll tax and sought on no occasion to give the sorts of concessions that this Government has implemented in its first year in office. Some State charges are increased in line with ordinary inflation; that practice is common throughout the Commonwealth, both at the Federal and State level. That is quite reasonable when one takes into account the increased costs of labour, administration, and services that the community requires.

#### WOMEN'S ADVISER

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to directing to the Attorney-General a question concerning the Women's Adviser.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** I was appalled to read in the *Advertiser* this morning an article concerning the anticipated consequences of this Government's decision to downgrade the Women's Adviser positions in the Education Department and the Department of Further Education. I was even more concerned to read that Mr. Allison linked these changes to the Government's proposal to establish an Equal Opportunities Unit in the Premier's Department. This obviously raises the question of the future status of the Women's Adviser in the Premier's Department. It is crucial that her role should remain specialised to deal with the problems of women, particularly if the Women's Advisers in education will be spending less of their time on women's issues. As it is, the Premier's Women's Adviser is overworked and has too few resources for the work she does on behalf of the women of this State. Will the Attorney-General give a categorical assurance on behalf of the Government that it will not interfere with the Women's Adviser's role and diminish her effectiveness by assigning to her responsibility for every other disadvantaged group it can think of?

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** I will not give that assurance.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** Shame!

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** If the honourable member would listen for a minute he would know why: because the Women's Adviser is not an officer who is responsible to me. I will refer the honourable member's question to the Premier and bring back a reply.

#### CRISIS CARE UNIT

**The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS:** I understand that the Minister of Community Welfare recently visited the Crisis Care Unit. Can he say how many telephone calls the centre handled in the past 12 months, and how many of those calls have required follow-up visits?

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** The telephone number of the Crisis Care Unit is inside the front cover of the telephone book. It frequently happens that someone needs care in some sort of a domestic crisis. It may involve a person contemplating suicide, or may relate to a bereavement. People frequently ring Crisis Care, although sometimes they will knock on a neighbour's door or seek help from someone close by who does not know them.

In the year ended 30 June 1980 Crisis Care handled 38 223 telephone calls, of which 2 248 required follow-up visits. Additionally, it may be of interest for members to

know that the number of visits required increased by 48 per cent during the first quarter of 1980 compared with the last quarter of 1979.

There are, of course, other similar voluntary agencies, such as Lifeline, as well as various other church-oriented welfare groups. Crisis Care operates in conjunction with the police. Often the police are called to a domestic dispute where there have been allegations of assault, and sometimes they are not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence to charge the members of a family accused of assault. Crisis Care is called on the two-way radio system that is operated by the department. Crisis Care then attends, talks to both parties, counsels them, and then provides the parties with follow-up counselling, if necessary.

It is perfectly true that I recently visited the Crisis Care Unit. I went with one of the officers who was called to a crisis, and I spent a good deal of the evening with officers on such calls. This was very interesting; more than that, it concerned me very much to find that there were people who had these kinds of crises. However, it comforted me to know that this kind of help was readily available at the end of a telephone.

In reply to the honourable member's question, I have referred to the number of calls that have been made. This, together with parallel services provided by voluntary agencies, is an important thing to people who suddenly find themselves in any kind of crisis and who need help.

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** As the Minister has praised so fancifully the work done by the Crisis Care Unit, is it his intention that the unit will continue to be manned by fully qualified professional staff, or, as is the case in so many other areas with this Government, does he intend to turn it over significantly to volunteers?

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** I intend that the unit should continue in the way in which it is operating at present. Now, only officers go out on calls to visit someone who has telephoned in. When the assessment is made that someone needs to attend, only professional officers will go.

At present (and this was so during the term of office of the former Labor Government), volunteers are used in Crisis Care and will continue to be used. Generally speaking, they are used to man the telephones, and those whom I have seen handle this work very well. Most of them are probably telephonists in their adult occupations, and these people are very calm and professional in their approach. That is exactly what is needed.

In reply to the honourable member's question, I do not intend to use volunteers to go out and actually deal in the field with crisis cases.

#### STOLEN MOTOR VEHICLE

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** Has the Attorney-General a reply to a question which I asked about two days into the first session after this Government assumed office and which related to a motor vehicle that had been the subject of a backyard repairer and was suspected of being stolen? Also, when can I expect the Attorney to ask the Minister of Transport for a reply to that question?

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** I have not received a reply, but I will make inquiries of my colleague as to the present position.

#### REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** I have a number of replies to questions that have already been supplied to honourable

members since the end of the last session, and I seek leave to have them inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

#### INSURANCE COMPANY

In reply to the **Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW** (19 February).

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** The Corporate Affairs Commission has made a preliminary examination of certain books and records of this company, but it is not possible to establish the amount of money that the South Australian public stands to lose as a result of this failure, for it has not been possible to establish which insurers (if any) are providing cover for clients who have paid renewal premiums to this company but which the company has not passed on to the insurers.

The books of the company show that as at the 30 September 1979 an amount of \$120 575 was owing to insurers in South Australia. This does not include brokerage which was being paid by clients—probably at an average rate of 15 per cent.

As to the question of the licensing of insurance brokers, this is a matter which is currently being examined by the Australian Law Reform Commission and the Government proposes waiting for that Commission to report before taking any decision on possible legislation.

#### OLYMPIC ATHLETES

In reply to the **Hon. J. E. DUNFORD** (27 February).

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** The matter was taken up with the Minister of Recreation and Sport and the answer provided was that the South Australian Government did support the Prime Minister in his attitude towards Australian representation at the Olympic Games. However, the South Australian Government has not, nor will it, discriminate in any way against anyone participating in these games.

#### PERSONALISED NOTEPAPER

In reply to the **Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON** (27 February).

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** The matter has been taken up with all Ministers and the following is the answer to your queries:

1. Which Ministers now use personalised notepaper?—All Ministers currently use personalised notepaper except the Chief Secretary, the Minister of Education, the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Industrial Affairs.

2. Which Ministers decided to scrap serviceable notepaper?—No serviceable notepaper has been scrapped by any Minister, including the Minister of Agriculture. Some notepaper used by the previous Ministry was rendered unserviceable due to altered portfolio titles or addresses; this is utilised as "rough" notepaper.

3. What was the cost of this wastage?—There has been no wastage of serviceable notepaper.

#### TELEPHONE RENTALS

In reply to the **Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW** (25 March).

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** In fixing telephone rentals Telecom is not concerned whether the premises are

domestic or non-domestic or whether the charges are tax deductible. The criteria is whether the service is used primarily for business or professional purposes; if it is then the "business" rate of \$120 per annum is charged. In assessing the rental the declared activity of the subscriber is taken into consideration. For example, if a farmer or a small shopkeeper advises his local Telecom Business Office that his service is not used primarily for business purposes and that an occupational entry is not required in the directory, then his service will be regarded as a non-business one and the rental of \$85 per annum will be applied at.

The classification of a telephone service for rental purposes for the nature of a listing in a telephone directory is not decisive when the Commissioner of Taxation determines whether the rental is tax deductible or not. The general deduction provisions of the income tax law apply and generally speaking a deduction is allowable for expenditure to the extent that it is incurred in carrying on a business for the purpose of deriving income. Rural and small business subscribers are likely to have a telephone used partly for private and partly for business purposes and in such cases a proportion of the telephone expenses would be allowable by the Commissioner of Taxation, regardless of whether the particular service was classified by Telecom as business or non-business.

To sum up, the criteria used in the two cases are different but not inconsistent. Telecom makes a simple decision as to whether the use is primarily for business or non-business purposes whereas the Commissioner of Taxation assesses the extent to which any telephone service, whether classified as business or non-business, is used for income producing purposes.

#### SUPERANNUATION FUND

In reply to the **Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW** (6 March).

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** The South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust is a body charged under the Superannuation Act with the responsibility of investing the assets of the South Australian Superannuation Fund. That fund is held, with a minor exception, to meet the employees' share of the cost of superannuation benefits, the Government's share being paid directly out of general revenue.

Although all of the trustees are public servants, in their role as trustees they are not, nor can they be, in any way subject to Government direction. Hence, even if my views on investment coincided with those expressed by the honourable member, it would not be proper for me to ask the trustees to follow my judgment rather than their own.

I would suggest that, if the honourable member, or any other member of Parliament, wishes to discuss the trust's investment strategies in greater detail, he should approach the Chairman of the trust who, I am sure, will be happy to expound on the rationale of those strategies.

#### ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

In reply to the **Hon. ANNE LEVY** (4 June).

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** In the latest Electricity Trust tariff schedule which was recently published the minimum charge applicable to the supplementary off-peak water heating tariff "K" is the same as the minimum applicable to other tariffs, namely \$1.50 per month. This minimum charge was applicable after 1 July 1980.

#### THE GHAN

In reply to the **Hon. L. H. DAVIS** (3 June).

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** On 3 June 1980 you asked me a question in Parliament about "The Ghan". I set out hereunder for your information an answer provided by my colleague, the Minister of Transport—

"The schedule of this service is designed to provide reasonable meal arrangements for passengers. For economic and operational reasons it is not feasible to provide on-train meals between Port Augusta and Adelaide. It is therefore necessary to provide a one hour break in the journey at Port Pirie to enable passengers to eat prior to departure for Adelaide.

The schedule running time between Port Augusta and Port Pirie is influenced by two factors. First, it is necessary to cross a train travelling in the opposite direction and this operation adds 20 minutes to the timetable. Secondly, the limitations of the platform facilities at Port Pirie preclude the positioning of both an Indian Pacific train and the southbound Ghan on the platform at the same time. A faster running time would therefore merely result in a long delay waiting for the Indian Pacific to clear the Port Pirie platform.

The journey from Adelaide to Port Pirie is completed at an average speed of 62 km/h (38 miles per hour) including some 11 or 12 stops to pick up and let off passengers en route. Speeds of up to 95 km/h are reached over some sections.

Towards the end of this year construction work will be completed on the new standard gauge railway from Tarcoola to Alice Springs. The journey from Adelaide to Alice Springs will then be reduced from 2¼ days to 23 hours. The timetable proposed for the new service is:

Northbound—  
Depart Adelaide—10.30 a.m. Thursday.  
Arrive Alice Springs—9.30 a.m. Friday.

Southbound—  
Depart Alice Springs—6.00 p.m. Friday.  
Arrive Adelaide—5.00 p.m. Saturday.

A second train leaving Adelaide on Sunday and returning on Monday may be introduced at some later stage during peak tourist periods. Speed over much of the 1 500 kilometre route will be 110 km/h.

Work is about to commence on conversion of the Adelaide-Crystal Brook line to standard gauge. Completion of this project several years hence will mean the entire journey will be over standard gauge lines, and a dining car will be included as part of the train for the whole trip."

#### ENVIRONMENT

In reply to the **Hon. J. R. CORNWALL** (5 June).

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** The Minister of Agriculture moved a vote of thanks to the guest speaker, Professor Thadis W. Box at the Rangelands Society Dinner and thus did not have a prepared speech.

The information given by the Minister of Agriculture on Government policy at the dinner was accurate, though the honourable member's account was not.

The Government's policy is based upon the Environment Policy published before the 15 September election, and in particular upon the statement . . . "A Liberal Government will encourage community responsibility and co-operation between all spheres of Government and the people of South Australia in the conservation of our environment.

Our conservation policy will maintain a balance

between the natural desires of people for improved living standards and employment and recreation, and will be compatible with continuing progress and general productivity."

### BIRTHLINE

In reply to the **Hon. ANNE LEVY** (5 June).

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** The answer to your inquiry is that no grants were made to Birthline in 1978 or 1979, but a grant of \$1 000 was made in 1980. This grant was towards the cost of Birthline's preventative work in schools and other organisations.

### BUSINESS NEWS

In reply to the **Hon. J. E. DUNFORD** (10 June).

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** *Business News*, which is circulated fortnightly to businesses throughout South Australia, is primarily aimed at providing information on Government initiatives which affect business and commerce in the State. It has been well received by the people who get it. It is not a secret document and any requests to be added to the mailing list will be welcomed.

### SALES TAX

In reply to the **Hon. N. K. FOSTER** (10 June).

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** On 11 March 1980 the State Government suggested to the Commonwealth that sales tax exemptions might be given on items required for buildings and other purchases after the bushfire. The reply, however was to the effect that this could not be done as neither the Federal Treasurer nor any other person had discretionary power to allow exemptions not authorised by the law.

You also inquired as to whether the State Government would reimburse the Stirling council for the cost of removal of bushfire debris. The answer to that inquiry is that the Government made available trucks, front-end loaders and water tankers together with men to operate them, following the bushfire. That assistance continued until 27 May 1980, when it was agreed that most of the work needing attention had been completed. However, the Government was not able to offer a grant to cover the cost of work carried out by council staff nor is it able to assist them by reimbursing other costs associated with the recent bushfire. The course of action open to the council is to make a special case to the State Grants Commission.

### GOVERNMENT CLEANING

In reply to the **Hon. C. J. SUMNER** (10 June).

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** In the past some of these buildings have been cleaned by persons who contracted with the department to clean the premises at rates which were fixed by the Government from time to time; these persons rendered accounts regularly through the Clerk of their court. At one court a contract had been let by public tender and in one small court a local resident had made a reasonable offer for the contract and this had been accepted. Because of the inconsistency of method in arranging cleaning services the department decided that it was best to put all court cleaning on the same basis and consonant with cleaning arrangements by other Govern-

ment departments. Therefore, with one exception (the small court referred to above) it was decided to call tenders for the work.

Some of the persons who had previously been carrying out the cleaning tendered for the contracts, and where their tenders were the lowest or reasonably close to being the lowest, the contracts were let to them. However, there were a few cases where the tenders by the former cleaners were substantially higher than other tenders and in such cases contracts were let to other tenderers.

You have mentioned in particular the cleaning of the Elizabeth Court. In this case the successful tender was less than half the amount tendered by either of the two former cleaners who each submitted a different tender of an amount more than twice the annual payment made to each of them.

The former cleaners were originally engaged as contractors to carry out the cleaning of specified areas at times out of ordinary office hours to suit their convenience and at rates which were fixed by the Government.

### HOUSING SUBSIDY

In reply to the **Hon. BARBARA WIESE** (12 June).

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** A certificate from the Town Clerk of Adelaide, listing expenditure on housing, has been sent to the Treasury to prepare a claim for subsidy. A further claim will be lodged in relation to the extra \$25 000 donated.

### REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them the answers to seven questions without notice. The answers to all these questions have already been conveyed to honourable members by letter.

Leave granted.

### LAND COMMISSION

In reply to the **Hon. J. R. CORNWALL** (12 June).

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** The replies are as follows:

1. Mr. Wallman has given an assurance that at no time during his period on the Committee of Inquiry was he involved, in any way, in assisting any private land developer or any other person in preparing any submission to the South Australian Land Commission.

Mr. Wallman advised that in his capacity as a professional consultant, he was consulted by Mr. Hickinbotham after the completion of his period of service on the Committee of Inquiry.

2. No.

3. No. Neither my colleague, the Minister of Planning, nor I had any knowledge of the letter to which you refer.

4. The letter was forwarded by Mr. Hickinbotham to the Land Commission after advice had been sought from Mr. Wallman in accordance with the answer to 1. above.

### ALDINGA SAND DUNES

In reply to the **Hon. N. K. FOSTER** (12 June).

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** The replies are as follows:

1. Discussions with the Willunga Council indicate that council has a by-law which allows for the control of foreshore activity and development, and has the power to



impose a penalty. Council would consider each shack and deal sympathetically with the time limit for removal.

2. The Willunga council has given an indication that it would generally tidy up the area of the shacks. There is no major programme for development, and the only plan that exists at present concerns a concept for a small picnic area. Any development proposal would be undertaken with Coast Protection Board consultation.

3. There appears to be no "rare" sand dunes in the immediate vicinity of the shacks. The location of the shacks as I indicated in my reply in the Legislative Council, is close to a clay cliff area and away from natural dunes.

4. See paragraph 2. above. The picnic area may have a small carpark attached, but council indicates there will be no major development in the area requiring extensive car parking. The Coast Protection Board is checking the probability of a boat ramp in the area.

5. See paragraphs 3. and 4. above.

6. The people have the right and have exercised the right of objection to the responsible authority.

7. It should be recognised that the council has heard extensive objections to its proposals over the shacks. A by-law to remove the shacks has been in existence since 1975. The shacks are on an annual lease basis and there has been an indication of their removal for nine years. It is considered that this question has been well and truly discussed.

Since submission of these questions, the Shack Owners' Association has taken out an injunction against the Council in the Supreme Court to prevent the District Council of Willunga from enforcing the removal of the shacks.

This Supreme Court injunction, following a delay by the District Council of Willunga, has now expired, and according to a report in the daily press of 15 July 1980, the Willunga council has reaffirmed its previous decision.

I note that you make reference to the Local Government Act giving the Minister of Local Government powers to require information from a local authority with regard to landscaping or removal work in this area. I consider that this is not the case and suggest that the Coast Protection Board is the body best equipped to review council strategies in this area.

#### FISHERIES MANAGEMENT

In reply to the **Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON** (12 June).

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** Since November the fishing industry in South Australia has been consulted on conversion of abalone permits to authorities with the right of transfer; management of the scale fishery through the joint consultative committee; extended closures in the southern zone of the rock lobster fishery; management of the fishery and licence tenure for the lakes and the Cooroong; the review of the processing and marketing sectors and several consequential management requirements in all of the above fisheries. Major policy initiatives have been made for the abalone and scale fish sectors and the necessary details were included in press releases.

#### AMATEUR FISHING REGULATIONS

In reply to the **Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON** (11 June).

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** The Government announced a set of policies for the management of the marine scale fishery in a Minister of Fisheries' press release on 23 April 1980. Of these announced measures, the Government has

agreed that the proposed areas in which netting will be prohibited will not be proclaimed before there is further consultation with industry. With the passage of the Fisheries Act Amendment Bill, 1980, it is the Government's intention that all other provisions of this package relating to commercial fishermen in the marine scale fishery will come into force at the next licence reissue. Once the commercial controls have been effected, the Government intends to proceed with regulations on recreational gear. Until such regulations have been promulgated, the Government is continuing to receive representations from recreational interests.

