LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 22 July 1982

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: HOUSING FINANCE

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Housing): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Commonwealth Government outlined its new housing package to assist home buyers on 15 March 1982. As part of this package the Federal Treasurer announced that a mortgage and rent relief scheme would be implemented in conjunction with the States. He stated that up to $20 000 000 per annum will be provided by the Commonwealth for a period of three years from and including 1982-83, provided these sums are matched each year dollar-for-dollar with new expenditure by the States and Territories.

Since this time all the States and Territories have been negotiating with the Federal Government on the preferred details of such a scheme. In fact, South Australia was the first State to put proposals to the Federal Government on how the funds should be used to assist home buyers and tenants who are in financial difficulty. To date no State Government has been in a position to take up the funds from the Federal Government for this mortgage and rent relief scheme. It was not until yesterday that the Federal Government confirmed the arrangements and outlined the proposals for the scheme to all States.

South Australia's share of the national assistance of $20 000 000 is $1 760 000, and the South Australian Government will match this amount. Therefore, more than $3 500 000 will now be available each year, for an initial period of three years, to assist South Australians in difficulty with their home loan mortgage repayments and private rents. The mortgage and rent relief scheme will provide short-term housing assistance to both tenants and purchasers who are experiencing genuine financial difficulty in meeting rent or mortgage commitments. The actual amount of assistance to be provided will be determined in the light of income and financial obligations, following an examination of the personal circumstances of each case. In determining eligibility for assistance, regard will be taken of gross family income, mortgage payments, or rent, as a percentage of gross family income, and other financial commitments. Purchasers who believe they qualify for mortgage crisis relief are advised to contact their own finance provider, or the Housing Trust's advisory service (telephone 50 0200). These applications will be treated in the same way as the State-sponsored 'home purchasers in a crisis scheme' which has been operating for the last several months.

In view of the substantial increase in funds available, the Government is reviewing the criteria under which assistance is given, as a matter of urgency, to determine in what manner they can be broadened. Before the rent relief scheme can be implemented the question of the social security and taxation treatment of payments to individuals under the scheme must be determined. These issues are being examined by the Commonwealth Government in the context of the 1982-83 budget. In the interim, private sector tenants in severe difficulties because of their rent payments are advised to contact the South Australian Housing Trust. Once full details of the scheme are known the trust will then provide the appropriate advice and assistance.

QUESTIONS

BUILDING COSTS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs a question on the subject of building costs.

The PRESIDENT: Is leave granted?

The Hon. N. K. Foster: No.

The PRESIDENT: Leave is not granted.

FOREIGN OWNERSHIP

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a question about foreign ownership of farm land.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Some time ago the Minister of Agriculture announced, in response to growing pressure from the community, that he would ask the Advisory Board on Agriculture to review the question of foreign ownership of farm land in South Australia. It was pointed out at that time that the advisory board had few resources and would find it very difficult to undertake such a review and examine the various transactions involving farm land to see whether there was an increase in foreign ownership.

I also asked a question in this Chamber as to how many additional resources in terms of research assistance and so forth would be provided to the advisory board to assist it in this substantial task. In fact, that question has never been answered. Recently I read that other States are taking the issue of foreign ownership of farm land seriously and are establishing registers and examining land titles to see how extensive the practice is and whether it is growing.

In view of the responsibility that the Minister gave to the Advisory Board on Agriculture to examine this matter, will the advisory board produce an annual report on its activities of reviewing foreign ownership? If it is to produce an annual report, on what date will that report be produced and will it be tabled in Parliament?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I shall refer that question to the Minister of Agriculture and bring back a reply.

MOUNT GAMBIER WATER

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a question about nitrates in Mount Gambier water.

The PRESIDENT: Is leave granted?

The Hon. N. K. Foster: No.

The PRESIDENT: Leave is not granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: My questions are directed to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health. Does the Minister recall that about 15 months ago the *Advertiser* carried a front page story concerning an increased incidence of birth defects in the human population in the Mount Gambier district? This work was conducted by a C.S.I.R.O. research team supervised by Dr Tony McMichael. Does the Minister recall that there appeared to be a statistically significant link between high nitrates in ground waters used for drinking and these birth defects? Does the Minister recall that the mechanisms which caused these defects were not clear? However, there was a suggestion—

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a point of order. I have not heard a question directed to the Minister in the

form of 'Will the Minister do this', 'Will the Minister ascertain', or 'I ask the Minister'. The honourable member is merely making a statement and this is outside my understanding of Standing Orders.

The PRESIDENT: I take the point of order. I have to make the decision, and I am watching the situation. I ask that the Hon. Dr Cornwall continue.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: As I was saying when I was inappropriately and rudely interrupted, there was a suggestion that the nitrates might act by combining with amines in the stomach to form nitrosamines.

The Minister would be aware, I am sure (or is he aware?), that nitrosamines are known to cause both mutagenic and carcinogenic (cancer-causing) effects. Can the Minister recall that at the time both the Minister of Health and the Minister of Water Resources adopted a very low key attitude? When eventually forced to comment publicly, the Minister of Health inferred, quite incorrectly, that the possible problem could be overcome by females drinking rainwater when they found that they were pregnant. Eventually, the Minister said that further investigations, including farm and laboratory animal studies—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I do not want to become embroiled in the argument of what is and what is not a question. I ask the Hon. Dr Cornwall to complete his question as soon as possible.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Yes, Mr President. These are further questions to the Minister. Does the Minister recall that eventually the Minister of Health stated that further investigations, including farm and laboratory animal studies, would be undertaken to investigate the problem further? Since then we have had no information as to whether or not that is being done. What surveys of farm animals have been carried out? What experiments have been devised and conducted to study possible mutagenic and carcinogenic effects of nitrates in laboratory animals? What further epidemiological studies, if any, have been conducted on the population of the Lower South-East for possible genetic, teratogenic or carcinogenic effects of nitrates? What mechanism or mechanisms are postulated for the biological action of nitrates?