#### FISHING

In reply to the **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS** (11 June).

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** There are no feasibility fishing ventures operating at present off South Australia. Some further feasibility studies by a trawler from the DALMOP group are expected later this year. Results of this year's feasibility studies on squid are still being assessed and further prediction on benefits from this fishery must await final reports from the companies involved.

#### NET FISHING

In reply to the **Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON** (5 June).

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** The Cabinet decision of 21 April 1980 on the marine scale fishery was not subject to a family impact statement. It is not considered that those decisions would in any way increase risks to persons engaged in recreational fishing. It is the Government's intention that matters coming before Cabinet from 1 July 1980 will be subject to appropriate family impact assessment and this would, of course, apply to decisions on management of fisheries.

#### DIRECTOR OF FISHERIES

In reply to the **Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON** (5 June).

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** The newly appointed Director of Fisheries has no formal qualifications in fisheries biology. He does have a degree in economics from the University of Queensland, and has had practical experience both with the commercial fishing industry and the Federal Government in fisheries management, fisheries economics and public administration. The Government considered 11 applicants. Four were interviewed, one of whom was a South Australian public servant.

#### REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them the answers to 12 questions without notice asked of me by various members during the last two weeks of the previous session. Written answers have already been supplied to the honourable members concerned.

Leave granted.

#### CIGARETTES

In reply to the **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS** (5 June).

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** I am advised by my colleague, the Minister of Health that this item was not

fully addressed at the conference, owing to the pressure of time. However, it was referred to the Standing Committee of Health Ministers' Conference for the development of revised terms of reference which could allow the matters of advertising in the printed media, labelling with tar and nicotine content and differential excise, to be fully considered by the Working Party on Cigarette Advertising.

The Health Ministers agreed to meet six monthly and the next scheduled meeting to discuss these matters will be in March 1981.

#### FEMALE CIRCUMCISION

In reply to the **Hon. ANNE LEVY** (5 June).

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** My colleague, the Hon. Minister of Health advises that inquiries made at Adelaide's major hospitals reveal that this operation has not been performed in recent years. My advisers are of the opinion that it has never been performed in Adelaide.

To my knowledge, there is no community pressure to introduce this operation and I therefore see no reason to introduce legislation which would make the procedure illegal. I understand that this is a tribal custom practised in some parts of Africa and Asia, but I do not believe that it is a practice performed in the Western world.

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR AND INDUSTRY

In reply to the **Hon. G. L. BRUCE** (11 June).

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** My colleague, the Minister of Industrial Affairs advises that there has been no cut-back in the staff of the Industrial Branch of the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment and the staff complement of 21 field officers, that is, 19 investigation officers and 2 assistant investigation officers, has remained constant over the past three years.

You will no doubt be interested to know that the number of written complaints alleging breaches of awards received at this department in 1979 increased by 8 per cent over the 1978 figure, and the amount of arrears of wages collected rose by 31 per cent to \$347 835.

#### KANGAROO ISLAND LAND

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** My colleague the Minister of Agriculture advises that the Crown Law Office has in essence recommended against the unconditional release of the report until at least the Crown appeal in the Johnson case has been heard. However, the Minister intends to canvass with the Minister of Lands the possibility of 'prematurely' releasing the report. No decision can be given until the Minister of Lands returns to Adelaide in early August 1980.

#### LIVE SHEEP EXPORTS

In reply to the **Hon. N. K. FOSTER** (5 June).

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** My colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, has provided the reply to the question without notice on 5 June 1980, in regard to live sheep exports. For the year ended 30 June 1980, Saudi Arabia accounted for 21.6 per cent of Australia's live sheep trade; 425 000 of these sheep were derived from South Australia, representing 22.8 per cent of live sheep exports from the State. There are two companies operating out of Western Australia, one is completely owned by Arabs including the

shipping company and on-shore facility in Saudi Arabia. The other company is owned by an Australian stock company with Arab interests. This leads to a monopoly with respect to dictating the price paid within Saudi Arabia. One of the companies mentioned is the major exporter of sheep from South Australia.

Fresh meat is still relatively cheap in most major Middle East markets and is subsidised by the various Governments. Occasional reports of Australian sheep selling for prices as high as \$500 each are entirely unfounded. However, such prices can be paid on or near special religious occasions, such as the Eid Feast, but only for entire male animals that are acceptable for sacrificial purposes. These animals must be "as born", which automatically excludes tail-docking, castration and ear-marking. These perfect animals are intended solely for ritual slaughter. Australian animals have not been used for this purpose as our management techniques automatically render our animals unsuitable. Sheep for this purpose are normally fat tail sheep and if not supplied locally are imported from the Sudan, Somalia and Ethiopia.

Current reported prices paid by butchers ex-holding yards for Australian sheep within the region range from \$US53 per head in Bahrain to \$US105 per head in Saudi Arabia. A rule of thumb estimate of the landed cost of sheep in this region is between \$US60 and \$US65 per head depending on the method of shipment. Handling and feeding cost vary between receiving areas, though more costly in Saudi Arabia than Bahrain. The accrued benefits to the Australian sheep industry are far reaching. Before the existence of this trade, aged wethers were of little value bringing average prices of \$2.50 to \$3.50 per head through saleyards and in many cases were being allowed to die in the paddock. As the export trade developed these prices rose to over \$20 per head. As a result aged wethers have become difficult to procure in large numbers. A floor price has now been created for shipping wethers and sheep and production has changed its bias and now tends to produce animals more specifically suited to this trade.

With respect to live sheep exports re-entering South Australian ports, this is totally banned. Quarantine requirements imposed upon animals loaded into overseas ships, which is the responsibility of the Commonwealth Department of Health, Animal Quarantine Division, specifically prohibit any re-landing of live animals loaded on to such ships. The reason for this ruling is that stock carrying vessels, although cleaned are not required to be disinfected and the danger of such diseases as foot and mouth, prohibit any re-entry of such animals.

#### ORGAN TRANSPLANTS

In reply to the **Hon. L. H. DAVIS** (5 June).

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** My colleague, the Minister of Health, informs me that the Human Tissue Transplantation Legislation as recommended by the Australian Law Reform Commission is one of a number of legislative matters which were pending at the time the Government came to office, and which are being progressively reviewed. The Minister hopes to make a submission to Cabinet in the near future for legislation to be drafted along the lines recommended by the Law Reform Commission.

#### APHIDS

In reply to the **Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON** (11 June).

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** On 30 June 1980, the special funds from State and Commonwealth sources for pasture

aphid control research ceased. A special task force was established with these funds and many aspects of control examined such as the development and release of parasites and the screening and breeding of new medic and lucerne varieties with resistance to the aphids. The work of this task force reached its most active peak during the 1978-79 financial year when on average 45 officers were employed on aphid control work or associated programmes. During that financial year \$564 946 was spent on wages and operating lines and \$97 299 on capital items.

After 30 June 1980, the work will be continued within the Pasture Research Section of the Department with a staff of approximately 24. Fortunately, this programme has been of such a high standard that strong financial support has been given by industry and, with funds from State Revenue, approximately \$370 000 will be available for salaries and operating lines to enable the work to continue. Far from being phased out the projects will be actively continued. New directions of the aphid control work will be developed including the search for different pasture species resistant to the aphids besides resistant lucerne and medic varieties. The recently found pea aphid will also become a part of the research programme.

As the Hon. B. A. Chatterton has pointed out, new resistant lucerne and medic varieties have already been developed and these are in various stages of being released to commerce. Contrary to his fears however, their release at present is not being delayed by legal questions.

#### FOREST HARVESTING

In reply to the Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (10 June).

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** The Minister of Forests has held discussions with the South-East Log Hauliers Association and these discussions have led to further meetings between members of the association and departmental officers wherein basic principles are being established.

It is not expected that all harvesting and hauling of Woods and Forests Department logs for the financial year 1980-81 will be let on open tender. The Government supports the open tender system in principle but is aware of a number of criteria needing to be met in implementation of the system.

#### EXTENSION BRANCH

In reply to the Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (11 June).

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** I am advised by my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, that it is not intended to hand over the production of extension material to private enterprise.

#### IRAQI FARMING PROJECT

In reply to the Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (11 June).

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** I am advised by my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, that the reply to the honourable member's question is "Yes".

#### CITRUS MARKETING

In reply to the Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (11 June).

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** The Minister of Agriculture is still consulting with the citrus industry on aspects of the

McAskill Report. Discussions thus far indicate some re-organisation of the industry will proceed but on a stage by stage basis.

#### ABORIGINAL AND HISTORIC RELICS

In reply to the Hon. J. R. CORNWALL (11 June).

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** The following answers are provided in response to your question without notice on 11 June, 1980 concerning Aboriginal and historic relics.

1. The Heritage Unit and the Aboriginal and Historic Relics Unit of the Department for the Environment have been amalgamated and the combined unit is now referred to as the 'Heritage Unit'.

2. A proclamation date is still under consideration.

3. Vide. No. 1.

4. Five people of Aboriginal origin are employed in the Heritage Unit. Four are Rangers Grade I (RA-1). Three of these positions were recently created to facilitate the employment of three Aboriginals who had been employed by the department for the past three years under an Aboriginal Ranger Training Scheme, and had completed their training. One person is a Clerical Officer Grade I (CO-1) employed for 12 months under the National Employment Scheme for Aboriginals (N.E.S.A.).

#### QUESTIONS RESUMED

##### APHIDS

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** I seek leave to ask the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a question about aphids.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** Yesterday, I asked the Minister a question on the run-down of the Aphid Task Force, and I was rather surprised that about an hour ago the Minister of Agriculture abused his position as a Minister by using a Ministerial statement in another place to make an attack on that question and on me.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** When did you say it happened?

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** It happened today.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** Did he get pulled up by the Speaker?

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** I believe that the Speaker did reprimand him.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Hon. Mr. Chatterton has sought and been granted leave to explain his question. The Leader was not given such leave.

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** The Minister also said on the *Country Hour* today, in response to a question that I asked yesterday, that the Aphid Task Force was being wound up because its job had been completed. He also implied that the breeding of aphid resistant varieties was in no way connected with the job of the task force and the programme that it undertook to develop and distribute parasites for the aphid throughout South Australia.

The clear implication of this statement on today's *Country Hour* programme is that the department will not be carrying on the sort of work that the task force was doing in multiplying and distributing these parasites throughout South Australia. I believe that the CSIRO has produced some additional biological control agents for the spotted alfalfa aphid, the blue green aphid, and the pea aphid. Will the Minister say whether that implication is correct, and whether the statement made on the *Country*

*Hour* this morning means that the department will no longer be carrying out tasks that the Aphid Task Force carried out in breeding and distributing these biological control agents in South Australia?

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

### POSSUMS

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Environment, a question on urban possums.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** I recently received a letter from a constituent writing on behalf of all metropolitan area residents who have a possum problem. The letter states:

I am writing to inquire whether you can take some action in connection with residents within the metropolitan area having to endure the annoyance of possums damaging their property.

Two years ago possums damaged our house and it cost us over \$300 to renovate and redecorate the area they had spoilt. The have now returned and once more we will have to spend about the same amount. We may also have to employ a pest control firm to catch and remove these animals, which is a costly business.

If the Government is so concerned that these "pests" shall be unharmed surely it should be their responsibility to catch them and also to compensate the residents for any damage done to their property.

I would like to point out that if I were to go around doing so much damage and making so much noise in the early hours of the morning I would soon get into trouble with the authorities and pay a penalty.

I would be grateful if you could look into this matter, which I understand is widespread in the metropolitan area, and see what action could be taken to alleviate the annoyance and worry caused by these "pests".

I will not give the constituent's name. My first reaction to that as an animal lover was that I was very much on the side of the possums. However, I can understand that in some areas they do cause problems.

Will the Minister say whether possums are protected in any way under the National Parks and Wildlife Act? Do they constitute a significant nuisance to householders in the metropolitan area? If so, what action, if any, can be taken or contemplated to humanely and effectively control the urban possum population?

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** I will consult with my colleague who, I am sure, will look into the matter as requested and bring back a reply.

### BUS STOP SEATS

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, a question on seats at bus stops.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** I am sure that I am not alone in having noticed people standing at bus stops even though there may be a seat at the stop where they could sit down. I have frequently noticed this, and recently the cause became apparent. Whilst many seats at bus stops are relatively new and in good condition and provide shelter

for people waiting for public transport, there are quite a number of bus stops that are served by seats that are far from being in that category. Indeed, there are seats at bus stops that have no shelter at all and where all paint or varnish has long since vanished from the wood, where the wood is splintered and rotting and extremely unpleasant to look at. I can well understand that no-one would want to sit on such a surface if they had any respect for their garments at all. I particularly fear that loose-weave material could be caught and damaged. The state of some of these seats would be absolutely lethal to nylon stockings. If the Minister wishes to check on this matter I suggest he try bus stops 6 and 11 on line 19, as they are good examples of what I am referring to. Will the Minister of Transport investigate this question and provide information on any programme to upgrade seats at bus stops? Will he inform us when we can expect decent seats for people to sit on whilst waiting for buses throughout the metropolitan area?

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

### APPRAISERS ACT AND AUCTIONEERS ACT REPEAL BILL

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT (Minister of Community Welfare)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to repeal the Appraisers Act, 1934-1961; to repeal the Auctioneers Act, 1934-1961. Read a first time.

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** I move:

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

It proposes the repeal of the Appraisers Act, 1934-1961, and the repeal of the Auctioneers Act, 1934-1961. The Auctioneers Act was introduced to consolidate South Australian statutes of 1862 and 1920, which in turn consolidated earlier legislation based on English statutes. The English precedents required auctioneers to be licensed and made provision for licence fees and renewals, in lieu of the former practice of imposing duty on auction sales. The main purpose of all these statutes appears to have been to raise revenue, although the Auctioneers Act also provides that only fit and proper persons may be licensed. No other licensing criteria are provided for.

Similarly, the Appraisers Act was introduced to consolidate earlier statutes, based on English precedents, dealing with appraisers. The main purpose of the legislation, as with the Auctioneers Act, was to raise revenue. The person issuing the licence must be satisfied as to the applicant's character and qualifications, but no other licensing criteria are established. Applications for licences under the Auctioneers Act are made to the local court of limited jurisdiction nearest to the applicant's usual place of residence. In practice, most applications are heard by magistrates in the Adelaide Local Court. The magistrate issues a certificate that the applicant is a fit and proper person to be licensed; the certificate and required fee are then presented to the cashier in the Commercial Division of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs, who issues the necessary licence. Licences under the Appraisers Act are issued by the same cashier, but there is no court hearing.

These two statutes provide a scheme for the licensing of auctioneers and appraisers, the payment of licence fees, renewal of licences, exemption of certain persons (for example, municipal officers), and prescribe penalties for operating without a licence.

Unlike most occupational licensing statutes, no body is established under the Acts to hear applications or to regulate the conduct of licensees, nor is there any power to discipline licensees if proper cause exists. In effect, the protection afforded to members of the public from objectionable behaviour of auctioneers or appraisers is negligible. Once a licence has been issued, there is no power vested in any authority to cancel or suspend it. Very few complaints are received about these classes of occupation. The complaints that are received concern auctioneers and valuers of land and auctioneers of secondhand motor vehicles, and these occupations are already subject to stringent controls under the Land and Business Agents Act, 1973-1979, the Land Valuers Licensing Act, 1969-1974, and the Secondhand Motor Vehicles Act, 1971.

There are approximately 100 licensed appraisers in South Australia. This number includes many persons also licensed under the Land Valuers Licensing Act. The number of licensed auctioneers is much greater, being approximately 1 000. Most of these, however, are licensed or registered under the Land and Business Agents Act and are subject to the controls established under that Act.

The number of persons who are regulated only by the Auctioneers Act and the Appraisers Act is therefore relatively small. Although some revenue is raised, these Acts do not provide an effective method of regulating these persons or protecting the public from any undesirable activities. Accordingly, the Government considers that there is no valid reason for retaining these Acts and proposes that they be repealed as one step in the process of giving effect to its policy of eliminating unnecessary regulation of trade and industry. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the repeal of the Appraisers Act, 1934-1961. Clause 3 provides for the repeal of the Auctioneers Act, 1934-1961.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT (Minister of Community Welfare)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Prices Act, 1948-1980. Read a first time.

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** I move:

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

The purpose of this small amending Bill is to facilitate the presentation of one annual report to the Minister by the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs relating to his administration of the Consumer Transactions Act, 1972-1980, the Consumer Credit Act, 1972-1980, the Residential Tenancies Act, 1978, and the Prices Act, 1948-1980. At present, the Commissioner is required to submit reports under the first three Acts as soon as is practicable after the thirtieth day of June in each year; however, section 18b of the Prices Act requires him to report as soon as is practicable after the thirty-first day of December. The Government is of the view that it would be convenient to have all four reports submitted at the one time, and so this Bill amends section 18b accordingly. However, it is proposed that the report under the Prices Act for 1980 be submitted as is presently required.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 18b of the principal Act, so that the report required under that section be submitted as soon as practicable after the thirtieth day of June of each year.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

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

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General):** I move:  
*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It provides for a further \$350 000 000 to enable the Public Service to carry out its normal functions until assent is received to the Appropriation Bill. Honourable members will note that the amount of the Bill now before the Council represents a considerable increase on the first Supply Bill for this year (\$220 000 000) and the second Supply Bill last year (\$270 000 000). The reason for this increase is that two innovations designed to give Parliament the opportunity for a more meaningful discussion of the Budget Estimates, could result in the passage of the Appropriation Bill taking longer than has been customary.

In accordance with undertakings given prior to the State election in September last year, the Government has initiated work to supplement the Budget documents with a presentation in programme form and to establish estimates committees of the House to consider the Budget. The Government is in no doubt that, over a period of time, the operation of the estimates committees will interact with the gradual process of change in presentation to produce a more effective and efficient approach to consideration of the Budget. However, in this first year of new initiatives, the Government expects that there will be a certain amount of "feeling the way" and, for that reason, assent to the Appropriation Bill could possibly be received somewhat later than usual.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from 13 August. Page 294.)

**The Hon. G. L. BRUCE:** I rise to support the motion that the Address in Reply as read be adopted. In doing so, I also add my condolences to those of the Governor in referring to the death of the former member of the House of Assembly, Maurice William Parish. I find it fitting that a member of another place between 1915 and 1918 should still be remembered in this time and age. It speaks well of the Governor that such a reference should be made to a former member.

In his Opening Speech His Excellency certainly touched on many parts of the legislative programme that the Government intends to act upon in this session. It is hoped that those parts that relate to the betterment of the people who live in South Australia are acted upon quickly and promptly. The Governor states:

My Government is anxious to ensure that the State will not lack people with the very specialised skills that are so necessary for the purposes of modern society. It intends to introduce an Industrial and Commercial Training Act to ensure that adequate attention is given to increasing the number of skilled tradesmen either through the apprenticeship system or through appropriate alternative methods of training. Thus the importance of vocational training will receive a very significant emphasis.

It is to be hoped that the legislation does not work against

people who are already in work, because I have memories of previous legislation that was enacted to ensure that unemployed people became part of the work force but, because of the way the legislation was enacted, people already in employment had their employment terminated so that employers could receive Government benefits by employing young people who were commencing their first job. At the end of such assistance and training they were dumped and told that they were not suitable. The same programme was then repeated by the employer. What was happening was that employers were using avenues made available by the Government to obtain cheap labour.

I also wonder how the Government relates to the lack of skilled tradesmen when venturing out on projects such as Redcliff. I understand that the lead time for Redcliff will be a number of years. At the moment they are just getting the infrastructure ready for that project, and that will be beyond the scope of what is presently in train. I will be waiting with interest to see how the Government implements that project. In his Speech, the Governor also stated:

Legislation will be introduced to grant to the Pitjantjatjara people inalienable freehold title to land in the Far North-West as agreed by negotiation between my Government and the Pitjantjatjara people. The legislation will include conditions for access, exploration and mining and provisions for arbitration of disputes.

I hope that the legislation proves to be all that the Pitjantjatjara hope it will be and that it does not become a tame, watered down sop to those Aboriginal people who seek rights and justices that they should have received many years ago. During a recent brief visit to the Northern Territory I received the impression that the only land rights that a large number of the white population thought the Aborigines were entitled to was a block of land 6ft. x 2ft.

What I found and saw in the Northern Territory was most depressing because what was once a proud and self-sufficient race has been reduced by the adoption and bastardisation of the white man's way of life. As a recent race of land grabbers, we have failed to realise that Aborigines have held in trust the land in question for thousands of years, and it is in the same condition today as it was in the first day they inherited it many thousands of years ago. That is something the white man will never be able to lay claim to. In the short time the white man has been custodian of this great land we have seen fit to fence it, dig it up and turn it into a huge suburban backyard. I suggest that 10 000 years from now there is no way that the land that will be handed down to our future generations will be in as good a state and condition as the land we have seen fit to call our own and have grasped from the Aborigines.

In his Speech the Governor also stated that his Government was on the threshold of mineral development and he referred to the Cooper Basin, the Redcliff area, Lake Frome, and the mining of copper, uranium and gold at Roxby Downs and the amount of exploration that it will entail.

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** Mr. Acting President, I draw your attention to the state of the Council.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**The Hon. G. L. BRUCE:** The Liberal Party has consistently maintained that the Party I belong to is against uranium mining, but that is not so. The Labor Party is opposed to the nuclear industry as such, and until such time that it can be clearly demonstrated that the waste from nuclear powerhouses poses no threat to us, our environment or our peace, not just in Australia but to all the peoples of the world—

**The Hon. R. C. DeGaris:** How can you be convinced?

**The Hon. G. L. BRUCE:** I will be convinced as soon as it can be demonstrated that waste can be disposed of safely without affecting the environment and the people living in it. As yet I understand that there is no safe way of disposing of that waste. It has been suggested that holes could be dug to bury the waste, and the Japanese have suggested dumping it in the Pacific Ocean, but I do not agree that that is a safe way of preserving this world for future generations.

**The Hon. R. C. DeGaris:** Then you will never agree with uranium mining.

**The Hon. G. L. BRUCE:** I will agree if I can be convinced that the waste can be disposed of safely. I understand that a new process has been developed called Synroc. That process involves drilling a hole deep into the bowels of the earth and depositing the waste therein. If that process proves to be successful, perhaps I would be convinced. However, the present state of technology does not convince me that it is safe to dispose of nuclear waste safely. As I have said, my Party cannot condone the mining of uranium until such safeguards exist. It has not been shown that those safeguards do exist. The Governor's remarks prove what I indicated previously in regard to looking after and holding our environment. That does not appear to be as important to certain sections of the community as it is to others. It appears that certain sections of the community are prepared to produce radioactive waste and desolation for future generations. The Governor continued:

Inter-governmental approval has recently been obtained for the drafting of legislation to amend the River Murray Waters Agreement to enable the River Murray Commission to take water quality into account in its planning. My Government gives a very high priority to the management of the Murray River which is in effect South Australia's lifeline, and will be seeking an early agreement to enable the legislation to be brought before Parliament. The very important salinity control programme is continuing. Major aspects of this programme include the \$40 000 000 Noora scheme to divert saline drainage water from the Renmark, Berri and Cobdogla Irrigation Areas; the Rufus River Groundwater Interception Scheme (estimated to cost \$2 500 000) which will be commenced this year by the River Murray Commission; and a major programme of research and monitoring of Murray River salinity and its effect on irrigated agricultural lands.

That is an example of what I have been attempting to illustrate. We have a moral obligation to maintain and improve our natural resources, not only for our benefit but also for that of future generations. I wish the Government every success in its endeavours, and I trust that it seeks the help and co-operation of the other States involved in the great Murray River system. It is also interesting to note, in relation to tourism, that other States do not have sewerage controls on houseboats or other tourist activities connected with the Murray River. Such controls should be uniform throughout the length and breadth of the Murray River. All States should contribute to such a scheme to help keep the Murray River pollution-free. The Governor's Speech continues:

My Government is pledged to maintain the high priority of education within its total programme. A Committee of Inquiry into Education in South Australia has been established, and will investigate the development of school curricula for modern needs and the most effective use of available resources. It is pleasing to note that pupil/teacher ratios have already improved, grants to ethnic groups teaching languages have been doubled, and school

equipment grants have been partly restored. Free book allowances have been substantially increased and living away from home allowances for students from remote areas of the State have been significantly lifted to \$500.

I believe that is one of the most important parts of the Governor's Speech. Nothing can be achieved without a well educated and informed society. It is tragic that we are turning out students who have a good education but who, through no fault of their own, find it impossible to obtain employment. Because of that they are denied the fruits of what this society, with its modern technology, is capable of producing.

I believe that failure to come to grips with the unemployment problem will eventually lead to the breaking down of our society, because in this well-educated society people will not be prepared to exist in a have and have-not situation. Perhaps education is the key that will unlock the door for that society—a highly computerised and technology-oriented society. What should we do about leisure, computers and longer life spans? That question can only be tackled by a well-educated group of people. Our society depends on the raw material of the people who make up that society, and it cannot afford to neglect the education of that raw material.

The bandying about of 7 000 new jobs promised by this Government during the last session achieved nothing. It is high time that the Federal and State Governments of Australia stopped using unemployment as a type of political football. They should do everything in their power, even to the extent of taking Opposition Parties into their confidence, to try to overcome this festering sore of unemployment. If that cannot be done, sufficient remuneration should be offered to ensure that the people concerned have a reasonable standard of living and can contribute as consumers. Poverty in a country the size of Australia with a population of 14 000 000 people and its huge mineral and agricultural wealth should be unheard of and should not be tolerated.

In his Speech the Governor also referred to the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs. He said that the Government is undertaking a review of many of the Statutes with a view to ensuring that the legislative provision achieves a fair balance between the interests of commerce and industry and the interests of consumers. It is envisaged that various legislative reforms will be involved in that review. I trust that that legislation does not weaken laws that benefit the consumers, who I believe have for years borne the brunt of shonky consumer transactions.

The report of the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs for the year ended 30 June 1979 states:

This is the sixth annual report on the operation of the Consumer Credit and Consumer Transactions Acts, 1972-1973, which were proclaimed on 3 September 1973— and I draw that date to the attention of honourable members because I intend later to comment on that aspect of the law governing people—

Some aspects of the practical application of the safeguards provided under the Fair Credit Reports Act, which was proclaimed in April, 1975, are included because of their close association with the provision of credit. The number of formal complaints received by the branch relating to matters governed by the Consumer Credit and Consumer Transactions Acts, during the year ended 30 June 1979, was 1137, an increase of 533 (or 88 per cent) compared to the previous year's total. Details of these statistics are set out in Appendix 1. During the year the total number of telephone and personal inquiries received by the Adelaide office of the Consumer Services Branch concerning credit matters was

5 721 which was 17 per cent higher than the previous year's total. The regional offices of the branch at Port Augusta, Mount Gambier and Berri dealt with 753 inquiries. As in previous years, the basis on which credit charges are rebated in the event of early termination of a credit contract or consumer lease, accounted for more inquiries (832) than any other category, being 12.9 per cent of all inquiries received.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** Mr. Acting President, I draw your attention to the state of the Council.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**The Hon. G. L. BRUCE:** The report continues:

Four categories, namely, rebate of credit charges (832 inquiries), seizure of goods under consumer mortgages (798), application for relief against consequences of breach of contract (706) and advertising stipulations (354), accounted for approximately 42 per cent of all inquiries. Although inquiries and formal complaints relating to credit matters accounted for only 5.5 per cent of the total received by the branch, the issues involved were usually complex and time consuming, often requiring lengthy legal opinion.

From this it can be seen that consumer legislation is filling a need. No-one could disagree with that. It should be fair to both sides, but knowing the philosophy and sentiments of this Government one can only hope that the consumer of South Australia is given the needed protection when this legislation is reviewed. The Governor also stated:

Child and family health services are to be rationalized and improved. As a first step, a merger will take place between the family and child health services of the South Australian Health Commission and the Mothers and Babies' Health Association.

My Government is anxious to ensure that drug abuse in the community is minimized. In accordance with the recommendations of the Royal Commission into the Non-medical Use of Drugs, a Drug Education Liaison Committee has been established to co-ordinate and extend the activities of Government and voluntary agencies in drug education and counselling. Programmes conducted by the committee will be monitored and evaluated and should provide a sound guide on which to base future action against drug abuse. In addition, legislation to give effect to certain other recommendations of the Royal Commission into the Non-medical Use of Drugs will be introduced during the current Session.

New legislation governing food standards will be introduced. A recent conference of Health Ministers has accepted a model draft in principle after some five years of discussions on the subject. The new Act will provide for a uniform approach to regulating the composition of foods, labelling, hygiene and other matters.

The area of drug abuse must be of concern to all. I often wonder just how much of a lift this is given by the despair and helplessness that people who are unemployed must feel. The inter-relationship of these matters probably cannot be dismissed. I have seen the report of the Commissioner of Police for the year ended 13 June 1978 which is the latest report we have and which shows that the number of crimes related to drugs is way up. In a reference titled "Drugs", the following is stated:

The activities of the Drug Squad have continued at a high level this year with emphasis being placed on the disruption of the importation, cultivation, manufacture and distribution of drugs. In consequence, several large cultivations of Indian hemp were located and the offenders dealt with. In addition, there has been a significant disruption of the trafficking in hard drugs. Some of the more important operations were:

The arrest of a number of heroin traffickers which has so far resulted in one of the offenders being imprisoned for four years.

The discovery of an Indian hemp cultivation in scrub

country near Tintinara. A total of 45 000 plants, with a street value of \$10 000 000 were destroyed. Three men were arrested and charged in relation to this matter.

On 28 September 1977 South Australian and New South Wales Police combined in an operation near Coffs Harbour in New South Wales. This resulted in the seizure of 250 000 Indian hemp plants and the arrest of six persons, including a notorious criminal and drug trafficker.

The arrest of five persons at Keswick following the discovery of 220 pounds of Indian hemp. The seizure of the drug was one of the largest in its dried form.

The discovery and seizure of 8 261 Indian hemp plants at Murray Bridge—one person arrested.

The discovery and seizure of 4 300 Indian hemp plants at Berri—two persons arrested.

Two separate kidnappings emphasise the growing violence within the so-called "drug scene". Both offences were committed by known drug offenders or known drug traffickers. A total of six persons were arrested following police investigations into the incidents.

Drug offences detected by police again increased this year with the biggest increase being in the category of "Cultivate Indian Hemp" which was up from 74 in 1976-77 to 233 in the current year; an increase of 214.86 per cent. Details of the arrests for varying types of offences connected with drugs were:

	1977-78	1976-77	1975-76
Smoke and possess Indian hemp	1 323	1 281	554
Use and possess narcotics (Heroin, morphine, etc.) . . . . .	78	70	45
Supply drugs of all kinds . . . . .	47	10	31
Use and possess L.S.D. . . . .	Nil	23	14
Possess pipe, utensils, etc. . . . .	212	—	—
Larceny of drugs from motor vehicles . . . . .	32	84	2
*False pretences . . . . .	5	—	4
*Forge and utter . . . . .	13	3	7
Cultivate Indian hemp . . . . .	233	74	65
Use and possess cocaine . . . . .	1	3	7
Chemist shop breakings and larceny . . . . .	119	135	51
Surgery breakings and larceny . . . . .	137	231	28
	2 200	1 914	808

The cost to the community in this area would be hard to estimate because that not only have we the cost of apprehension but also the associated costs of rehabilitation and education. Also, we have the destroyed lives of those who finish up on the so-called "hard drugs". Indian hemp has had the largest percentage increase of all drugs on the drug scene. Eventually society, through our Parliament, I believe, will have to come to grips with just what it is going to do with this drug, as it would appear that its cultivation and use are becoming so widespread as to bring the laws relating to it into disrepute.

His Excellency the Governor also went on to refer to tourism, which is now acknowledged as one of the fastest growing industries in the world. He said that it is important that this State should take advantage of present trends. He continued:

My Government has called for a review of the Department of Tourism. The committee of review will consider ways and means by which the effectiveness of the department in promoting and encouraging tourism can be enhanced, and the great potential of this State, as a centre of tourist activity, can be realised.

This is a most difficult area. One must marry the needs and aspirations of people living in the State to just what amount of intrusion is to be tolerated in the name of

tourism. I am reminded of a recent cartoon which I saw and which shows a couple talking, one saying to the other at a scenic spot, "This was a beautiful tourist spot until the tourists discovered it." They are surrounded by litter and garish tourist-hawking paraphernalia shops, with the whole scene completely commercialised.

Organised and planned growth in tourism is of vital importance. Haphazard and non-regulated growth is to be discouraged. It must be done in a spirit of co-operation and planning, with those people living in areas that attract tourists. I will watch and wait with interest to see how the Government acts on this matter.

It appears from the Governor's Speech that we will be looking at a large number of Bills this session. I trust that this does not involve the absurd practice of sitting into the small hours of the morning (4 a.m. and 5 a.m.). To my mind, it is ludicrous, when Parliament sits 35 days a session, for it to sit until 4 a.m. or 5 a.m. Surely the business of the Council can be better organised than this. I for one would be happy to sit on more days than to go through the stupidity of pushing Bills through in haste and sitting to ridiculous hours.

A matter of grave concern to me is the fostering of the belief that there is too much red tape and too many rules and regulations stifling our society. In this respect, I quote from the *News* editorial of 6 August 1980. Entitled "The Road to 1984", the editorial states:

Red tape is strangling us, choking industry, stifling enterprise. Most of us have known that almost instinctively for years. Now the Confederation of Australian Industry has put a figure on it—a staggering figure.

Complying with Federal and State Government regulations, feeding the bureaucracy with its pettifogging forms, costs business \$3 700 000 000 a year. Put another way, that represents \$900 per household a year, and it is a good other way to put it since it is the Australian household which ultimately has to foot the bill.

It is not only the cost of this massive indulgence in pen pushing that is alarming. What is also disturbing is the insidious way government pokes its nose into private affairs. This is true of business just as it is true of individuals in their private lives.

Some regulation is necessary, no doubt of that. But a lot is unnecessary, expensive snooping by little Hitlers. The confederation has proved anew that government by nature makes rules and regulations, and bureaucracy by nature retains them and grows cancerously to administer long after any original need has gone.

George Orwell seems to have had an uncanny sense of timing when he wrote about what kind of world that produces and called it 1984. With 40 months to go, we are well on the way.

We fail to recognise (and this has occurred in relation not only to the *News* but also to the other media in Australia) why these regulations exist. They exist because of those people in our society who deliberately set out to buck the system and to rip people off. Ignorance is no excuse for these people. To support my view that this is correct, I quote from the Department of Labour and Industry report for the year ended 31 December 1978, where, at page 30, the following appears:

Awards	1978
Number of Inspections . . . . .	12 193
Number of written complaints investigated . . . . .	1 326
Arrears of wages collected . . . . .	\$264 834
Prosecutions . . . . .	54
Long Service Leave	
Number of written complaints investigated . . . . .	51



Awards—*continued*

	1978
Number of Inspections .....	1 065
Value of long service leave .....	\$24 198
Prosecutions .....	1
Shop Trading Hours	
Number of Inspections .....	3 042
Prosecutions .....	52
Industrial Code: Re Weekend Baking of Bread	
Number of Inspections .....	56
Prosecutions .....	1

I understand that for 1979 the arrears of wages collected is higher than the \$264 834 collected in 1978. I will quote a few more paragraphs from the report, the first of which is as follows:

The statistics for 1978 show a decrease in the number of complaints alleging breaches of awards.

One would think that people were getting better. However, the report goes on to say why the decrease occurred, as follows:

This decrease has been brought about by the economic and industrial climate. There are grounds to suspect (but no proof)—

there is plenty of proof if one likes to look for it—

that some employees are working for less than the award rate without complaining, because they are afraid such a complaint may jeopardise their job security.

It is also interesting to note that the number of prosecutions because of underpayment of employees rose. Many of these cases were detected during routine checks when an investigation officer visited industrial premises without prior warning and checked employers' records of wages and hours of work.