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

WALLAROO HOSPITAL

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Will the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, inform the House of the date on which the Wallaroo Hospital is likely to cease to function? Is there a likelihood of any further admissions to the geriatric section of that hospital? Has a date been set for the planning and commencement of the building of a hospital at Kadina? If so, what is the expected date of completion? What is the proposed cost of such a hospital at Kadina? Will the Minister have a statement prepared on the proposal in such detail as to inform Upper Yorke Peninsula residents of the proposed date of closure of the Wallaroo Hospital and the aged care section? Finally, in the event of a new hospital being built at Kadina, will the Minister state the Government's intention in respect to the existing Wallaroo Hospital in terms of its future use or demolition?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

HOUSING TRUST

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Housing a question about the Housing Trust.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: It has been drawn to my attention that the South Australian Housing Trust has passed information to the Department of Social Security in regard to some of its tenants. Trust officers have visited trust premises and sought information as to who is living in the premises and who might or might not be staying there occasionally. The particular cases referred to supporting parents who were living in trust rental premises. Apparently, the Housing Trust officers were making inquiries as to whether any person other than the tenant was even temporarily residing at the premises.

Furthermore, this information was being passed to the Department of Social Security which could, of course, make use of such information in determining eligibility for pensions. I understand, further, that the Social Security Act requires the Housing Trust to provide the Department of Social Security with such information if it has it. It would seem to me that it is highly undesirable for the Housing Trust to be snooping on its tenants in this way in order to have information should the Department of Social Security request it. This seems to me to be an unnecessary action on the part of the Housing Trust. It certainly should in no way go out of its way to obtain such information to pass it on to the Department of Social Security should it request such information.

I am sure that Housing Trust tenants are not aware that any information they give to Housing Trust officers may be passed on to other Government departments. Will the Minister have discussions with the Housing Trust to ensure that Housing Trust officers are not snooping on tenants in any way? Furthermore, will Housing Trust application forms clearly indicate to any applicant for rental premises that information supplied may be divulged to the Department of Social Security, so that people become aware that any information they provide is not necessarily confidential to the Housing Trust?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not know of any relationship between the Department of Social Security which, of course, is a Commonwealth department, and the South Australian Housing Trust, a State instrumentality. I doubt very much that there would be any reference in the Commonwealth legislation to the Housing Trust—

The Hon. Anne Levy: Anyone has to give any information they have, if requested.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I see. Trust officers certainly, from time to time, are bound to make checks on household incomes and occupancy of their houses. Of all our trust tenants, 54.8 per cent are now on subsidised rentals, and more than 45 000 trust homes are being rented, so a great number of people are being subsidised in their rent by the State. It is essential that the Housing Trust has full knowledge of a household income because of this question of subsidy. In other words, the subsidy varies on a percentage basis with the household income: there are adjustments made from time to time when someone other than the breadwinner in a family becomes income producing, such as children or the wife or husband going out to work.

All that information must be monitored periodically by the trust so that a fair and proper subsidy is adjusted in the rent fixed by the trust against the tenant involved. It would surprise me greatly if this information, which is sought periodically by forms issued by the trust to its tenants, is being utilised for any other departmental purpose. I would be surprised if it went so far as being used in any way by

a Commonwealth department. However, I will refer the matter to the General Manager of the Housing Trust and bring back an answer for the honourable member.

FAMILY RESEARCH UNIT

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question on the Family Research Unit.

Leave granted.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: During the past two days I have asked questions of the Minister concerning family policy and the Family Research Unit. I believe that my command of the English language is adequate. I do not usually have problems communicating the things I want to communicate to people, but I have had considerable difficulty in drawing adequate replies from the Minister to the questions I have asked. I rise again today to ask, for the third time, a question relating to the Family Research Unit. I will try to speak slowly, to be sure that my question is understood. Has the use of the family impact statement been dropped in any area of Government activity other than that outlined in the *News* three days ago? If so, will the Minister give details?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I gave that answer quite clearly yesterday.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: No, you didn't.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: If the honourable member likes to look at the *Hansard* pull, which I have, she will find that I did. If she is not satisfied I will answer it unequivocally now: in any respect, other than those mentioned in the article in the *News*, there will be no lessening of the use of the family impact statement. It will be used in exactly the same way as it was before.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: By way of a supplementary question, in relation to the six officers who are now working part time in the Family Research Unit—

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The question must be supplementary.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: It seems that I have to break things up for the Minister to appreciate what I am saying. In relation to the six officers who are working part time on family research, will the Minister advise in which sections of the Department for Community Welfare these officers are employed? Secondly, what experience or qualifications do those officers have to equip them to undertake family research? What proportion of the work time of those officers is devoted to family research?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I answered that previously. I will get the exact details as to the amounts of time, and so on. I did explain yesterday, but I will go further than I have gone previously. When we first came into Government we had a policy to establish a family research unit within the Department for Community Welfare, and that we did. It was done within our first week in office. At that time it comprised two officers, as I have said before, who were almost totally devoted to that work in the Family Research Unit. As I explained before, in fairly recent times one of them was promoted to become a Director, but she still has her interest in the Family Research Unit and still carries out that work. She is able to do so from a better perspective, because she is now a Director and not simply an officer employed in the Family Research Unit.