From this, it would appear that people could be aware that they are being cheated on their wages. However, because of the fear of losing their jobs, these people are not prepared to express their concern. I have no doubt whatsoever that the majority of persons whose business books the Department of Labour and Industry inspectors random checked would resent the fact that they had been subject to this type of investigation, and would fully support the *News* editorial. I think perhaps that the boot might be on the other foot when it comes to see how the recipients of the back wages felt.

Of course, it is a different kettle of fish if the inspectors go in on a specific complaint and investigate and check time books. Then, the person involved, if he still works at the establishment, is well on the road to dismissal. Some justice! It would be interesting to ask him or her what they thought of a system that allowed them to be sacked because the wages were queried. This relates to the law and why we have it.

A brief look through the report indicates the vital areas of the work force activity on which the department has statistics. A comprehensive look at the index shows where and in what the department is involved. I have not the slightest doubt that the employers would be happy to see the department's activity and power curtailed. No doubt this Government is having pressure put on it already by those people who elected it in order to ensure that the power that the department has is curtailed.

I could not support that view and, in fact, consider that possibly the employers are getting off lightly. I see that in 1978 a total of 12 193 inspections resulted in only 54 prosecutions, and that 11 279 inspections in 1977 resulted in only 42 prosecutions. It would appear that employers have little about which to complain in this area.

I refer also to a report for the year 1978-79 from the Office of the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity, which is a very recent department. This indicates that,

unfortunately, rules and regulations are necessary to obtain justice from discrimination. A quotation from what the Commissioner said in that year's report puts emphasis on legislation and Government support to obtain progress in this field. She states:

Having served as Commissioner for Equal Opportunity for one year—

of course, this is the 1979 report—

it is obvious that the legislation, giving as it does some punitive measures, is a steady and effective way of reducing the level of discriminatory practices. Without a combination of legislation and Government support, progress towards equality of opportunity would be even slower, thereby allowing the continuance of hurtful practices and the wastage of human resources.

This is the sort of legislation that Governments must introduce. They are forced to do it because people do not practise and live by the ideals that they would like to see others perpetuate. The Commissioner continued:

For the second year in succession the work of the Equal Opportunity Division has suffered as a result of staffing shortages. In the second annual report it was noted that there was a period of four months without a Commissioner for Equal Opportunity. In the third year of operation the division was without the services of a research assistant, again leaving the operation of the division in the hands of two people for a further period of six months. Unfortunately, the staff shortage has meant the review of legislation has not been carried out to any great extent. This responsibility will be consolidated during the next year. In May 1979, a new research assistant was appointed and the division is again at the full establishment level of three people.

The second report year saw a total of 132 formal complaints being lodged with the Commissioner. This third report year has produced 197 formal complaints. The increase in numbers may be due to various reasons. The Equal Opportunity Division is becoming more widely known by its own actions in dealing with complaints, by media coverage, by contact with community groups, and by the efforts of the Education Division of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs. Towards the end of the year, leaflets explaining the terms of the Sex Discrimination Act were prepared in seven languages and will soon be distributed throughout various centres.

I have not the slightest doubt that the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity has a role to play in our society, and that role has been brought about by the lack of goodwill and understanding of people in our community who should know better. Their action or lack of action has resulted in laws and regulations in this field. One would only have to ask a woman on a good income with a steady job what she thought of not being able to obtain suitable credit rating in the community to see that a need existed for this department. Another new department would be the State Ombudsman, and referral to the report of the Ombudsman for 1978-79 shows that the Government sector is just as vulnerable to denying a fair go to the average person as is the private sector. I refer to the report which has a subheading "Year's work at a glance" and states:

The extent and outcome of the work of the current year may be gauged to some degree from the following statistical capsules:

The number of complaints registered during the year was very similar to the previous year, 1 009 as compared with 1 001 last year. In addition to these registered complaints, my office received another 3 415 contacts or enquiries which were dealt with informally, making a total of 4 424 enquiries for the year. Of complaints received and registered and which were within my jurisdiction, 48 per cent were against

State Government departments, 29 per cent against local government councils and 23 per cent against statutory authorities.

Complaints were made against 82 per cent of the State Government departments, 54 per cent of the local government councils and 18 per cent of the statutory authorities. I considered that 26.4 per cent of the complaints investigated were justified in whole or in part. There were 31.6 per cent of the complaints against local government which I considered to be justified in whole or in part; 26.6 per cent against statutory authorities and 22.1 per cent against State Government departments were, in my opinion, justified.

A vital key to how effective legislation is in this area is the fact that 26.4 per cent of the complaints investigated were justified in whole or in part. What do we do if we are to take the advice of the *News* editorial? I note in the last session of Parliament that 173 reports were tabled for the consideration of Parliament. What this effectively does, of course, is make those 173 reports public property and subject to discussion by any interested party. I noted with interest the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Davis last night regarding those reports. I am very mindful of the comments made by both the Hon. Dr. Ritson and the Hon. Ren DeGaris. The Hon. Dr. Ritson was very concerned at what the Government is capable of in respect of passing laws and regulations and was most concerned that it not be overdone. It is my belief that, while we live in a society such as ours, the minority of people who spoil it for the rest make it necessary for these red tape stifling rules and regulations to be brought in. Having said that, I am of the firm belief, as evidently is the Hon. Ren DeGaris, that the people, through the Parliament, keep a vigil on the laws and regulations that we implement, and Parliament is not by-passed in the process.

However, I believe that the Parliament is being by-passed through Executive power decision-making and Public Service machinery that is eroding the power of the Parliament to effectively debate and legislate in the interests of the people that we represent. I believe that the fundamental difference between the Party that I belong to and the Party that is in office in the Federal and South Australian sphere is adequately represented in the editorial of the *Advertiser* on Monday 4 August 1980. Headed "The Coal Miners", it refers to the current dispute between the Federal Government and some 4 000 Queensland coal miners, and states:

The Government, nevertheless, must press on with its efforts to bring some early settlement of the coal strike. The issue involved is one of principle—whether a particular group should be allowed to succeed in avoiding obligations arising from the Government's policy of closing tax loopholes. The actual amount of extra tax payable on the subsidised rents of the miners has been calculated at a mere \$20 000 or so a week. But the cost of the strike in lost coal exports exceeds \$25 000 000 a week, the Federal Government is losing \$8 600 000 a week in income tax, export duties and excise, the Queensland Government \$3 000 000 in royalties and freight and the mining companies some \$5 000 000 in profits.

These are horrifying figures, but even they do not reveal the full extent of the potential damage. There have been indications recently of growing resentment in Japan about uncertainties of supply arising from industrial disputes in Australia. In these circumstances our hold on export markets would very quickly weaken if our customers found alternative sources of supply.

What this means to me is that the Federal Government, for the six weeks that this strike has been going on, has lost by way of revenue, if it had its way, some \$120 000 from increased taxation from the subsidised rent scheme. What

it is prepared to forgo to implement its wishes to this stage is Federal Government losses in income tax, export duties and excise on coal amounting to \$48 360 000. The Queensland Government losses in royalties and freight total \$18 000 000. The mining company's loss of profit is \$30 000 000. So, to obtain some \$120 000 from the workers involved, the Government has lost \$96 360 000 plus \$150 000 in export sales of coal. To gain a proper balance of what it is all about, I refer to an article in the *Australian* on Friday 18 August 1980, headed "Cheats thwart tax cuts", and stating:

Tax cuts will be limited in this month's Budget because of massive cheating against the creaking, 44-year-old Income Tax Assessment Act. The Act, passed three years before Treasurer John Howard was born, is about as broken-down as another institution—the carrier H.M.A.S. *Melbourne*. Both are antiquated, patched-up relics which are past their prime and need replacing. Tax morale has been badly damaged by huge avoidance rip-offs costing an estimated \$1 000 000 000 over the past few years.

The report further states:

Various estimates put the annual tax avoidance and evasion loss at \$500 000 000 a year, and the sieve is still leaking. As fast as the Commissioner of Taxation and the Treasurer plug one leak, another springs up, and the process is bogged down in disputation and appeals all the way to the High Court.

It continues:

The last round of tax cuts in July cost \$640 000 000 in a full year, and still only put 85 cents a week back into the hands of 70 per cent of the work force. On average, single-income families wound up with about \$4-50 in tax cuts and family allowances. If the Government could extract fair taxes from the cheats it could repeat that sort of handout immediately. That seems unlikely because the High Court has allowed some blatantly contrived schemes to beat the system.

This week, the High Court allowed a scheme which Mr. Justice Murphy said was acknowledged as a sophisticated tax avoidance operation. Mr. Justice Murphy ruled against it. The scheme, based on complex dividend stripping, involved use of partnerships and is believed to be a precedent which could cost the Government at least \$100 000 000.

This, and the famous Curran scheme, also a winner at the High Court, is costing the Government at least \$500 000 000 a year. It is not likely that the average miner at Blackwater, Queensland, would understand the reasoning behind some of the tax avoidance schemes. But the miners, along with the rest of the community, generally get their taxes ripped out of their pay packets and are aware that they are caught in the tax system while others go scot-free.

Indeed, well-informed members of the Government acknowledge that paying tax is an option and a matter of conscience for some of the richer members of the community.

The Government has not been asleep, and it is noteworthy that Mr. Howard has launched more than 30 single attacks on schemes over the past year or so.

It is only people in the high income brackets who can afford to avoid it. The Government thinks it can get into the small bloke, the teacher or miner living in the remote areas away from facilities and the like.

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** How much do miners earn?

**The Hon. G. L. BRUCE:** The Government has described the income of miners at \$15 000 to \$25 000 a year. However, if one examines people in the higher income brackets, those income earners pay no tax at all, yet miners pay tax every week, except for the lousy subsidising of their homes in isolated Queensland.

*The Hon. L. H. Davis interjecting:*

**The Hon. G. L. BRUCE:** As soon as the Federal

Government blocks one loophole they find another. Who uses these loopholes? It is the people who support your Government. It is not the poor working people; it is not the 70 per cent of lower income earners but the people who support your type of Government. The report continues:

He has asked the Commissioner of Taxation to speed up the redrafting of section 260, which is designed as a catch-all shield against tax dodgers.

This is easier said than done, and the cream of the legal and accounting professions are burning the midnight oil plotting new capers to beat the amending legislation.

So, with at least \$500 000 000 lost before the Budget was framed, the tacticians had to proceed with the estimated funds in hand.

It is interesting to note in the report that the places where tax is not avoided are in relation to those goods and products that are used by the average citizen. The report continues:

Beer drinkers contributed \$982 000 000 in last year's Budget estimates and that will probably grow by about the inflation rate this year, 10 per cent.

It has been mooted that super beer might be taxed higher while low alcohol could be given some concessions to cut the road toll and improve the nation's livers.

Potable spirits last year were expected to raise \$105 000 000 and it is unlikely this will be increased because whisky, at about \$12 a bottle, is out of the reach of all but the wealthy or truly dedicated drinkers.

Tax on tobacco, which raised \$675 000 000 might be increased to please the anti-smoking lobby.

Normal petroleum products were worth \$956 000 000 and the controversial crude oil levy pulled in about \$2 400 000 000—

Who uses the bulk of that petrol, and who pays for it? It is the working man with no chance of avoiding tax. The report continues:

As OPEC will probably continue to lift the price of crude oil, the levy could raise more than \$3 500 000 000 in 1980-81.

To get back to my original point, the fundamental differences between the two Parties is that the present Government, both Federally and State, gives the appearance and the fact to the point that they expect the ordinary average wage-earner to foot the bill rather than the wealthy individual firms and companys, which could and should pay their way in the taxation stakes.

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** Rubbish!

**The Hon. G. L. BRUCE:** Why does the honourable member make that interjection? Does he still believe after what I have read to the Council that the ordinary average working man is not paying his way in the taxation stakes? I say the person who is fleecing the taxation stakes is the big person.

I recently had the experience of travelling in the country, where it cost me \$4 more to fill my car with petrol than it did in Adelaide. That was just for one fill, yet country people have no choice and must pay this price all the time. Surely there could be some sort of justice that allows country people some sort of rebate for working and living in areas without the perks that city living people can offer.

My Party does its best to help people, and our policies and aims are geared to this philosophy. Cuts such as these that we saw from this Government in death duties and gift duty mean that a greater burden must be placed on the working-class taxpayers of this State and Australia to provide services in all of those fields that Governments finance or to even maintain current services.

Just this week I had the opportunity to speak to a migrant who is having difficulty obtaining employment.

This migrant who is not on a tourist visa but who has recognised migrant status has been in Australia for two months and is presently unemployed. However, he was recently offered two weeks work without pay to see whether he was any good, yet this man had served 10 years in the trade of his choosing in his own country, and his experience was made clear to the person offering him two weeks work without pay. To his credit, this migrant refused the offer, which highlights man's inhumanity to his fellow man!

I cannot understand how this situation can develop. This migrant has paid his fare and is unemployed with a wife and two children. By the time he meets his commitments he is living on \$92 a fortnight. The Governor stated that the Government wanted to increase the potential for people getting work in skilled trades. How can this skilled migrant not obtain work and exist on \$45 to \$46 a week? It is beyond me.

It is time our society showed a willingness to do unto others as they would have done to them. I believe that the \$900 that the editorial said it could cost each householder to police rules and regulations is possibly well spent. Without spending that \$900 and without having such rules and regulations, which seem to restrict us at every opportunity, people who cannot help themselves would be ripped off. I wish the Government every success in bringing unemployment down in the 1980's not just for its sake but for the sake of our community.

On a more personal basis I deplore the publicity that the Minister of Health has sought to bring into her campaign to end discrimination against women in the work place. I believe it did her and those women she purports to represent little good.

I remember some time ago having raised the issue of women having to work topless and in see-through clothing to wait on tables. Since then I have had it drawn to my attention that now they even go bottomless.

Surely as Minister of Health her efforts to assist women could be better served to see what her Government could do to stamp out this discriminatory and undesirable practice in the food and drink serving areas of our State.

Prior to entering this Council, I read an article by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris about what a useful purpose this Council served as a House of Review. I agree that this is a House of Review but that little changes in our review of Bills before us. The Bills before us seem to say the same thing—we are locked into a system.

**The Hon. M. B. Cameron:** That is because since we have been in Government they are so good when they get here!

**The Hon. G. L. BRUCE:** I wonder how the Hon. Mr. Milne feels about having to make decisions on which way to vote.

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** Do you think that the Legislative Council is justified?

**The Hon. G. L. BRUCE:** I have not finished. I do not believe it is a House of Review, because it is bound by the dogma of Party politics.

**The Hon. M. B. Cameron:** On your side.

**The Hon. G. L. BRUCE:** On both sides. We are both bound by Party politics.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. G. L. BRUCE:** I welcome such interjections. I refer to a Bill being debated in this Council. The honourable member claims that we are not bound by Party politics, yet all honourable members know that we on this side are bound by Party politics. Indeed, when one honourable member opposite went to cross the floor he was threatened with the withdrawal of his preselection at the next election. If Government members and Opposi-

tion members are not effectively policed, then I do not know what is happening.

I agree with the Hon. Mr. DeGaris when he said that it was a House of Review. It was a House of Review for many years. Members opposite were reviewing their own legislation. As long as members opposite are in power in this place and in power in another place, the Council will be a House of Review, because they are reviewing their own legislation. The Government has tried to float to the community that the Council is a House of Review now, but that is not true.

**The Hon. M. B. Cameron:** Not while your Party was in power.

**The Hon. G. L. BRUCE:** Not while the Hon. Mr. Cameron's Party is in power, either. I have seen amendments put forward by my Party, which would have strengthened a Bill, thrown away out of hand by the Government. It did not matter whether those amendments strengthened the legislation or not, if they disagreed with Liberal Party policy, they were thrown out.

The Council becomes a House of Review when the Government believes it is going to lose a vote and it approaches the Hon. Mr. Milne. However, the Council is not a House of Review when the Government believes it has the Hon. Mr. Milne on its side.

**The Hon. R. J. Ritson:** He is part of the Council.

**The Hon. G. L. BRUCE:** That is correct. I am not saying that Party politics are bad; I believe we must have them to function. Parliament could not function without them. If all members were in the Hon. Mr. Milne's position (that is, one member one Party) we would be all over the place. This Council has 21 members, with the result that there would be 21 different opinions. I do not agree with the Hon. Mr. Milne when he says that he is in a happy situation where he can do what he likes. I do not disagree with Party politics, but I disagree that this is a House of Review. The Council is not a House of Review unless the Party in Government has control of both Houses.

**The Hon. J. C. Burdett:** Do you believe in a two-House system?

**The Hon. G. L. BRUCE:** I do not know what the answer is, but I really believe that some of the amendments put forward by my Party were rejected out of hand whether they were good or bad, simply because of the Party system and the dogma of the Party line. I have no doubt that that also occurred when members opposite were in Opposition.

**The Hon. M. B. Cameron:** Queensland has only one House, and that seems to work well.

**The Hon. G. L. BRUCE:** All right, let us abolish the Legislative Council.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I believe that all honourable members have given the Hon. Mr. Bruce sufficient assistance.

**The Hon. G. L. BRUCE:** I refer to a newspaper article dated 8 September 1979, as follows:

Mr. DeGaris said yesterday—before the shadow Cabinet was announced—that he had made himself available.

When Dr. Eastick formed his shadow Cabinet Mr DeGaris said he did not want a portfolio.

Mr. DeGaris said yesterday he had made himself available because the concept of the Council had changed.

"The old concept of the Upper House as a House of Review is no longer valid," he said. It was now an "adult franchise Party House."

After the shadow Cabinet was named Mr. DeGaris said he was not disappointed. "I am very pleased I missed out," he said.

It appears that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris has come around to thinking that the Council is no longer a House of Review,

but a Party-political place.

I have had the good fortune to be elected to two Select Committees; one on council boundaries and the other on random breath tests. I am most heartened with the way that those committees function and the way members of both Parties get together in an attempt to solve a situation in the best interests of the people concerned. I believe that, given a chance, Parliament can serve a useful purpose for the betterment of the South Australian community. I for one support any move that makes Parliament more relevant in today's society.