The other officer, as I have said, sought employment elsewhere although, I am pleased to say, still in the welfare area. I did mention yesterday that he still, from his other employment, has recently made input to me by letter on the question of the family impact statement. Because the department has had the experience of having just two full-time officers and having lost both of them, in order to complete work in the Family Research Unit it seems that the better approach, at least in the meantime, is to have a number of officers make input so that, if we do lose one through promotion, doing work elsewhere, or any other cause, it will not have such a radical effect on a small unit. That was the experience that we had when we did have just two officers in the unit and having them both leave the permanent direct services of that unit in a short space of time, so that we were left completely stranded.

The department's interim strategy has been to use the input from a number of different officers in relation to specialised areas within the general area of family research. That is what we are doing. We are certainly looking at again staffing it with one or two permanent officers in the future. We felt that that was a necessary strategy to ensure that the unit does not become completely stranded again through the loss of two officers.

In relation to the honourable member's detailed questions about the number of officers, their expertise, and the amount of time that they devote to family research work, I will obtain information from the department and do my best to answer those questions. When the Family Research Unit was first set up I was not questioned about the expertise of the officers: indeed, the two officers were very expert. I know from my own knowledge that the officers concerned (and I have seen some of their work) are very skilled indeed, but I will not attempt to provide such detailed answers off the top of my head. I will bring back detailed answers for the honourable member.

TAXATION

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Can the Attorney-General, representing the Treasurer, indicate the cost per annum to the South Australian taxpayer, both State and Federal, in relation to grants and taxation benefits for the dairy industry? What is the similar cost in relation to the Riverland fruit growing area in relation to all forms of taxation and/or grants? What is the cost in relation to the motor vehicle industry and the supporting components industry? To what extent does the taxpayer, through taxation, support industry and other commercial enterprises?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Including tariff protection?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I include all forms of taxation, protection, grants, and so on. What has been the percentage increase in financial terms over the past five years? Finally, what, in percentage terms, is the labour content in all of these areas, both in the number of persons employed and, more importantly, in the number of man hours worked?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: That would obviously require a great deal of work. I will refer the question to the Treasurer and bring down a reply.

ARBITRATION

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Premier, a question about the State arbitration commission.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: All members would be aware of the inherent problems in having separate State and Federal arbitration tribunals which, at times, give quite conflicting decisions in relation to matters of a very similar, if not identical, nature. In other words, one decision can be handed down in the Federal Arbitration Commission and, when the matter comes before the State tribunal of South

Australia or any other State, it is not uncommon on an identical matter for a completely different decision to be handed down.

As far as the workers are concerned, sometimes they win and sometimes they lose. I believe the whole community would benefit if these decisions were standardised. The best way to do that would be to have joint sittings of State and Federal commissions, making collective decisions, whether the decisions handed down affect workers and employers in one State or under a Federal award. Before this could occur there would have to be uniform legislation before all State Parliaments and Federal Parliaments to allow such a procedure.

What is the Government's attitude to what seems an eminently sensible proposition? What is the Government's policy in relation to joint sittings of Federal and State arbitration tribunals? Was the question of joint sittings of Federal and State arbitration tribunals discussed at the recent Premiers' Conference and, if so, were any decisions made? If decisions were made, what were they? Finally, does this Government intend to legislate to allow joint sittings of Federal and State arbitration tribunals?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer those questions to the Premier. It is also a matter for the Minister of Industrial Affairs, and I will ensure that he is also consulted.

RIVERLAND CANNERY

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the Riverland cannery.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The people in the Riverland are naturally concerned about the future of the Riverland cannery. One of the major problems in assessing the future of the cannery is the lack of financial information available to the community about the cannery's operations. A number of grower groups would like to know about the financial returns of the cannery over the last couple of financial years.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: It's not brilliant.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I know that it is not brilliant, but I also know that it is not as bad as has been reported in the press by the local member, who tried to give the impression that the cannery was losing more than $5 000 000 a year. I believe that it is certainly not as bad as that.

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: It is.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: That is the point I am making. When will the cannery's financial figures for the last financial year be available to give the people in the community some idea about its returns at the present time? When will those accounts be completed and when will they be available for people to look at?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I am not in a position to give any indication about the timing: that is a matter for the receivers and managers. I am prepared to take the matter up with them and obtain some information for the honourable member. The honourable member referred to the operations of the cannery and said that it was not losing as much money as had been indicated by the local member. I can say unequivocally that the local member was quite correct. The cannery has been propped up most significantly by the taxpayers of South Australia; it is losing quite a large amount of money and has lost a lot of money in addition to the capital losses that became obvious when the whole operation was restructured. The cannery's finances are certainly not good. I will endeavour to obtain greater detail for the honourable member in due course.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I have a supplementary question. Can the Attorney-General clarify his reply? The Attorney-General, in his reply, seemed to be confirming the statement made by the local member, which was that the cannery operation is currently losing money at a rate of $400 000 per month, or $4 800 000 per year.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The latest information I have received, which now is a little old, is that the cannery was losing something like $400 000 a month on its operations. Of course, this includes fruit products, processing and general products. Again, I will endeavour to obtain up-to-date information. I would be surprised if any new information differed from the information I received some time ago, and that was that there was an operating loss of something like $400 000 per month.