First, we have had stable and continuous Government in this State, with the inauguration of responsible Government proclaimed in South Australia on 24 October 1856; secondly, throughout the years since then we have seen fit to change and adapt to change without the upheavals and bloodshed that occurs in other countries. Those two facts speak well for our system of Government. I also support the Hon. Mr. Foster's remarks when he said that we must adapt to change. I believe that our Parliamentary system has adapted quite well to change throughout the years. However, we must continue to adapt to change; we cannot remain stagnant. I believe that change is vital to strengthen the pillars on which Parliament is based. It is in the interests of all members to seek improvement in ways of Government and the system, so that the community can see that Parliament works for all the people represented in South Australia.

I am very concerned about the lack of Government credibility on both sides of politics. The Premier stated that 7 000 new jobs would be provided and that the O'Bahn bus system would be introduced. However, after some months he reneged on both counts. The Hon. Mr. Cameron referred to the lack of fulfilled promises by the Labor Government, and he referred to what that Government promised before the election and what it delivered. I hope he gives the same speech in relation to the Liberal Government promises before the last election and what it has done since.

It serves no useful purpose for political Parties, simply for political gain, to promote things without conducting proper studies. Parliament's credibility is at stake, and the people we represent will have no faith in a system that does that.

**The Hon. M. B. Cameron:** The people are regaining their faith now.

**The Hon. G. L. BRUCE:** I do not see how.

**The Hon. M. B. Cameron:** Because of the better Government.

**The Hon. G. L. BRUCE:** The Government's credibility is not high. The Liberal Party gained Government, and evidently it must have had a majority. However, at the moment its credibility is down to 39 per cent. The Government has lost credibility in South Australia. That credibility reflects on both Parties in Parliament. All members should attempt to retain credibility when our respective Parties form a Government. The exploitation of people must stop. The Government should seek a more just and equitable society. I support the motion.

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** I rise to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. It is now almost 12 months since the Liberal Party took office. In that time it has demonstrated its total lack of commitment towards improving the status of women in South Australia. The Government seems bent upon turning back the clock to the days when women were trapped in traditional roles and had few choices and very limited opportunities.

I would like to discuss some of the things that the

Government has done that it should not have done, and some of the things that it should have done but it has not. I make it clear from the outset that this is not simply a personal view. I am raising these matters today because of the growing disquiet in the community among men as well as women. First, I refer to education, because that is clearly the topical question of the day. The Government's decision announced last week to change the nature and role of the Women's Adviser in the Education Department and the Department of Further Education is perhaps the clearest example of its retrogressive approach to the female equality issue. First, I will discuss the Women's Adviser to the Department of Further Education. As honourable members will recall, the previous Labor Government had a firm commitment to appoint women's advisers in public areas where there was a demonstrated need.

The D.F.E. was such an area, and the selection process for a D.F.E. Women's Adviser had reached the stage of interviewing prospective candidates for the job prior to the change of Government last September. When the Government changed, the new Minister announced that the appointment would be postponed for review. He said that he wanted to be sure it was necessary. Mr. President, blind Freddie would have seen it was necessary! The Minister's clear intention was, in fact, not to proceed with the appointment at all. The outcry by employees of the D.F.E. and the general public which resulted forced the Government to retreat from that course. The Minister subsequently announced that he had decided to proceed with the appointment, after all. However, no appointment was announced, even though, I believe, a nomination for the position was made at least a month ago. It was clear that the Government was stalling for time, and we now know why.

Many people feared, and their fears have been confirmed, that the delay on this appointment was linked to the Government's decision to downgrade the Women's Adviser's position in the Education Department. The current Women's Adviser, Denise Bradley, made it known some months ago that she would not seek to renew her contract when it expired this month. The normal course of events in such a case would have been to advertise the position immediately, since it can take up to six months to fill senior positions of this kind. The failure to advertise the position caused both alarm and speculation in the Education Department.

Last week we found out the reason for the delay. The Government announced that both Women's Advisers' positions in the D.F.E. and the Education Department were to be downgraded. In future, these officers will be known as Equal Opportunity Officers and will be responsible not only for improving the status and opportunity for women and girls in education, but also for handicapped people, Aborigines, ethnic groups and other disadvantaged people. This is one of the most outrageous decisions this Government has made, and it will not go unchallenged. I understand that the Minister of Education, the Premier and other authorities with some responsibility or interest in this matter have already been swamped with letters, telegrams and phone calls from furious teachers, parents, organisations and others.

**The Hon. M. B. Cameron:** You probably organised it.

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** No, I have not been organising it. I can say, too, that members of the Opposition have also been bombarded with urgent requests to do something.

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** How do you know we have been swamped with requests?

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** Because I have been

told.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** I have had nothing to do with contacting anybody at all. I state that categorically. There happens to be community opinion against this move and the honourable member wants to wake up to that. I have been told that at least 50 letters have been sent to the *Advertiser*. So far, only three of those letters have been printed, which I think is rather disappointing.

**The Hon. M. B. Cameron:** You have had nothing to do with it; you just know the numbers.

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** The honourable member has probably had something to do with that. In criticising the Government's decision, I am not arguing that there is no need for advisers for other disadvantaged groups in the community, quite the contrary, but the Government's proposed solution to the problems of these groups is utterly absurd. How can an already overworked Women's Adviser confronting a vast range of problems with insufficient resources possibly take on the onerous tasks of catering for the special needs of other disadvantaged groups? Time spent with other groups' problems is time not spent dealing with women's problems.

These actions mean that the Women's Adviser's role is being downgraded. To claim that it is not is pure humbug. The Government wants an overworked Women's Adviser to take on three extra advisory jobs, and it is just not possible for her to do all of them effectively. I think that this decision is no accident. It fits perfectly with the conservative and sexist attitudes that the Minister of Education has repeatedly demonstrated.

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** What sort of examples can you give?

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** I will give the honourable member some later.

**The Hon. Anne Levy:** This morning's *Advertiser* contains a good example.

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** As the Hon. Miss Levy points out, this morning's *Advertiser* is a superb example. The decision also shows that the Government's commitment to equality of opportunity for Aborigines, migrants and the handicapped is mere tokenism, and let there be no doubt about this. I talked to a very senior officer in the Education Department about this matter and expressed my concern about the downgrading of the Women's Adviser's role. "Not to worry" I was told, "the three new jobs won't take up more than about 10 per cent of the new adviser's time." I hope that the migrants, Aborigines and handicapped people in our community take note of that view and the cynicism which underlies it.

Everything we know about women and education suggests that the Women's Adviser's role must be expanded and not downgraded by reinforcing traditional sex role stereotypes. Our education system has, and still does, though to a lesser degree, churn out women who are neither qualified for, nor encouraged to move into many traditional male occupations. This keeps women out of the most rewarding jobs and denies society the talents of a large number of its most gifted people purely by virtue of their sex.

In a Schools Commission study completed in 1975, titled "Girls, school and society", the following statement was made about sexism. This has formed the basis of the approach adopted by the Education Department and I quote from that document, as follows:

Sexism is a process through which females and males not only progressively learn that different things are required and expected of them because of their sex, but learn those things in an unexamined way. Good education is incompatible with

such a process; central to it is the examination of assumptions and the rational consideration of alternatives. Hence, "sexist education" is a contradiction in terms; good education is necessarily non-sexist, it makes no assumption about sex differences.

Overt and covert sexist practices and sex role stereotyping still persist in our education system and have had two main consequences. First, fewer girls than boys stay on at school. In 1977, for example, there were 40 per cent more 18-year-old males than females still at school. The second problem is that amongst those girls who do survive at school only a minority take courses that enable them to make a wide choice in their future options. The subject choices for year 11 female students show an over 50 per cent enrolment in history, biology, English, languages, maths and music. Boys have an over 50 per cent enrolment in chemistry, economics, English, geography, geology, maths I and II and physics in year 11.

In year 12, subject choices display the same pattern, although female concentration tends to increase in the traditional subjects as females give up the male subjects such as maths I and II, which show a noticeable drop from 40 per cent in year 11 to 28 per cent in year 12. That narrow subject choice limits girls' objectives in tertiary study where they cluster overwhelmingly in arts and humanities disciplines, which hampers their chances for future employment. In fact, women can be found in a very narrow band of occupations in the work force. Over 60 per cent of working women are in clerical, sales and service jobs.

This has happened because, for a hundred years, the education system has been prejudiced in favour of men and boys. It has reinforced stereotyped images of men as dominant breadwinners requiring education in order to take their rightful place in the work force to provide for their families, and women have been stereotyped as passive homemakers, not requiring any particular attention at school other than in home economics-type courses, because their role was to marry and rear children at home rather than enter the work force.

Where women do receive vocational training, it is typically in areas such as basic commerce subjects such as typing and those sorts of subjects where promotion prospects are negligible.

However, apparently Mr. Allison does not agree with this point of view. I will take up the Hon. Mr. Davis's point now in order to illustrate the sort of sexist attitudes that the Minister of Education has shown in the past few months since he became the Minister of Education. I refer to this morning's *Advertiser*, in which Mr. Allison was reported as commenting on the education system and the opportunities available for girls to progress in the system. He said:

I don't really see that women (students) are disadvantaged in schools. It is in the job opportunities afterwards that they can be disadvantaged.

He believes in the operational skills. "With typing learnt at school, they are all ready to go into the operation of computers. The skill is at their fingertips, literally," he said. Apparently, the only jobs to which women are apparently supposed to aspire involve the punching of computer cards. Is it not possible for women to become engineers, scientists, doctors, microbiologists, and so on? I suggest that this approach to education is not good enough. I say that, first, because equity and justice demand that boys and girls should have equal opportunity and equal access to education in order to develop their full potential and to make their own choices.

Secondly, the role of women in society is changing. As the birthrate has dropped during this century and as

housekeeping has become easier, more and more women are joining the work force. They may drop out to raise children, but they return to work afterwards. Women can expect to spend a larger part of their lives in the work force than ever before. Also, more and more women are becoming breadwinners, too, as the incidence of sole parent families increases, and they must be properly equipped to cope with these new roles.

Yet, our education system has failed to keep abreast of these changing realities. There is often too little in our school environment that fosters girls' aspirations, and there is still much which discourages them and places limits on their aspirations and therefore their options.

It is crucial that opportunities and access to education for girls be improved, not only for the well-being of the individual but also for the betterment of society as a whole. The social consequences, already grave, will worsen if nothing is done, as the Adelaide University Vice-Chancellor, Professor Don Stranks pointed out in an interview which appeared in the *News* on 8 August. Commenting on the Myers Report on changing technology, he suggested that women will miss out on careers in the new high technology areas because they are not being adequately equipped in maths and science areas. These subjects will be even more crucial for employment prospects in the future. Professor Stranks said that teachers must be retrained if necessary to bring about more positive responses in students in science-oriented areas of study.

Here, Professor Stranks has hit on another of the major problems in our education system. Very often teachers in our schools inculcate (mostly unconsciously I suspect) sexist attitudes that lead girls into humanities subjects rather than science subjects. Perhaps it is not surprising that these attitudes should persist in a system that is heavily male dominated at the decision-making levels. For example, although women comprise 58 per cent of teaching personnel in the Education Department as a whole, they hold only 23 per cent of all promotion positions. In the primary teaching areas the situation is even worse. Women comprise 68 per cent of the teaching staff and hold only 13 per cent of the promotion positions.

At the administrative levels of the department the problem is worse still. In 1975, the directory of the South Australian Education Department, as published in the *Education Gazette*, listed 112 men and only 8 women in senior administrative positions in the Education Department. My inquiries lead me to believe that the situation has changed very little since then.

Only in the last decade have the last formal discriminatory barriers been removed, which now makes it possible for women to be promoted to senior positions in the Education Department. Unfortunately, however, the legacy of discriminatory practices and attitudes still persists, and the participation rate of women at the senior levels has improved very little in 10 years.

I think by now that it should be clear from the points I have made that there has been a serious imbalance in the type of education for boys and girls in our education system, and, secondly, career and promotional opportunities for women in the Education Department have been far from satisfactory as a result of discriminatory practices.

These are problems that Denise Bradley, the Education Department Women's Adviser, has had to confront and try to overcome. It would be useful to examine some of the things she and the Women's Advisory Unit have been doing since the post was created in 1977. First, a number of programmes have been developed to counter sexist curricula and teaching methods, and members of the

Advisory Unit have made themselves available to work with teachers in the schools to implement these programmes. Secondly, programmes and visual material have been prepared to improve access of girls to male-dominated secondary subjects which limit future study and career options. Also, steps have been taken to broaden girls' career expectations.

Also, considerable attention has been paid to the problem of overt and covert discrimination against women teachers. Conferences have been held to raise awareness of these problems among men and women in the department. Programmes have also been developed to assist women teachers to gain greater self-confidence and self-esteem and to assist with career planning. The Women's Adviser has also dealt with numerous individual queries and complaints from women teachers, who see her not only as an advocate for their cause but also as someone who understands the bureaucratic processes and who can freely investigate suspected injustice on their behalf.

Much has been done in three years, but there is still much more to do. The task is enormous, and, as one would expect with any project that starts from scratch, a major part of the work of the past three years has centred on collecting a sound statistical and information base from which to work. Also, a lot of time has been spent setting up the committees and structures to work through and, of course, all the basic material for use by teachers and students concerning the status of women and sexist education has been devised and put together in that time also. The basic framework is now in place, which will enable the real work (the work in schools) to proceed in earnest.

All of the Education Department's problems, and more, are found in the Department of Further Education; where there is no Women's Adviser at all. So, not even the basic preparatory work has been done in that department. Many of the D.F.E.'s problems are similar to those in the Education Department. No college principals are women. There are no women in senior positions in head office; there are no women on the policy-making bodies; and women have little or no input into curriculum development. The problems for women students are also considerable.

A large proportion of the women D.F.E. caters for are women who missed out on education at the secondary level or who were denied the appropriate opportunities through discrimination in the Education Department system. And many of them find that in D.F.E., too, there is discrimination which hampers their ability to continue their education. For example, many women with pre-school children find that they are precluded from pursuing further education or have to suffer because of the lack of child care facilities. All D.F.E. colleges have provision for child care, but very few have staff. Allocation of funds for this purpose is a policy decision, and the policy makers are men. Child care simply is not a priority that they identify with.

Another problem in D.F.E. is that not enough attention has been given to the vocational needs of women in the development of curriculum. Women are guided into life-enrichment courses like macrame or cooking rather than the courses which would develop skills of some vocational value. Of course, some women are looking for life-enrichment courses, and that is fine. But others really want vocation-oriented training, and they are not encouraged and guided along the appropriate paths. Women are not encouraged to undertake training in traditional male occupations. And D.F.E. is paying insufficient attention to vocational courses for people who require retraining. The need for such courses will be

overwhelming in the near future as people, particularly women, are displaced through technological change.

During the last few years, women lecturers in D.F.E. have tried to improve the status of women and their self-perception and awareness through the introduction of women's studies courses. Women students have shown a great deal of interest in these courses, but the department has not. In some colleges these courses are not even listed as a study option on handouts for students. Hardly any of the lecturers conducting the courses are given teaching credit for their work; most do it because they are committed, and they do so in addition to their other full teaching loads. Dedicated teachers are grossly overworked because of lack of departmental commitment, brought about because all-male committees are not prepared to recognise the level of their own prejudice against women. The fact that student demand is greater than can be catered for in these courses is apparently irrelevant.

It is because sexist attitudes and behaviour in this male-dominated department are so pervasive that a Women's Adviser, who would be responsible for a broad overview of policy and practice, is so necessary. Given the extent of the problems which still confront women in the education system, the Minister's decision to change the nature of these Women's Advisers' positions displays either gross ignorance of the nature of the problems involved, or a deliberate attempt to arrest progress.

If the Minister's public pronouncements are any guide, then the latter is the case. For example, in 1978, when he was shadow Minister of Education, Mr. Allison was asked to respond to a working paper which had just been released on non-sexist education. He bitterly attacked the paper and said that he believed that this and other material being prepared by the Education Department for use in schools was all part of a left-wing social engineering programme. He added that he thought that egalitarianism had not proven successful in Russia, China or the Jewish kibbutz. When reminded of these bizarre statements in another place last week, Mr. Allison said that at that time he was being pressured by "the more conservative elements in our society" who were disturbed about the proliferation of non-sexist material in schools. This excuse is quite ludicrous. Would he start mouthing pro-Nazi statements if he was pressured by pro-Nazi groups?

**The Hon. J. R. Cornwall:** If he thought he could get away with it he would.

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** Yes, I suppose so. In fact there is little doubt that the Minister actually shares the point of view of these "more conservative" (and highly unrepresentative) people in our society, because last week he went on to say that the non-sexist material being prepared for schools swung the pendulum too far in the other direction. Did he mean that the material was not sexist enough or that it was too non-sexist, or was he simply confused?

**The Hon. Anne Levy:** The latter.

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** No doubt. The fact is that any reasonable person who has seen this material, as I have, would agree that all it seeks to do is refrain from stereotyping male and female behaviour, in line with the *Girls, School and Society* statement.

If Mr. Allison is in favour of sexist stereotyping, then let him say so publicly. His publicly stated views strongly suggest that the downgrading of the Women's Adviser is a deliberate act of policy. He would like women to go back home where he thinks they belong. He thinks that if all married women left the teaching profession he would have jobs to give the young graduates from C.A.E.'s and that would solve his problems.

Mr. Allison's outlook is appallingly reactionary, out of

date and sexist. I think it is outrageous that such an individual should have responsibility for the education of the young people of South Australia, and I say that with the deepest conviction and sincerity. As I said earlier, there has already been an outcry in the community against the Government's decision to downgrade the work being done for females in education. Opposition to this Government's education policies will continue to grow, and Mr. Allison and his colleagues will be forced to face the fact that they are out of step with community attitudes and expectations. I seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

### THE BANK OF ADELAIDE (MERGER) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 13 August. Page 265.)

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (Leader of the Opposition):** This Bill is, in a sense, enabling legislation to facilitate the merger that has already been agreed to between the Bank of Adelaide and the A.N.Z. Bank. The merger whereby the A.N.Z. Bank acquired the share capital of the Bank of Adelaide has been approved by Bank of Adelaide shareholders and approved by the Supreme Court of South Australia and became effective on 30 November 1979.