PATIENT CARE

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a question about the quality of patient care.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I have in my possession a letter sent to the Hon. Jennifer Adamson and written by Mr C. J. Stead of Renmark which, amongst other things, says:

> . After having spent a few days in Queen Elizabeth Hospital for tests and later going on to the Royal Adelaide Hospital where I spent 17 days and underwent a heart by-pass operation, I must say that it is very hard to understand how anyone can justify the short staffing of nurses, which is very noticeable at both places. As far as I could see, the nursing staff did a magnificent job, and generally cramming a lot more than eight hours work into an eight-hour shift, and in its hospital funding, the South Australian Government is capitalising on the dedication of the nurses to the care and comfort of their patients. This short staffing is not only unfair to the nurses, it also has an adverse effect on a lot of patients who are unable to get immediate attention because the nurses are all busy elsewhere. I was one who was forced to suffer intense pain and discomfort because of having to wait for over an hour for a rubber cushion.
>
> The following day I was subjected to a further agonising ordeal by having to be taken down to the X-ray room on a transport that was covered with a mattress so thin and worn that the end of my spine was very badly bruised by pressing on the metal bars underneath. Everyone I complained to about the mattress told me I'd have to get in touch with you, because you are controlling the finance.

He was there referring to the Minister of Health. This, of course, happens in all our public hospitals all the time.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: The letter continues:

> With a bruise as big as the palm of my hand on the end of my spine, that answer didn't give me much consolation.

The letter goes on at some length, and I do not intend to quote it all. We are here talking about a coronary by-pass patient who was extremely vulnerable in the circumstances in which he found himself, not about somebody who was in day care for a matter of hours. Mr Stead concluded by saying:

> I feel that I, and probably a lot of others, have been a victim of unwarranted circumstances, of which the general public have the right to be made fully aware.

When will reasonable funding be restored in order to ensure quality of patient care in our great teaching hospitals in South Australia? Will the Minister investigate this particular case as a matter of urgency?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer that question to the Minister of Health and bring back a reply.

BUILDING COSTS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs a question on the subject of building costs and prices.

The PRESIDENT: Is leave granted?

The Hon. N. K. Foster: No.

The PRESIDENT: Leave is not granted.

DAIRY INDUSTRY

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a question about the South-East dairy industry.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The South-East dairy farmers are concerned because it appears that the augmentation scheme, which has been developed over the past few years, is not going to be completed due to the need to amend the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act. The augmentation scheme is a scheme whereby the returns from the more profitable liquid milk market are paid to dairy farmers in the South-East. So far, these payments have come from milk that has been sold for liquid milk consumption outside the metropolitan area.

It appears that there will be insufficient funds from that source to complete the augmentation of payments to the South-East dairy farmers. The South-East dairy farmers were under the impression that the Liberal Party promised, before the last election, that it would take the necessary steps, even if that meant amending that Metropolitan Milk Supply Act, to ensure that augmentation was completed.

However, it was reported in the land column in the *Advertiser* that the Minister of Agriculture is now reluctant to amend the Act to allow the augmentation scheme to go through. Can the Minister say whether the report in the *Advertiser* that said he will not now amend the Act to complete the augmentation scheme is true? Is this a breach of a promise given by the Liberal Party at the last election?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer that question to the Minister of Agriculture and bring back a reply.

PIGGERIES

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Environment and Planning, a question about piggeries.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: The Light District Council has received an application from the South Australian Bacon Company Pty Ltd to establish a 100-sow piggery on the outskirts of the Light District Council boundary, in fact, right on the Gawler northern boundary. While it would be a 100-sow piggery, it would contain about 1 000 pigs in various stages of growth throughout the year. There are a number of piggeries north, west and north-east of Gawler in a 10-mile radius, and a great deal of money has been spent on these piggeries. However, very little can be done to remove the obnoxious odour.

These piggeries are in the country and, unless one passes close by, one does not know that they exist. The odour is most obnoxious and I am sure that the residents of Gawler and surrounding districts would take exception to the establishment of another piggery and having this odour inflicted on them by an insensitive adjoining council. Naturally, that council wants growth, but I sometimes think that, had the Gawler corporation pursued its boundary extension, as was recommended in earlier reports, the area in question could possibly now come within the confines of the Gawler corporation, the matter of the obnoxious odour from a piggery would not arise, and the residents of Gawler would not be as concerned as they are now. Will the Minister take every action necessary to ensure that this kind of establishment is not built on the outskirts of a major town?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am not sure what jurisdiction the Minister has on this matter, but I will certainly refer the question to him and bring back a reply.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Highways Department Regional Office, Port Augusta,

Robe Water Supply Improvements.

PARLIAMENTARY STAFFING

The PRESIDENT: I take this opportunity to inform honourable members that today the review committee, comprised of Public Service personnel, which conducted a review of staffing and managerial aspects of Parliament, delivered its final report to the steering committee. When the opportunity presents itself, probably early next week, a copy will be available for each member, in compliance with my comment that I would keep members informed of all developments. As well, a copy will be made available to each member of the staff.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Chief Secretary, a question about domestic violence.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Earlier this year we passed legislation to enable police to undertake a different procedure in cases of domestic violence that are reported to them. I understand that this legislation was proclaimed about two months ago, and I am sure that I am not the only person who would be interested in finding out what effects the new legislation has had.

Will the Minister obtain an indication of how many domestic violence cases the police have been called to attend in that time, how many injunctions have resulted from domestic violence, how many breakings of injunction have occurred, and with what result under the new procedures, and what are the comparisons between the degree of domestic violence with which the police have dealt in the past two months compared to that which occurred in the corresponding period last year before the new legislation was in operation?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will refer those questions to the Chief Secretary and endeavour to obtain the answers that the honourable member seeks.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 21 July. Page 45.)

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Feleppa is about to make his maiden speech, regardless of the fact that he has been in this Council for some time.

The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA: In supporting the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech, I acknowledge with thanks the honour that has been conferred upon me in being entrusted with my maiden speech in this Chamber. With this task, I would like on this occasion to speak on some matters which I believe are of particular importance to the citizens of South Australia.

Before doing so, I wish to thank you, Mr President, for the courtesy and assistance you have extended to me since my admission to this Parliament. I also would like to thank all honourable members from both sides of the Council who have made me welcome in this institution. Further, I wish to thank my Parliamentary and Party colleagues who have placed in me great confidence and, finally, the people of South Australia, to whom I offer my services.

I cannot by-pass this opportunity without expressing my deepest sympathy to the family of the Hon. Mr Jim Dunford, a former member of this Council. Naturally, it was my wish to join you, Mr President, and other honourable members on the resumption of this Parliament on 1 June in your expression of sorrow for the sudden death of Mr Dunford. However, due to the particular nature of the regrettable situation, I was too moved to speak from Mr Dunford's own chair.

Today I am fully aware that my premature presence in this Chamber is due to an act of God, and I deeply regret the sad and sudden disappearance from this Council of a person very dear to all of us. Therefore, the decision to accept the position offered to me was a very difficult one.

I wish to address myself in the first part of my speech to the problem of unemployment that we face today. There can be little doubt that unemployment today is one of the most hideous social and economic problems confronting the entire Australian community. During the latter half of the 1970s we experienced the highest rate of unemployment since the depression years of the 1930s. At present about 450 000 Australians are officially recorded as unemployed and the number will undoubtedly pass 500 000 by the end of 1982.

In addition, between 350 000 and 450 000 Australians have been forced into a state of 'hidden unemployment' since the mid 1970s, having withdrawn from, or declined to enter, a job market which offers few employment prospects. A further 200 000 people may also have been forced into part-time employment or self-employment, as a result of a lack of full-time job opportunities. The average period of joblessness at present is considered to be in the vicinity of 30 weeks, and 140 000 Australians have now been out of work for at least six months.

The burden of unemployment, however, while affecting an increased section of the Australian labour force, continues to be perniciously concentrated on certain disadvantaged groups: migrants at large, females, the young, and those with few skills, including older workers. Employment opportunities have increased at an average yearly rate of as little as 1 per cent during the latter half of the 1970s, nowhere near enough to cater for the increasing number of people coming into the labour market. Moreover, almost half the growth in jobs has been in the part-time area.

The regressive nature of the Liberal Federal and State Government policies must bear much of the responsibility for the current disastrous employment situation and, in particular, the Federal Fraser Administration, which continues to pursue a misguided policy strategy of giving priority to fighting inflation by deliberately suppressing the level of economic activity and attempting to restrain growth in real wages.

The Government has reduced expenditure in manpower and training areas by approximately 40 per cent in real terms since 1975-76, while unemployment has risen by over 50 per cent. It has steadfastly refused to implement programmes which would create additional employment opportunities for those out of work, and has done very little to improve the availability of training opportunities for the labour force confronted with the need to adapt to changing skill demands.

Unlike the Liberal Government in Canberra and in this State, the Australian Labor Party is totally committed to working towards the restoration and maintenance of full employment. This will be a major policy priority of the next State and Federal Labor Governments. A major programme of direct job creation will be initiated in the public and community sectors. A Labor Government in South Australia will introduce a regional training scheme through local government to create potential employment opportunities. Through such a scheme, many small firms will be able to employ and train more apprentices.

Labor's programme for policy action is positive, responsible and absolutely necessary in the context of massive and increasing unemployment and declining employment opportunities. Let it be perfectly clear that we in the Labor Party are of the opinion that it will involve increased Government expenditure, but this is and should be regarded as totally necessary and justifiable, since we believe that unemployed men and women, and in particular the young, have had more than enough of the Fraser policy, supported by the Tonkin Government, which has pushed 2 000 000 Australians to the poverty line, including, of course, thousands of South Australians.

I wish now to turn to the development of Australia's society and, in particular, of the society of South Australia. A recent publication titled *Multiculturalism For All Australians*, issued by the Australian Council on Population and Ethnic Affairs, makes the point that the consequences of the multicultural composition of our society is affecting and will affect all Australians. This is, indeed, the concept expressed in the title of the paper. Australia's population has changed in composition and in nature. The type of people mixed together at the arrival of the first fleet is vastly different to the composition of our society today. In 1892, 87.2 per cent of the population of Australia was of British stock: 3.4 per cent were Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders; 7.0 per cent were of European origin; 2.1 per cent were of Asian origin; and 0.3 per cent of other origins. In 1947 the balance had shifted so that 90.2 per cent were of British descent, 0.8 per cent of Aboriginal and Island descent, 8.4 per cent of European descent, 0.5 per cent of Asian origin; and 0.1 per cent of other origin. In 1978 the mix had again shifted so that we had: 76.9 per cent of British descent; 1 per cent of Aboriginal and Island descent; 19.9 per cent of European descent; 2 per cent of Asian descent; and 0.2 per cent from other countries. The projected figures for the year 2008 are: 70.6 per cent of British background; 1.5 per cent of Aboriginal and Island background; 18.7 per cent of European origin; 8 per cent of Asian origin; and 1.2 per cent from other parts of the world.