The Bank of Adelaide is now a wholly-owned subsidiary of the A.N.Z. Bank. That does not mean that the bank could not continue to operate as a separate entity in South Australia, with its major operations in South Australia, if the A.N.Z. Bank so decided, or if there were appropriate approval from the Federal Government.

However, the merger was approved by the Federal Treasurer as he is required to do under the Commonwealth Banking Act, on the understanding that the operations of the merged bank would be carried out under a single entity, that single entity being the A.N.Z. Bank. The understanding is that the Bank of Adelaide will cease operating. That is a result not of just the merger but of the understanding in relation to the approval given by the Federal Government to the merger that proceeded. There is some suggestion that there is a Federal Government or Reserve Bank policy to try to reduce the number of individual banks in Australia, and that gives effect to this policy.

In any event, it is highly likely that the A.N.Z. Bank would not want the Bank of Adelaide to continue to operate as a separate entity. Even if it did, the merger was approved by the Federal Treasurer on the understanding that the Bank of Adelaide would cease operating as a separate entity in this State and the rest of Australia and that the A.N.Z. Bank would take its place.

There is no sense in which the Bank of Adelaide can be revived. It is well and truly dead, and we can only ensure by the passage of this legislation that the transport to the cemetery for final burial is carried out as expeditiously as possible. Accordingly, there is no suggestion at this time from the Opposition that this legislation should be opposed. That would be bloody-minded in the extreme, and would only place obstacles in the way of the transfer of accounts and borrowing arrangements. The demise of the Bank of Adelaide is an established fact. We can now only help in the paper work involved in the transfer of operations to the A.N.Z. Bank. The single entity will continue the banking operations of the Bank of Adelaide doubtless in considerably modified and rationalised form when everything is concluded.

However, in this debate something needs to be said on

certain matters. First, was it necessary for the Bank of Adelaide to disappear as a separate and local South Australian bank? Secondly, why did the Government not pursue its pre-election promise to save the bank? Thirdly, was there a viable alternative to the merger? There can be no doubt that there was a strong feeling in the community that the Bank of Adelaide was the only private bank registered and based in South Australia. There was support that the bank should continue, that there should be at least one private bank that would be making decisions, with South Australians on the board aware of South Australian conditions and in a position to provide finance to South Australian industry and other ventures.

There was also a strong feeling in the community that any demise of the Bank of Adelaide would have a substantial and severe effect on employment within the bank, but in the end that feeling was not able to prevail, I believe, because the Government, after it was elected on 15 September, was not willing to make a hard decision at that time to provide some kind of guarantee to enable the Bank of Adelaide to continue.

Dealing with the first point I raised in relation to why the Government did not pursue its pre-election promise to save the bank, I stress that members should not be under any misapprehension that before 15 September and in the few days after that date the Premier and his colleagues had made several sympathetic noises about retaining the Bank of Adelaide as an independent entity.

On 11 June 1979 the then Acting Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Goldsworthy) was quoted in an *Advertiser* report as saying that he believed an offer other than that by the A.N.Z. Bank was imminent. The report states:

"It would probably involve an overseas interest," he said. "Competition from another group can only enhance banking facilities and services." The Opposition's major concern was for the best possible result for the Bank of Adelaide shareholders, depositors and employees. The best option would be one which retained the Bank of Adelaide as a South Australian identity with its head office in South Australia, with maximum benefit for local shareholders, promotion opportunities and security for bank staff.

On 14 September, the day before the last election, Mr. Tonkin is quoted in the *News* as saying that a Liberal Government would support the retention of the Bank of Adelaide as the only trading bank with headquarters in South Australia. The report further states:

He said the South Australian Liberal Party kept close to the problem and he had been fully briefed on the available options before making submissions to both the Prime Minister, Mr. Fraser, and the Federal Treasurer, Mr. Howard.

Here is Mr. Tonkin saying on the day before the election that he has been fully briefed on all the options and would support the retention of the Bank of Adelaide as the only trading bank with headquarters in South Australia. After the election, on 17 September in the *News* Mr. Tonkin is then referred to, as follows:

The Premier elect, Mr. Tonkin, said today he would be prepared to have talks to any groups on counter-proposals relating to the Bank of Adelaide. Mr. Tonkin was reaffirming his previous stated policy that a Liberal Government would do everything possible to support the continued independence of the bank. Mr. Tonkin said the Liberal Party had a firm belief that South Australia should retain a trading bank with its headquarters here. This would be in the best interests of the State, business and the bank staff. The Liberal Party was not averse in any way to overseas interests participating in investment in the bank.

Something happened between 17 September and 25



September. A *News* report on that day states:

In major developments the Premier, Mr Tonkin, issued a statement saying he now believes it may be best if the bank's merger with the A.N.Z. group goes ahead.

Within the space of eight days the Premier had completely changed his mind. Previously he gave full support to the Bank of Adelaide as an independent entity operating in South Australia, but by 25 September he is saying, "No, sorry, oops, made another mistake, it looks as though we will have to give way and let the A.N.Z. group merge with the bank and to destroy its existence as an independent entity." At that time Mr. Tonkin was reported in the *News* as stating:

I am bound to say I am tending towards the conclusion now that the best course of action for the bank is to follow through with the A.N.Z. merger plan. We have made a close study of the bank's situation since taking office.

The report further states:

Speaking from Perth, Mr. Myer Solomon said he could not understand Mr. Tonkin's attitude when less than a week ago the Premier said the Bank of Adelaide was one of his priorities.

Before the election he had been kept fully briefed on all the options. After the election, following a close study only 10 days after the election, he decided that the Bank of Adelaide had to go under. It is no wonder that Mr. Myer Solomon and other businessmen in South Australia who wanted to see the bank retained were upset. It appears that that statement on 25 September was not the end of the matter. On Thursday 27 September it appears that the Premier had gone backwards towards his pre-election position. In the *Advertiser* of that date the Premier stated:

I've had lengthy and involved discussions regarding the Bank of Adelaide and more are planned. As I said on Tuesday, I intend thoroughly examining any other proposals if they are put to the State Government. The sentiments I expressed before the election still remain.

Therefore, before the election the Premier's attitude was to save the bank. A few days after the election he still wanted to save the bank. However, on 25 September he appeared to believe that that was a mistake and that perhaps a merger was the best option. Then, on 27 September he said that he would continue to look at the issue and that what he said before the election was still really correct.

**The Hon. J. C. Burdett:** If Labor had stayed in Government what would it have done?

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** Here we go. Members opposite just do not wait to hear what I have to say. If the Hon. Mr. Burdett will just bear with me I will explain it all.

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** We have heard all this before.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** Yes, and no doubt honourable members will hear it again, because it was the Government's first big test and one the Government failed. I will inform the Hon. Mr. Burdett of the Labor Government's approach if he will give me time and stop interjecting and being rude. Following the Premier's statement on 27 September, there was a whole flurry of activity from him. At that time Mr. Holmes A'Court got into the act. At one stage, on 11 October, the *Advertiser's* finance writer, Brian Hale, believed that the Government would accept Mr. Holmes A'Court's proposal, because his article of that date stated:

The South Australian Government today is likely to advance a plan put forward by Mr. Robert Holmes A'Court as the only viable alternative to the A.N.Z. takeover of the Bank of Adelaide.

Mr. Myer Solomon's overseas interests had travelled to Hong Kong and returned with a proposal for a consortium

of banks from that area, to alleviate the Bank of Adelaide's financial difficulties and establish investment in the bank to maintain it as an individual entity. We then had a further proposal from an overseas bank, the Standard Charter Bank of London. Then we had a local consortium of business people who thought that they would contribute towards saving the bank. However, during that time there was a lot of to-ing and fro-ing

The Premier rushed off to the Prime Minister to see whether the Federal Government would agree to overseas interests being allowed to invest in the bank. Despite the fact that at one stage the Government, when in Opposition, had said that the Liberal Party had no objection to overseas interests being involved in saving the Bank of Adelaide, when Mr. Tonkin saw the Prime Minister he was told quite flatly that that was not on. In my view the crucial position was how much of a role the Government was prepared to play in saving the bank. I am afraid that we must come to the conclusion that the Government was not prepared to do anything—except talk.

The Hon. Mr. Burdett asked what the Labor Government would have done. When problems with the Bank of Adelaide and F.C.A. first surfaced, the then Premier, Mr. Corcoran, co-operated with the directors of the bank, particularly with Sir Arthur Rymill. Mr. Corcoran went to Canberra, and I believe he saw the Federal Treasurer and Reserve Bank officials. In May he returned to South Australia with the proposal that was eventually adopted, namely, that the Bank of Adelaide could not survive but would have to be taken over in some way by one of the other major banks in Australia. That subsequently turned out to be the A.N.Z. Bank. However, before the election, as a response to community pressure and concern about the loss of the Bank of Adelaide, the Premier ordered a report from an independent consultant, Mr. Allert, to see whether or not the problems with F.C.A. could be resolved if it was given time to trade out of its difficulties and, if so, whether there was any scope for a Government guarantee to enable any consortium that was prepared to invest in the bank with a Government guarantee to trade out of any difficulties over a two to three year period.

That report was ordered by Mr. Corcoran when he was the Premier. Unfortunately, it was never released, and we do not know what it says. The Opposition asked for the report in another place last year, but at no time has the Government said that it will disclose it. Of course, the Government has not disclosed it because it knows that that report indicates that F.C.A. could trade out of its difficulties if it received some kind of guarantee from the Government. That fact was recognised by the finance writer for the *Advertiser*, Mr. Hale, who on 11 October last year said:

Mr. Tonkin will detail his view of the drawn-out bank saga in State Parliament this afternoon. He is likely to reveal that the Holmes A'Court proposals and the plan devised by the previous State Government are the only possible alternatives for the bank to retain its independence. The previous plan is not likely to find much support from Mr. Tonkin's Government because it involves loans and guarantees using public money.

In my view, that is the crux of the situation. There was a proposal that could have saved the bank but the Liberal Party, because its head was firmly in the philosophical sand, was not prepared to indicate that the Government would provide guarantees to enable F.C.A. to trade out of its difficulties. In other words, all the to-ing and fro-ing and running around amounted to nothing because of the strictures placed on overseas funds by the Federal

Government. The only way that a local group could have got off the ground was if it received a guarantee from the Government.

So, in answer to the Hon. Mr. Burdett's question, I repeat that action was taken by Mr. Corcoran. We do not know what the report stated, but there was a plan devised by the previous Government in response to community concern which included statements about saving the bank made by the Liberal Party.

**The Hon. K. T. Griffin:** What was the plan? You haven't told us what the plan was.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** The plan, as the honourable member knows, involved, first, obtaining an independent report from this consultant, Mr. Allert. That was the first step.

**The Hon. K. T. Griffin:** What was the next step?

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** The Hon. Mr. Griffin asks, "What was the next step?" I do not have the full details of the next step.

**The Hon. K. T. Griffin:** There weren't any next steps.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** There were. What I do know is that the first step that was to be taken was this report because, if there was no chance of F.C.A. trading out of its difficulties, then no alternative plan would have worked. I do not believe that the Labor Government was prepared to put money into the bank. It was prepared to look at the possibility of a guarantee. That is why the report was ordered. What this Parliament has not had is a copy of that report. The Hon. Mr. Burdett cackles and squawks and asks what we would have done. If he shows us that report, or tables that report in the Parliament, we will tell him what we would have done. If the report stated that there had been a chance of F.C.A. trading out of its difficulties, then it is quite possible that the Government would have been prepared to put up the guarantee funds to enable the bank to be saved. It is no use members asking what we would have done. What we would have done would have depended on that report. Certainly, before the election it cannot be denied that the report was ordered. In other words, we were not ignoring the situation. We were not ignoring the concern in the business community and the South Australian community generally about the potential demise of the bank.

We wanted to do something about the situation, so we ordered that report. That report has not been made available to the Parliament, or to the Labor Party. We suspect that it did state that the bank could have been saved had certain guarantees been given by the Government. This Government was not prepared to give those guarantees. I believe that if the report had been satisfactory the previous Government would have been prepared to give those guarantees. The fact is that that was the only way that there was a chance of saving the bank.

We have heard the Liberals, when in Opposition, continually calling for the release of reports and condemning the previous Government, and moving motions of no confidence in that Government for its failure to release reports. Yet, here on this very important issue, the Government refuses to release this report to the Parliament, or to in any way disclose to the Opposition the findings in the report, despite the fact that it was a report ordered by Mr. Corcoran when he was Premier. That is what the Labor Party did in relation to this issue. It had not ignored the situation; it tried to find a constructive proposal. That was recognised by the financial writer for the *Advertiser*, Brian Hale, but rejected by the Government because it involved some kind of guarantee.

It is my view that the present Liberal Government must bear a considerable amount of the responsibility for the demise of the bank, because it was not prepared to put up

the money involved in guaranteeing the consortium that was prepared to put money into the bank to enable F.C.A. to continue to trade, and to trade out of its difficulties. One thing certain about the demise of the Bank of Adelaide is that private enterprise was unable to keep an independent private bank operating in South Australia. Despite everything that members opposite say about the virtues of private enterprise, what has private enterprise produced in the South Australian banking situation? Nothing, except the demise of the only locally based bank, the Bank of Adelaide. That was the only private bank where South Australian people were making decisions as part of the South Australian community and where the interests of South Australians were paramount. It is a great irony that under this Government, in particular, the only banks left in South Australia that are part of the South Australian community are the State banks. Private enterprise has failed dismally to provide the South Australian community with a private trading bank.

The simple fact is that decisions, so far as banking in South Australia is concerned, will now be made interstate and overseas. It is the conservative philosophy to upgrade private enterprise. It fails to recognise that State enterprises are owned by the community, and they are better described as community enterprises. One might speculate, indeed, if there had been a stronger State banking system in South Australia, whether that might have been able to assist in maintaining the Bank of Adelaide. Members will recall that, when suggestions have been made on this side of the Chamber that there be a strengthening of the State banking system, involving the Savings Bank of South Australia and the State Bank of South Australia, the conservatives of the Liberal Party have organised runs on the funds of the Savings Bank to try to counter any move of that kind.

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** Rubbish!

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** It occurred in 1966 and 1978, as the Hon. Mr. Davis well knows. They certainly were not Labor supporters who were organising a run on the funds in the Savings Bank when those suggestions were raised. I believe that as the State banking system is the only banking system moves ought to be taken to strengthen the State banking system in South Australia. One can speculate on what would have happened if the State banking system was, in fact, stronger. It is conceivable that funds could have been made available to save the Bank of Adelaide as an independent entity. The only banks that remain in South Australia that are South Australian owned and are part of the South Australian community are the State banks. I believe that action should be taken to strengthen them.

**The Hon. R. C. DeGaris:** Was the Labor Party thinking of making an offer for the Bank of Adelaide?

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** I do not think we would have the funds to make that sort of an offer, assuming the honourable member means the Government. I do not think there was any consideration given to an offer, as such; that would have involved public funds. The only consideration I think the previous Government was prepared to give was some kind of guarantee. I believe that that was the effect of the Allert Report, which we do not have before us. I think steps should be taken to strengthen the State banking system in view of the loss of the Bank of Adelaide.

**The Hon. R. C. DeGaris:** How will you do that?

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** One way would be by amalgamation of the two banks so that they can compete fully with the existing trading banks, at one end of the scale. At the other end of the scale is the possibility of joint premises and some kind of rationalisation. There is

the possibility of people serving on both boards to ensure that there is a bit more co-operation between them. I certainly think there are ways whereby the State banking system can be strengthened, but they need to be looked at in detail. All I can say is that, because of the loss of the Bank of Adelaide, the State banking system should be strengthened. Serious consideration should be given to further co-operation between the State banking institutions, the State Bank of South Australia, and the Savings Bank of South Australia, as the only locally-based banking institutions. When proposals of this kind have been made in the past, conservative interests in South Australia have organised a run on the Savings Bank deposits. Had there been a stronger State Savings Bank system in South Australia, it is possible it could have participated in moves to save the Bank of Adelaide. Certainly, the State banks are now the only banks where South Australian people are making decisions as part of the South Australian community about South Australian projects where the interests of South Australians are paramount. It is important we have a strong State system.

The Liberals should not be allowed, because of their philosophy, to downgrade the system and thereby leave South Australia with no voice in the banking system of Australia.

**The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw:** Who said they were downgrading the State Bank?

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** All right. I did not say that the Liberals were downgrading the State Bank, but the Liberals have a philosophy which is to downgrade public enterprise, and that includes the S.G.I.C. The Liberals fought tooth and nail when the Bill came in to establish the S.G.I.C. The whole philosophy of the Liberals is to take things out of the public sector and give them to the private sector. I do not see that they can deny that this is their basic philosophical position, to downgrade public enterprise.

**The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw:** The State Bank—

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** I do not know of any moves to downgrade it. I am merely issuing a word of warning to the Council and the Government that I hope this system is not downgraded. Rather than being downgraded, it should be strengthened.

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** We have not downgraded any commercial operations.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** Such as?

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** I'm asking you.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** You are attacking the S.G.I.C. at the moment.

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** We haven't downgraded the S.G.I.C. Don't talk rubbish!

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** I do not think the Hon. Mr. Davis knows what is going on in the Government. Perhaps he should have a word with the Hon. Mr. Burdett to see what Cabinet decisions have come up about the S.G.I.C.

**The Hon. J. C. Burdett:** We haven't downgraded the S.G.I.C.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** We shall see. The Hon. Mr. Davis does not know.

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** Do you know?

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** No, but I know enough to indicate that—

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** You've got to stop walking down Rundle Mall?

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** No. There are some attempts to change the role of the S.G.I.C., and we shall have to wait and see what they are. Philosophically, that is the approach of the Liberals. If it is not, what did they tell the electors for three weeks before the last election? I am saying that I hope there is no attempt to downgrade the

State banking system, but I hope that moves are taken to strengthen it, because it is the only State banking system we are left with in this State. Private enterprise has failed miserably to maintain a banking system in South Australia. In the sphere of banking, private enterprise has failed to maintain for South Australia a bank that is part of the local community. The only banks now left to fulfil that role are the South Australian community based State banks.