Several considerations could be made about the shift in composition and the composition itself of our society. Probably, however, the most obvious one and also the most important one is that we are destined to remain a society composed of many cultures for many years to come. This is brought about principally by two factors, the first being the natural increase from people who are themselves migrants. Statistically, the rate of reproduction of migrants is only marginally above that for the overall population. However, this ensures that their presence is maintained and slightly increased. The other reason, of course, is immigration

itself. Currently, the Australian Government is committed to let into the country about 125 000 people every year. If we exclude those who leave the country for whatever reason every year, we are left with a net intake of about 70 000. Of these it is estimated that at least 50 per cent will be from a non-English speaking country.

When mass migration was initiated in 1947, Australia had its own reasons for inviting and accepting newcomers to this country. Some of those reasons were unashamedly practical. Australia was on the verge of an economic and technological boom which required a large amount of manpower. This need, by historical chance, coincided with the presence in the world of a large number of refugees created by the turmoil of the Second World War. Finally, there was the overtly stated fear that a sparsely populated Australia might have been too much of a temptation for the thickly populated countries of Asia. At the time of the formulation of the new immigration policy, the White Australia Policy was alive and thriving. The programme fell neatly into place: Southern Europe filled the bill to perfection. Italy, Greece, Yugoslavia and other neighbouring nations were looking for countries where they could relocate some of their people.

The question of the consequences of this intake of immigrants was hardly raised and even less understood. It was taken for granted that the desirability of coming to Australia would have been self-apparent to any new migrant, and that, in the face of such opportunity, they would adopt the local language, customs, mentality and behaviour. And, in cases where some resistance was shown to this process, the Government might take action to ensure that this happened.

To tell the truth, Mr President, the Australian Government never imposed assimilation by force. It simply presumed that migrants would come around to it by themselves. It was perhaps more by ignorance and good intention than by malice that no special programmes were devised to take care of the problems and needs associated with migrating. People disembarked into a new world, hardly aware of the loss they had suffered in abandoning their own country of origin, and equally totally ignorant of the new world into which they were being inserted.

The migrant, by and large, managed. It is perhaps one of the ironies of the history of the past 35 years that the failure of the Government to take into account the cultural needs of migrants had enforced their identification with their background.

Although the Government felt that by not providing services it was enticing migrants into conforming, the migrants responded by doing exactly the opposite. They established their own organisations, they built their own structures, they rallied around their own communities, they developed their own strengths. And the result of this is a survival story which is admirable and which has placed the foundation for the developments which are currently under discussion.

One wonders what the outcome would have been, had the Government provided 'transition services' to migrants. If migrants had been provided, in the late 1940s and 1950s, with English classes, classes on Australian law, Government systems of services, special health services, interpreters, etc., perhaps migrants might have seen the reasonableness of the environment of their new culture and felt more inclined to adapt to it.

As it was, this never happened and today we are confronted with a society which possesses a number of well-established and clearly identifiable groups, proud of their heritage and determined to maintain it. I am, of course, not sorry about this possible mistake. I believe that Australia is all the better off for it. We are a country with greater experience, greater wisdom, greater variety and with more stimulation, than we would have been if we had remained strongly monocultural. But this phase has passed. It is only unthinking, shallow-minded people who would still believe in assimilation or mono-culturalism in Australia. It is impossible to achieve, because it goes against reality. We are a multicultural society and, because it defies people's attachment to their background, people cannot detach themselves from their past.

We are now entering a new phase in the discussion on the role and future of ethnic groups in Australia. Throughout the 1970s we developed and accepted the concept of integration. We buried the white Australia policy and we declared that all people have a right to their past, to their present and to their future. It is to the merit of the former Federal Minister and current shadow Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, Mr McPhee and Mr Young, that a bi-partisan policy on immigration was developed. This policy contains the seeds for the development of Australian society.

Since its first establishment, this policy has come a long way. Australia has now recognised more vigorously its international obligations towards the refugees of the world. It has also revamped its criteria for entry so as to give greater consideration to relatives of current residents. This measure, in particular may seem a generous concession in terms of its economic implications. I do not share this view.

I believe the clause on family reunions is still too restrictive and does not take sufficiently into account the nature of family composition of migrant communities. In the long run, provision for the widest consolidation of families in Australia can only increase their stability and reduce the likelihood of a breakdown and the need of services for their support. Migrants have never lived off the back of Australia; they have contributed to it, as can be amply demonstrated in retrospect.

The recent proposals announced by the Minister on new legislation on citizenship is another area in which great improvement is seen but which still contain areas of glaring inconsistencies. According to these proposals, the right to a vote will be consequent to the granting of citizenship which, it is suggested, can be given after a minimum permanence of three years in Australia. However, British subjects who, prior to this legislation were given the vote automatically after six months residence in Australia, will, after the proclamation of the new legislation, be accorded automatic citizenship so that their right to the vote will be maintained.

The legislation, however, does not make the same or similar offer to residents who may have lived in this country, contributed to its wealth for decades and may have no intention of returning to their country of origin. Minimally, these people should have been offered the vote and the citizenship on simple application. The British subjects had both vote and citizenship bestowed upon them. Thus, the new legislation will confirm and legalise a state of unequal treatment which has existed since 1947. The proposed new legislation, instead of eliminating discrimination in the granting of citizenship, will in fact officially sanction such practice for hundreds of thousands of migrants, residents of Australia.