In the private sector, all the banking decisions will now be made interstate or overseas. The State banking system is a community asset, and is one of the few financial institutions that the South Australian community has a direct interest in as a community. The Liberals' philosophy fails to recognise that State enterprises are owned by the community.

In conclusion, I repeat that the Government has failed to provide the Parliament with full details of other proposals to save the Bank of Adelaide, which were rejected last year. The Government failed to release the report of a competent consultant, Mr. Allert, which indicated, I believe, that F.C.A., the bank's subsidiary, could have traded out of its difficulties if some form of Government guarantee had been available.

The Bank of Adelaide was the first real test for this Government. As it was a matter of controversy at the time of the election, it made commitments before the election that it failed to honour afterwards, despite the fact that, if it had been prepared to be less rigid about its philosophy and provide some kind of State guarantee, it could have done so.

There is no question that, in this matter as in many other areas, favourable statements towards the Bank of Adelaide were made, which were completely countermanded after the election when the Government found that the electoral purposes of the statements it had made had been served.

I will ask the Attorney-General a couple of specific questions, particularly in relation to jobs in the new merged bank. At the time of the controversy last year, Mr. Tonkin is reported as saying:

A "substantial number" of jobs will be at risk if the Bank of Adelaide merger goes ahead, the Premier, Mr. Tonkin, told Parliament today. He conceded this before the Government used its numbers to prevent any debate by the Opposition.

I would like to know whether the Government has any information on the number of jobs likely to be lost and, secondly, whether the Government is making some arrangements for compensation for the loss of stamp duty and other fees that would have occurred if the Bill had not been passed and had it been necessary to obtain consent and fresh documentation for the depositors and borrowers of the Bank of Adelaide. I would like to know from him how the State Government has calculated that compensation, and whether this matter will be referred to a Select Committee. As I understand the Attorney-General, this is a hybrid Bill, and he will be moving for it to be referred to a Select Committee.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** Another one!

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** Yes. I support the second reading and the referral of the Bill to a Select Committee. I will consider the Bill in that committee and determine our final attitude to it after evidence has been brought forward in the Select Committee and after the committee has made its recommendations to the Council.

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General):** I am surprised that the Leader of the Opposition should forget some of the facts of the Bank of Adelaide saga in 1979

because, on 27 April 1979 (some 4½ months before the State election on 15 September 1979), representatives of the Bank of Adelaide and F.C.A. first approached the previous Government. The decision by the shareholders of the Bank of Adelaide occurred one month after the election. Leading up to the election, the future of the bank was very much in the hands of the previous Government, which believed that there was some way in which the bank could be preserved as a South Australian banking entity. The then Government had no satisfactory way in which the bank could be rescued from the difficult situation in which it found itself and which it referred to the previous Government on 27 April 1979.

Even during the course of the speech of the Leader today, he could advance no alternative scheme which the previous Government would have implemented to save the bank, except to say that he believed that the previous Government had commissioned a report.

That report did not become available until the date of the election. A meeting of shareholders of the Bank of Adelaide took place within one month of that election. One would expect that, if there was a viable option for the Bank of Adelaide, the previous Government, having had 4½ months to consider the dilemma, would have come up with something more than asking for a report. The fact is that the previous Government had no alternative, and its request for a report was a last-ditch attempt to demonstrate that it was trying to take some action, at least as a public face-saver, to save the Bank of Adelaide.

On Friday 12 May 1979 the Chairman of the Bank of Adelaide advised the then Premier that urgent merger moves were being considered on the advice of the Reserve Bank. That is just over a fortnight after the representatives of the Bank of Adelaide first approached the previous Government claiming that there was some difficulty in relation to F.C.A., the wholly-owned subsidiary of the Bank of Adelaide. Two and a half weeks had elapsed since the first approach by the Bank of Adelaide to the Government, and even at that stage the previous Government had not really done anything about a rescue operation which it had been claiming was available and about which there had been no evidence presented to the public since that time. The Finance Corporation of Australia was in serious financial difficulty and, because the Reserve Bank was anxious to maintain a strong banking system, it had the responsibility for endeavouring to prevent a disaster for the Bank of Adelaide by being the dog which was being whipped by F.C.A.

It is true that before the election the Opposition made a number of statements about its desire to see the Bank of Adelaide retained as a South Australian banking entity. However, it did not have access before the election to information which should have been available to the previous Government, and it was not in a position—

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** The Premier said he was being fully briefed when he was in Opposition.

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** He was being briefed by the Federal Treasurer on options which were available and on the Federal Government's attitude. He was not privy to confidential information which was undoubtedly being made available by the Bank of Adelaide to the then Government. So, the Opposition was not in a position other than to express the very strong wish that the Bank of Adelaide should be retained and that every effort should be pursued to ensure that it did remain such a banking entity. When we came into office there were a number of statements made by the Premier about the Bank of Adelaide. These Ministerial statements started on 11 October, the first day of sitting of the new Parliament. In addition to outlining various options, the Premier stated:

One other thing is quite certain: there is no point in the shareholders of the bank choosing to vote against the merger with the A.N.Z. unless an alternative fall-back arrangement is available. By an alternative fall-back arrangement I mean an arrangement which has been thought through in detail and which is administratively workable.

Most of the schemes which have been suggested require Commonwealth Government approval either in relation to foreign ownership of the bank (which the Commonwealth will not contemplate) or in relation to foreign ownership of F.C.A. The Commonwealth's foreign investment guidelines are very much more stringent with regard to foreign investment in financial institutions, including finance companies, than for manufacturing or primary industry. As I see it, three possible courses of action are open to the bank, should the shareholders choose to reject the A.N.Z. scheme on Monday. Members will realise as I explain these courses of action that they are not alternatives to the A.N.Z. scheme. However, it is a reasonable and responsible approach for interested parties to take to consider what could be done should the A.N.Z. offer not be accepted.

The Premier made clear that, because the creditors were required to vote on the scheme of arrangement so soon after we came into office, the responsibility for determining whether or not the A.N.Z. scheme should be accepted was a matter for the shareholders of the Bank of Adelaide, and that, if the shareholders decided that the A.N.Z. scheme should not be accepted, there was a fall-back proposal that involved Government guarantees. But the Government was not prepared to step in and purchase the Bank of Adelaide or take such drastic action in the face of the responsibility that the shareholders of the Bank of Adelaide were being asked to exercise. In fact, the Leader of the Opposition has admitted today that there were not funds available for his Government to seek to acquire the Bank of Adelaide. If that is not achievable, what is?

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** What about the guarantee proposal?

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** You did not talk about guarantees; you talked about acquisition. On 11 October in another place the Premier outlined three options. One was from Mr. Holmes A'Court. I refer to the *Hansard* report of 11 October, where the Premier stated:

The only other scheme I have seen so far, which would be anywhere near workable, is one worked out by people concerned about the bank. Because of the agreement under which the support operation was mounted, the bank is not able to discuss alternatives to the A.N.Z. scheme. However, the possibility of a decision by shareholders to refuse the A.N.Z. offer has given rise to some thought about a fall-back position which could be debated if this were to occur.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** That is the one that required the guarantee.

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** Let me finish what the Premier was saying. The Premier continued:

I understand that this scheme was discussed with the previous Premier, and I assume it is the one to which Mr. Scott of Mount Gambier has referred recently.

The Government has made some modifications to the scheme suggested. As modified, it would require: a loan of a substantial amount by the Government to the bank; a Government guarantee related to a share or notes issued by the bank; a loan from F.C.A. to the bank; and a Government guarantee in relation to any losses on the problem land in excess of the \$41 400 000 included in F.C.A.'s accounts.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** That is what the independent report was asked to look at, wasn't it?

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** I am telling the Leader what was in the statement. The Premier was talking about the

options available and indicated that, if the scheme involving the friends of the bank was to be adopted, it would involve a substantial amount being loaned by the Government to the bank, and the interests of the State being subordinate to the interests of all other creditors.

Whilst I am not aware of the exact amount likely to be involved, it was in excess of \$10 000 000 and was probably much more than that. The Premier indicated clearly that it was a fall-back position. As it turned out, the shareholders of the A.N.Z. Bank supported the scheme and it was carried by 74 per cent in number of the shareholders represented, and by 89 per cent in value of the shareholding represented at the meeting.

Honourable members should recall that those figures are much in excess of the figures required by the Companies Act before a scheme of arrangement can be approved or forwarded for approval by the Supreme Court. From there it moved on to the Supreme Court, where there were extensive matters reviewed by the Full Supreme Court and the Master of the Supreme Court. The fact is that all those shareholders of the Bank of Adelaide who were concerned about their investment and the future of the Bank of Adelaide could see only one prospect for retaining some banking interest, and that was to merge with the A.N.Z. Banking Group.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** What alternative proposal was put?

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** The alternative fall-back positions were announced by the Premier in the House of Assembly on 16 October.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** He didn't say he was prepared to support them, though.

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** He indicated that they were fall-back provisions, and that was all that we had the time and the resources to do.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** You had Mr. Allert's report.

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** You place a lot of faith in Mr. Allert's report.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** Table it.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** The fact is that the previous Government had 4½ months in which to do something and all it did was refer the matter for report. It could think of nothing imaginative to save the Bank of Adelaide. It offered no hope to the shareholders, and it was not prepared to acquire the Bank of Adelaide, because it did not have funds. There was talk about a guarantee and, as I have indicated, we were prepared to consider the guarantee situation, notwithstanding that it would have required a substantial amount of State funding to support an enterprise that was in such financial difficulty. We were prepared to support it as a fall-back position.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** You didn't tell anyone that.

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** The Premier on 11 October 1979 and again on 16 October 1979 made the Government's position very clear by statements made in the House of Assembly, which received wide publicity.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** He didn't say that you would provide the guarantees; he only said that it was a fall-back position.

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** In a Ministerial statement on 11 October the Premier stated:

As modified, it would require: a loan of a substantial amount by the Government to the bank; a Government guarantee related to a share or notes issued by the bank; a loan from F.C.A. to the bank; and a Government guarantee in relation to any losses on the problem land in excess of the \$41 400 000 included in F.C.A.'s accounts.

The Premier made clear in the statement that the Government was prepared to consider, however reluc-

tantly, the support outlined in that programme, if the A.N.Z. Bank shareholders declined to support the scheme of arrangement. The Premier, in another Ministerial statement, said:

Calls by the members of the Opposition for me to table the Allert Report appear to be based on the misconception that, in my statement on Thursday 11 October I said that nothing was available to the shareholders other than the A.N.Z. scheme. In fact, I said exactly the opposite. I made it quite clear in the statement that I believed there were two sets of arrangements other than the A.N.Z. scheme which could be made to work. Both of them involved the Bank of Adelaide and F.C.A. continuing to operate. I think it is a reasonable inference from other comments in that statement that I would not have put them forward if I had not been certain in my own mind that they were workable.

One of them would have required Government guarantees; the other may have required them. I indicated quite clearly in my statement that the Government would have been prepared to provide those guarantees if the shareholders rejected the A.N.Z. scheme. The Allert Report was one of the pieces of information which helped me to form the view that the proposals I outlined at that time were workable. It is a technical document which comments on the financial feasibility of the alternatives I mentioned as having been put forward by friends of the bank. It reaches the conclusion that the alternative is financially feasible but makes the point specifically that it would not be as advantageous financially to shareholders as the A.N.Z. scheme.

That clears it up.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** They weren't prepared to support it.

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** The Opposition obviously forgets what occurred at that time. It has falsely suggested that it was not prepared to make some guarantee available. I have made it clear that whilst we clearly sought the retention of the Bank of Adelaide as an entity representing South Australians, the facts were quite clear, that on the information available to the Government a decision ought to be made by the shareholders of the Bank of Adelaide when voting on whether or not they should accept the scheme.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** Members opposite certainly did not promote the other scheme.

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** The Opposition really cannot do anything but repeat that the Liberal Party did not put forward any alternatives. However, the record speaks for itself. They are alternatives in the form of fall-back schemes that we were prepared to propose. However, the Opposition when in Government could not even consider those alternatives. The facts of the matter are that, whilst the Bank of Adelaide is to be merged with the A.N.Z. Bank, there are still many very strong banking institutions—private enterprise as well as Government—carrying on business in South Australia that provide a top grade service to South Australians.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** They are from overseas and interstate.

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** They provide a service to South Australians. They provide to South Australian individuals and South Australian companies banking facilities of the highest order. The fact that the Bank of Adelaide was not able to continue is not any reflection on the private enterprise policy of this Government. In a number of areas the Government has clearly identified the initiatives that it is taking to reinforce private enterprise and to ensure that that sector of our economy strengthens and takes over from Government in those areas that should not be the Government's responsibility.

In relation to the Leader of the Opposition's question about employment, I do not have any readily available information, but I undertake to make it available during the Select Committee proceedings or in the Committee stage of the debate. In relation to the matter of compensation being paid by the A.N.Z. Bank to the State in lieu of stamp duty, a formula has been devised that takes into account the number of transactions which, but for this legislation, would have taken place in the transfer of responsibilities of the Bank of Adelaide to the A.N.Z. Bank. The amount that the Government will collect as a result of that formula will be almost identical with the amount that it would have otherwise received from the several hundred thousand documents that would have been lodged for stamping at the Stamp Duty Office in South Australia.

There is a precedent for the arrangement by which in this case the A.N.Z. Bank makes a payment to the State in lieu of stamp duty. That precedent occurred, as I recall, when the A.N.Z. Bank merged with the Esanda Bank in the early 1970's. It provides a very important saving to the State Government, because it means that the Government does not have to process several hundred thousand

documents through the Stamp Duty Office. For the A.N.Z. Bank it means a similar saving in administration costs that would result from unnecessary red tape. One of the Government's emphases is to eliminate that type of red tape. The stamp duty arrangement results in no loss to the State had the legislation not been proceeded with. I commend the Bill to all honourable members.

Bill read a second time.

**The PRESIDENT:** As this is a hybrid Bill, it must be referred to a Select Committee pursuant to Standing Order 268.

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

That the Select Committee consist of the Hons. R. C. DeGaris, K. T. Griffin, D. H. Laidlaw, Anne Levy, and C. J. Sumner.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** I move:

That the motion be amended by adding the name of the Hon. Barbara Wiese.

**The Hon. K. L. MILNE:** I support the increase to six. I have a schedule that I would like to table of Select Committees of this Council since 1970, and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL SELECT COMMITTEES

##### 1970/71 CAPITAL TAXATION UPON BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY—Labor Government

5 Members—

Liberal

The Hon. J. M. Cooper  
The Hon. R. C. DeGaris  
The Hon. C. M. Hill  
The Hon. H. K. Kemp  
The Hon. C. R. Story

Motion that Hons. T. M. Casey and D. H. L. Banfield be Members of Committee disputed by A.L.P. Members.

##### PLIGHT AND NEEDS OF CERTAIN PENSIONERS AND OTHERS IN DISTRESS—Labor Government

3 Liberal 5 Members—  
2 Labor

Liberal

The Hon. F. J. Potter  
The Hon. E. K. Russack  
The Hon. V. G. Springett

Labor

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield  
The Hon. A. J. Shard

##### 1971/72 FLINDERS UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL, 1971, AND UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE ACT AMENDMENT BILL, 1971—Labor Government

5 Members—

Liberal

The Hon. R. A. Geddes  
The Hon. H. K. Kemp  
The Hon. F. J. Potter  
The Hon. V. G. Springett  
The Hon. C. R. Story

1972 NIL

1973 NIL

##### 1973/74 BEVERAGE CONTAINER BILL, 1974—Labor Government

6 Members—

Liberal

The Hon. R. A. Geddes  
The Hon. C. M. Hill  
The Hon. V. J. Potter

Labor

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield  
The Hon. B. A. Chatterton  
The Hon. A. F. Kneebone

##### BOATING BILL—Labor Government

6 Members—

Liberal

The Hon. J. C. Burdett  
The Hon. J. M. Cooper  
The Hon. C. R. Story

Labor

The Hon. T. M. Casey  
The Hon. C. W. Creedon  
The Hon. A. J. Shard

Increase from 5 to 6 Members on motion of Minister of Agriculture.

GAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL, 1974—Labor Government			
2 of 6	5 Members—	Liberal	Labor
2 of 5		The Hon. R. A. Geddes	The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield
		The Hon. C. M. Hill	The Hon. A. J. Shard
		The Hon. C. R. Story	
TRANSPANTATION OF HUMAN TISSUE BILL, 1974—Labor Government			
	5 Members—	Liberal	Labor
		The Hon. J. C. Burdett	The Hon. B. A. Chatterton
		The Hon. M. B. Dawkins	The Hon. A. F. Kneebone
		The Hon. R. C. DeGaris	
1974/75 NATURAL GAS PIPELINES AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL, 1974—Labor Government			
	6 Members—	Liberal	Labor
		The Hon. J. C. Burdett	The Hon. T. M. Casey
1 of 6		The Hon. R. C. DeGaris	The Hon. B. A. Chatterton
1 of 5		The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan	The Hon. A. F. Kneebone
ROYAL INSTITUTION FOR THE BLIND ACT AMENDMENT BILL, 1974—Labor Government			
	5 Members—	Liberal	Labor
		The Hon. J. C. Burdett	The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield
		The Hon. M. B. Dawkins	The Hon. A. J. Shard
		The Hon. V. G. Springett	
1975/76 NIL			
1976/77 CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL, 1976-1977—Labor Government			
	6 Members—	Liberal	Labor
		The Hon. M. B. Cameron	The Hon. T. M. Casey
		The Hon. M. B. Dawkins	The Hon. N. K. Foster
		The Hon. C. M. Hill	The Hon. C. J. Sumner
DISTRICT COUNCIL OF LACEPEDE (VESTING OF LAND) BILL, 1976—Labor Government			
	5 Members—	Liberal	Labor
		The Hon. R. C. DeGaris	The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield
		The Hon. R. A. Geddes	The Hon. J. E. Dunford
			The Hon. C. J. Sumner
EMU WINE COMPANIES (TRANSFER OF INCORPORATION) BILL, 1976—Labor Government			
3 of 6	6 Members—	Liberal	Labor
1 of 5		The Hon. J. A. Carnie	The Hon. B. A. Chatterton
(1 Liberal majority		The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw	The Hon. C. W. Creedon
1 Labor majority)		The Hon. A. M. Whyte	The Hon. C. J. Sumner
FORESTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL, 1977—Labor Government			
	5 Members—	Liberal	Labor
		The Hon. J. C. Burdett	The Hon. C. W. Creedon
		The Hon. M. B. Cameron	The Hon. C. J. Sumner
		The Hon. R. C. DeGaris	
		The Hons. C. J. Sumner and C. W. Creedon later withdrew from the Committee.	
UNITING CHURCH IN AUSTRALIA BILL, 1976-1977—Labor Government			
	6 Members—	Liberal	Labor
		The Hon. J. C. Burdett	The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield
		The Hon. J. M. Cooper	The Hon. J. R. Cornwall
		The Hon. R. A. Geddes	The Hon. J. A. W. Levy
1977 NIL			
1977/78 DEBTS REPAYMENT BILL, 1978—Labor Government			
	6 Members—	Liberal	Labor
		The Hon. J. C. Burdett	The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield
		The Hon. R. C. DeGaris	The Hon. F. T. Blevins
		The Hon. K. T. Griffin	The Hon. C. J. Sumner
1977/78 MINORS (CONSENT TO MEDICAL AND DENTAL TREATMENT) BILL, 1977—Labor Government			
	6 Members	Liberal	Labor
		The Hon. J. C. Burdett	The Hon. J. E. Dunford
2 of 6		The Hon. J. A. Carnie	The Hon. J. A. W. Levy
		The Hon. R. C. DeGaris	The Hon. C. J. Sumner

## 1978/79 CHILDREN'S PROTECTION AND YOUNG OFFENDERS BILL, 1978/79—Labor Government

6 Members—

Liberal

Labor

The Hon. J. C. Burdett

The Hon. F. T. Blevins

The Hon. J. A. Carnie

The Hon. T. M. Casey

The Hon. K. T. Griffin

The Hon. J. A. W. Levy

## CONSERVATION AND USE OF FUELS AND ENERGY RESOURCES—Labor Government

6 Members—

Liberal

Labor

3 of 6

The Hon. J. A. Carnie

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris

The Hon. C. W. Creedon

The Hon. R. A. Geddes

The Hon. N. K. Foster

## MOTOR BODY REPAIRS INDUSTRY BILL, 1979—Labor Government

6 Members—

Liberal

Labor

The Hon. J. C. Burdett

The Hon. T. M. Casey

The Hon. M. B. Cameron

The Hon. J. E. Dunford

The Hon. C. M. Hill

The Hon. N. K. Foster

## 1979 ABATTOIRS AND PET FOOD WORKS BILL, 1979—Labor Government

6 Members—

Liberal

Labor

1 of 6

The Hon. M. B. Cameron

The Hon. T. M. Casey

The Hon. J. A. Carnie

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton

The Hon. C. M. Hill

The Hon. J. E. Dunford

## SUMMARY

1970-1979 20 Committees  
 8 Committees—5 Members  
 12 Committees—6 Members  
 From and including 1973/74  
 12 Committees of 6 Members  
 4 Committees of 5 with Liberal majority  
 1 Committee of 5 with Labor majority  
 Since 1977 they have all been 6 Members

**The Hon. K. L. MILNE:** During the period I have surveyed, the Labor Party was in Government and the pattern was most distorted sometimes. Sometimes there were three Labor members and three Liberal members, and at other times there were all Liberal members. What was said some time last session was true—that it has been decided for some years now that Select Committees of this Council should comprise three Government members and three non-Government members. I say “non-Government” because I hope that on some occasions I will be included on committees, as I was kindly included on the Select Committee in relation to uranium. When honourable members see the schedule, I think they will agree that in principle the amendment is fair.

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** I oppose the amendment, and I do so on the principle that since 1977 all Select Committees have comprised six members—three from each side of the Council. That was done for a specific reason.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** Because you were in Opposition.

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** We were in Opposition, but we had a majority.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** We have a majority now.

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** It's a numbers game, mate.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** The Liberal Party had a majority, and it conceded that, if there were to be Select Committees, the Government ought to be equally represented on them. I take the view that, on issues as they come before the Council, such as the Bank of Adelaide Bill, which are not going to be opposed, the

Government then has the numbers on the floor to ensure that the Bill passes.

In those circumstances, I believe that it is a matter of principle that the Government should have three members on the Select Committee and the Opposition two, because it reflects the state of support for the legislation on the floor of the Chamber. I oppose the amendment.

The Council divided on the amendment:

Ayes (10)—The Hons. Frank Blevins, G. L. Bruce, B. A. Chatterton, J. R. Cornwall, J. E. Dunford, N. K. Foster, Anne Levy, K. L. Milne, C. J. Sumner (teller), and Barbara Wiese.

Noes (9)—The Hons. J. C. Burdett, M. B. Cameron, J. A. Carnie, L. H. Davis, R. C. DeGaris, K. T. Griffin (teller), C. M. Hill, D. H. Laidlaw, and R. J. Ritson.

Pair—Aye—The Hon. C. W. Creedon. No—The Hon. M. B. Dawkins.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried; motion as amended carried.

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

That the quorum of members necessary to be present at all meetings of the Select Committee be fixed at four members, and that Standing Order 389 be so far suspended as to enable the Chairman of the Select Committee to have a deliberative vote only.

Motion carried.

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

That the Select Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, to adjourn from place to place, and report on 21 August 1980.

Motion carried.



## ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

(Continued from page 294.)

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** Before the interruption, I was making some remarks about the Government's appalling decision last week to change the nature of the role of the Women's Advisers in both the Education Department and the Department of Further Education. I should like now to outline some of the other changes that have taken place, since the Government took office, in relation to women. Further evidence of the Government's lack of commitment to the cause of female equality is found in the bizarre story of the appointment of the new Commissioner for Equal Opportunity. Honourable members will recall that in June, soon after the new Commissioner's appointment, a series of questions was asked in this Council by the Hon. Mr. Sumner and myself, and by the Leader of the Opposition in another place, concerning the procedures adopted for the selection of the successful candidate.

At first, the Minister of Consumer Affairs was evasive. Eventually, he had to make a Ministerial statement in order to correct the inaccuracies in his previous replies to questions. We then learnt that the Government had decided to make the Commissioner's job a political position and felt justified in departing from the long-standing convention in the Public Service by appointing Ross Story, a political appointment himself, to the selection panel, instead of a public servant, as would normally be the practice. Why would the Government wish to do this? It seems to me that the answer to this question is fairly obvious.

When I asked the Minister in this place what the new Commissioner's qualifications were for this position, I was told that he could not quite remember, but that she had noticed some discrimination among male nurses in her previous job as a nurse counsellor. I do not wish to cast any aspersions on the new Commissioner personally, but it seems to me that this Government should have been looking for a candidate who had had very considerable previous experience in industrial relations, preferably in the private sector, from which most of the complaints come, and, more importantly, should have been looking for a candidate with a very comprehensive understanding of the nature and incidence of discriminatory practices.

The reality is, Mr. President, that overwhelmingly, discrimination on the grounds of sex occurs against women rather than men; so, extensive background and knowledge in that area should have been a prerequisite for such an important position, and it would seem that Mrs. Tiddy's knowledge in this crucial area is somewhat thin.

I was very disturbed to hear Mrs. Tiddy say on a recent radio interview that, since taking the job, she had been surprised to learn the extent to which discrimination still exists in the community, and she was surprised that many employers do not seem to take the anti-discrimination legislation seriously. This is rather like a new Minister of Employment saying he is surprised to find that there are 500 000 people unemployed. I would have thought that anyone with a passing interest in the area in South Australia must have been aware of the facts of discrimination.

In the wake of last week's announcement about the so-called expanded roles of the two women's advisers' positions in education, it is unsettling to recall the comments of the Minister of Consumer Affairs about the work with which he expected the new Commissioner for

Equal Opportunity to be involved. He said that she would spend a proportion of her time dealing with cases of discrimination against handicapped people. He had already given notice that the Sex Discrimination Act was likely to be widened to cover discrimination against the handicapped.

I certainly have no quarrel with that. I am delighted that the Government wishes to alleviate the difficulties suffered by handicapped people, but is the Government seriously suggesting that the previous commissioner was underworked? I certainly hope not. So, giving the commissioner a new responsibility must mean less time and effort being spent on overcoming sex discrimination. The commissioner already has insufficient staff to cope with the work currently coming her way. The amount of work she can do is severely limited by the current requirement that she personally must negotiate on behalf of clients, rather than having the power to delegate this responsibility to other personnel. The commissioner needs more resources, not more responsibilities.

While I am dealing with the Sex Discrimination Act, I will raise another matter. Although the Attorney-General has announced that a review of the Act is under way, he has not stated the intention of the review, and continued his silence on that matter today in answer to the Hon. Miss Levy. There is some concern that changes to the Act might favour the interests of employers, rather than women and others who suffer discrimination in employment. That such concern should exist is not surprising, because members of the Government, particularly the Minister of Industrial Affairs (Mr. Brown), believe the anti-discrimination legislation is an obstacle to industrial development in South Australia, presumably because it puts South Australia at a comparative disadvantage to other States by preventing employers from exploiting cheap labour.

We should remember that in the 19th century employers fought against abolishing child labour for similar reasons. Anti-discrimination legislation to protect children was opposed then as anti-discrimination legislation to protect women is opposed now. We should reject such opposition—it is as unjust as it is self-serving. It may be that the fears I am expressing are completely without foundation. But the Government must expect speculation when its own position has not been made clear to Parliament. If any changes are to be made, they should follow the lines recommended in the last two annual reports of the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity.

I turn now to another issue affecting women on which Government members have shown a remarkable lack of courage and conviction. Honourable members will recall that last year the question of law reform on prostitution was referred to a Select Committee, which unanimously recommended decriminalisation on the grounds of equity, social justice and removing the current double standard. There was little overt opposition to this proposal from members of the Liberal Party. But, when the Government changed, so did the public views of many of the members opposite.

Suddenly they saw the problem in a completely new light. They caved into intense pressure brought to bear by the absurd and bigoted Festival of Light and its supporters, who include many women in the Liberal Party. This capitulation was as stupid as it was cowardly. The fanatics of the Festival of Light, who claim to represent the community, in fact represent only themselves. This is quite clear with respect to the prostitution issue. In February last year a survey published in the *Advertiser* showed that 67 per cent favoured law reform in this area.

Although prostitutes comprise only a tiny proportion of women in the community, they are a vulnerable and grossly exploited group of people. Many of them are victimised, discriminated against and subjected to physical violence. Because the oldest profession is an illegal activity, and because it will persist, whatever the law says, prostitutes have little or no protection. Members of the Liberal Party know that this is so, and they know that it ought not happen. Yet in the House of Assembly, where a Bill for decriminalisation was introduced, only two Liberal members were courageous enough to stand up and be counted.

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** You had 10 years to do something about it.

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** I did not. I was only elected in September. One of these was the Minister of Transport, Mr. Wilson, who had been Chairperson of the Select Committee and a signatory of the report, so he could hardly vote otherwise, and maintain any credibility.

In order to avoid controversy and to put off having to make a decision one way or another, the Government prevented a vote being taken at the end of the last session. This was a procedural vote only which would have allowed debate to continue in the new session without interruption. But, the Bill lapsed because no vote was allowed. This means that it must be reintroduced and the debate repeated. The Government has wasted members' time and taxpayers' money, while prostitutes, whom the Bill was to protect, continue to suffer gross exploitation and victimisation.

The Government's behaviour exemplified its lack of compassion, its lack of courage, and its susceptibility to pressure from the vociferous bigots of the Festival of Light who want to impose their narrow Victorian morality on the rest of us. The lobbyists of this organisation are also hard at work trying to turn back the clock in another area of progressive legislation. I refer to the question of abortion. The current Act needs amending; it could be greatly improved. But the Festival of Light wants the existing law changed to make abortion almost impossible to obtain. There is overwhelming evidence that to do this would bring back the backyard abortionists with all the injury and trauma that that involves. The Festival of Light does not care about that.

Two Government Ministers—the Minister of Health and the Minister of Community Welfare—have discussed the possibility of restricting abortion still further than it is at present, though not as far as the Festival of Light would advocate. However, despite the talk, there has been no action—thank goodness.

Perhaps the response that the Bjelke-Petersen regime received to its Bill to restrict women's right to choose has persuaded members of the Government that the community supports liberalised abortion laws, that the Festival of Light's views are those of the lunatic fringe, and that restricting the availability of abortion is more likely to cost votes than liberalising it.

I turn now to yet another issue which affects women—an issue which the Government talked about at some length during the election campaign when it tried to play on people's fears and whip up hysteria on its law-and-order tack. I refer to the problem of rape, and more particularly the problems of the Rape Crisis Centre, which is the only organisation of its kind giving support to rape victims in this State.

It is this Government which paid lip service to the need to make our streets safe for women to tread and which has left the Rape Crisis Centre unsure of its future and in a state of limbo since coming to Government. The Government, and more particularly Mrs. Adamson, the

responsible Minister, has shown no support for the centre's work and has given no commitment for its continuation. This is the same Mrs. Adamson who has been hogging media headlines with accusations of bottom pinching. If the Minister really cares about sexual exploitation let her do something more to help the victims of rape—the most savage and barbaric form of sexual exploitation. This is certainly a more serious issue than an assault on her Ministerial bottom in the bar! What should be done? Well, for example, the premises that the centre currently occupies are temporary, and the staff do not know whether permanent accommodation will be made available. Its funding is uncertain, and arrangements for payment of accounts are *ad hoc*. This means that long-term planning is impossible. And I understand that a request which was made some time ago for funds to employ a person to work on the problems of child abuse (which is emerging as an enormous problem in the community) has not been considered.

This is what the Party which talked so loudly in Opposition about protecting the victims of this vile crime has failed to do in office. Let the Government put some money where its mouth was. If one adds all this up, one gains the clear impression that the Government has been testing the water to see how much it can get away with without creating too much fuss. Neither Mr. Tonkin nor any of his Ministers have made any public commitment to furthering the initiatives of the previous Government to improve the status of women in South Australia.

Again, we are forced to conclude by the Government's silence on these issues that it has capitulated to reaction—that it is influenced by the anti-feminist backlash which is being spurred on by such organisations as Women Who Want to be Women and the Festival of Light, which represent a very small proportion of the female population but which have been very efficient in grabbing publicity for their cause.

**The Hon. R. C. DeGaris:** You say that they are anti-feminist?

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** Yes.

**The Hon. R. C. DeGaris:** On whose view?

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** My own and many others in the community. As my colleague in the Federal Parliament, Senator Susan Ryan, has said in her discussion paper released recently, such groups play on the insecurities, fears and tensions which accompany all social changes, whether in the work force, in schools or in homes.

And there is no doubt that changes have occurred. The most significant change has been the dramatic increase of married women returning to the work force during the last decade, in particular, after spending varying periods of time at home rearing their children. Some women go back to work because they want increased intellectual stimulation and social contact; others work through sheer economic necessity and in order to supplement family incomes. Whatever the reasons, women are there to stay. No amount of argument will change that. No amount of abuse by conservative politicians and reactionary community organisations will be able to send women back to their homes because, first, they need the money and, secondly, the economy depends on the labour and skills of married women to keep going.

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General):** I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the sitting of the Council to go beyond 6.30 p.m. in order to allow the Hon. Barbara Wiese to conclude her remarks and all other formal business to be finalised.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** Organisations like the Festival of Light and Women Who Want to be Women foster irrational superstitions and prejudices which should be treated with the contempt they deserve by legislators.

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** Women who want to be women sound all right.

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** It is not. Why don't you look up its charter? Ironically, these extremist groups are often headed by successful middle class women whose policies, if adopted, would deny to other women many of the choices they have themselves exercised. Some of these organisations take the view that the national women's advisory body should be abolished on the grounds that men do not have such a body, and I think Mr. Allison has said enough publicly to suggest that he shares this view in relation to the women's adviser positions in the field of education. He has described them as a sop to women.

These sorts of attitudes ignore the obvious fact that Australian women are not yet the equal of men in political representation, power and influence. Translating such reactionary policies into policy would act to preserve women's inferior political status. The view that the road to equality lies in treating everybody equally has long been discredited.

Another ploy used by such groups in discussing the advancement of women is to focus on differences between women at work and at home. Thus, it is depicted as "unfair" that women in the work force receive a wage while full-time housewives do not. This sort of argument underlies support for tax penalties against working women. It diverts attention away from progress towards full equality in the wider society. Similarly, maternity leave is opposed. It is argued that working women should not have maternity leave because it is not available to women in the home. In what precise way it is expected that women in the home will gain any advantage from a reduction in the industrial entitlements of other women remains unclear.

It is worth noting that, while the economic gains of women in paid employment compared to women in the home disturb these vociferous groups greatly, they are never heard to protest at the vast disparities between rich and poor. They will never suggest that rich men with private incomes should leave the work force to create jobs for others—only married women are required to make this sacrifice. These people are hypocrites, and should be treated as such. Their views should be recognised for what they are—blinkered, reactionary and increasingly out of step with community attitudes.

In summary, I want to say that it is the view of many people in this community that this Government is not committed to female equality. Today I have tried to highlight some of the Government's actions that demonstrate this lack of commitment, and I remind honourable members that less than a year of this Government's term has passed. I am sure that more would have been done in that time to downgrade services for women if the Government had thought it could get away with it. So far, it has not been quite sure of its ground.

I remind the Government again that women's lives are changing and so are their expectations. Women of my generation will not tolerate the sort of discrimination their mothers lived with. Their expectations are different, and they will not tolerate Governments which do not meet their needs. It is time the Government came to terms with this, and it is time it stated publicly exactly where it stands on these issues.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 6.35 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 19 August at 2.15 p.m.