The point about the right to a vote and citizenship should be made in this Chamber because it affects the vote in South Australia. There are currently many thousands of residents in South Australia who have not been given the right to a vote in the same way that British citizens have. A change in the proposed law, as suggested above, would quickly correct this unfair and discriminatory practice.

Finally, I wish to make some comments on the question of deportation. Again, the proposed legislation is an improvement on the primitive rules which have governed this matter to date. The only case where it is proposed to deprive persons of citizenship is when 'he or she has committed a serious offence before the grant of citizenship even

though the conviction occurs after the grant.' As I said, this is an improvement on the previous situation where a new citizen could have had his or her citizenship withdrawn and been deported if he or she committed a crime while a citizen.

I am suggesting that these fine measures of crime committed before or after citizenship are artificial, costly and coming close to attacking the human rights of an individual. It would seem to me that once a resident of Australia has lived in this country for a period of time, sufficiently long to give an indication of wanting to settle here permanently, this country should accept him or her for all that this means. Most often it will mean that this country will benefit from his or her work. Sometimes it will mean that this country will have to shoulder the social responsibility of dealing with his or her shortcomings. It is simply part of the human reality of any society that some of its members will commit crimes and that these members are distributed among all classes of people, all colours, all races, and also among its citizens as well as among its non-citizens.

I always thought that a member of a society acquired the right to the protection of society and to a fair deal from it, when a crime is committed by virtue of belonging to that society and contributing to it. In the case of all residents of Australia, these two criteria are mostly always present.

As for the previous question I examined, this one also has implications for the citizens of South Australia. This Parliament, which represents not only its citizens, but also has the duty to govern its residents, should consider this question and make appropriate representations to the Federal authorities. But there are matters of even a more practical and immediate nature, which I believe need to be addressed and redressed. I am concerned that, in all the talk about equality of access, integration of ethnic groups and special provision for them, we may consider all matters resolved simply because we have talked about it, or because we have now devised a neat theoretical scheme or drawn up a tidy plan for the future.

The reality is that to this day there is still rampant discrimination against minority cultural groups on a grand scale. There seem to be two main sources of racial discrimination still current in Australia and in South Australia. One is related to offences against the discrimination Acts of our State and of the Commonwealth. The reports from the Commissioner for Community Relations testify to the currency of this question. Unfortunately, in South Australia we do not possess a mechanism as apt in surveying this matter as does the Federal Government. In South Australia the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity has no jurisdiction over the 1976 Discrimination Act. Jurisdiction is with the police. This is indeed a peculiar situation, when, very often, the complaints of discrimination on the basis of race are precisely against the body which is entrusted with its surveillance.

I suggest that a more appropriate body would be the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity. In this case, the office should be given not only the powers to investigate the complaints, but also the power to prosecute on behalf of the plaintiffs. But, as I said, there is a second type of discrimination: one which is more subtle, less evident and more insidious. I am speaking of the situation created by the very nature of the way in which our society is structured and functions.

The social, political and service delivery structure of our society is based on and takes into account almost exclusively the principles, traditions and needs of the dominant 75 per cent of our population. Access to this structure or services is dependent not only on availability but on ability, and ability is based on knowledge, experience and length of presence. It goes without saying that where participants have greater knowledge of the structure, or longer experience of it, they will be able to use it to better advantage. Our society has all the signs of these elements. Several instances of this inequality are evident. This very Chamber and the House of Assembly are good illustrations of this.

Of the 69 members of Parliament, I am the only one of a non English speaking background. And, may I add, my nomination to Parliament was itself fortuitous, accidental, and, given the circumstances, even unfortunate; in other words, it was not by design, but by accident. While the ethnic population of this State is about 20 per cent, its representation in Parliament is barely 1.5 per cent. If this Parliament is to claim to be a fair and honest representative of the people it governs and by whom it has been elected, it must surely alter this discrepancy.

Clearly, this failure to have representatives in Government from ethnic communities cannot be attributed to lack of talent among them, or lack of initiative. This imbalance is present in business, in the unions, in the Public Service and in local government. The problem in this sense is not dissimilar to the one suffered by women. Structures and steps of progression were designed not only with men in mind, but with men of Anglo-Saxon origin. While women have been able to wage a successful campaign against this discrimination, ethnic minorities have as yet been unsuccessful. It is possible today, and it has always been possible, to treat everybody equally, to observe the laws scrupulously and maintain the fairest of attitudes to all citizens and yet discriminate against them in the most atrocious manner. Discrimination is inbuilt into the system. When a law is enacted which takes into account only the cultural traits of one group, discrimination is given an opportunity to be legitimised. Thus, we have institutionalised, and sometimes legalised, discrimination by virtue of the inequalities inbuilt into the system.

A quote from the Race Relations Conciliator of New Zealand, published this year by the Human Rights Commission of New Zealand, is appropriate to this matter. The report is titled, *Race Against Time* and states on page 42:

> Members of the dominant culture in a society often do not realise how much they owe their success in life to the fact that the education, economic and political systems, legal and other social institutions are all constituted along lines that fit in with the culture and value system in which they have been raised. Neither do they realise that people who have been brought up in a culture which does not fit in with these systems and institutions suffer discrimination purely by virtue of the nature of the systems and institutions themselves. This state of affairs can be described as institutionalised discrimination, where there is an unintentional social bias to the benefit of one race and the disadvantage of another.

The matter quoted above, I suggest, is valid for New Zealand as well as Australia. And examples abound. Legalised discrimination exists in our legal system both in the procedure as well as the substance of the law. It is still not a legal right to understand the proceedings before sentence is passed. We are still battling over the adequate provision of interpreters in our courts in South Australia. This service is still left largely to the good will of the judge, the convenience of the lawyers, or the availability of interpreters, especially in country areas.

And the substance of the law itself can be a source of discrimination. In one of the latest reports by the Law Reform Commission of Australia, the point is made that the test of the reasonable or ordinary man is discriminatory. A Working Paper by the Victorian Law Reform Commissioner, states (page 24):

> In this State (that is, Victoria), where there is a considerable cultural mix and where it has been asserted, for example, that Melbourne has the largest Greek population of any city outside Athens, it would seem an insoluble problem to pin-point the qualities or characteristics of the ordinary man when considering

such a man's (or woman's) ability or propensity to lose his (or her) self control.

The problem underlined in the above quote is contained in the fact that in law the 'ordinary man' is equated with the ordinary 'English man'. I defy anybody to state that the 'ordinary English man' behaves in court like the ordinary Italian man, or Greek man or Vietnamese man.

Therefore, I insist that it is primarily the structure that needs to change if we seriously wish to attack the evil of discrimination. Evidence of this can be found in the education and welfare services. The structure, curriculum and rules governing our schools may be excellent in quality and reflect truly the social composition and mentality of the majority group, but it does little to reflect the mentality of the minorities.

The laudable efforts of migrant education units are no substitute for an overall understanding of this question and an in-depth analysis of its consequences. There have been some efforts in this direction. These, however, have been left mostly at the theoretical level, with no practical steps being taken to experiment.

Thus, far too often, multi-cultural education is reduced to language study or the occasional 'multi-cultural day'. The matter, however, is much deeper than it appears on the surface. It is a matter of educational philosophy, expectations of parents, freedom of choice of curriculum, and the right to determine the type of education that the child should have.

The area where the most flagrant abuse of the power of discrimination takes place is in the field of welfare. In this field society, through its agencies—and I draw this to the attention of the Minister—mostly the Department for Community Welare, has intervened in the area which is most sacred to ethnic groups. I am speaking, of course, of the power which this department has assumed over families and its members. At this point I do not wish to associate myself with the recent comment made by a writer in a weekly newspaper, and therefore I wish to point out that the Minister's reply to that article will not be appropriate to the comment that I will be making.

The Minister of Community Welfare will recall my rage and the rage of many members of ethnic communities at the tragedy of Truro and other families. The Minister will recall how we accused his department of complicity in the final outcome of these events. The accusation still stands and I believe it is valid. It is the irony of this department which, on the one hand, takes upon itself the right and authority of intervention in families and, on the other hand, fails to protect them.

The department declares itself the defender of the children, but takes no steps to maintain the natural authority which parents have over their children. When this authority needs to be exercised it is no longer there. Withdrawn from the parents by the law, the law itself is unable to enforce such authority. A parent is left unable to demand the return of his child to the family in the face of the refusal of the child. The department, on the other hand, will take a neutral position. The child, lured by the promises of freedom and uncontrolled by any restraint, will risk his whole life for a moment's fling.

The law and the department do a great injustice to our communities by not taking into account the traditional strengths of our families and by disregarding the numerous alternative approaches to the protection of children, without creating a situation which can be worse than the one designed to be remedied by the law. I insist that intervention by the Department for Community Welfare in the past has been damaging and negative, and I give notice that I shall pursue this matter in great depth in the future.

I do not wish to be appearing to condemn every aspect of every service provided by the Department for Community Welfare, nor do I wish to criticise the approach of its staff. I think that social workers need to pursue more vigorously this question of provision of welfare to ethnic communities. I believe the profession as a whole has not adequately committed itself to this matter. The staff of the department, however, function within the guidelines, rules and standard procedures set by the department itself. Unfortunately, the staff are as much the victims as are the clients. By observing these rules and standard procedures, they run the risk of discriminating against the migrants and of damaging their clients. I criticise the Minister and the executive of the department for not examining this issue more thoroughly, giving it better resources, and treating it more seriously.

Perhaps there is no group, however, which has suffered more from overt and covert discrimination than the original inhabitants of this country. Decimated by the invading white man, maintained in a state of virtual captivity for nearly 200 years, it would be a wonder if they did not feel enraged and militant. Still abused by many, deprived of effective power, Aborigines struggle with great dignity to retain their past, lay foundations for the future, and maintain a commitment to the present. Their demands that the land be returned to them is the beginning and basis for this process. The Aboriginal without his land is not an Aboriginal; he is like the Italian without his family, and the English royalist without his Royalty. I would not be true to my responsibility in this Chamber if I did not make a commitment to the Aboriginal aspirations and pledge support to their cause.

So it is that, in concluding this segment of my comments, I suggest that this Government in future needs to take into account the following matters when it legislates:

(a) examine whether the legislation reflects the needs and mentality of all the citizens it is meant to serve and represent, and not just the larger group;

(b) where conflict of interest may be diametrically opposed, then steps should be taken so that groups whose legitimate attitudes are excluded may be helped to cope or may not be, in practice, discriminated against;

(c) a revision of existing structures and legislation to bring it in line with the above principles;

(d) the provision of appendix services at all levels and for all services to ensure that maximum benefit is accessible to all. Such appendix services to include effective information, use of interpreters and the introduction of community languages as the norm in the delivery of services.

This dismal picture of ineffective analysis and criticism of existing structures is unfortunately rendered even more piteous by the existence of efforts by this Government to begin some type of redress. I refer, of course, to the role and function of the South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission. It has now been in existence for more than 18 months, and its claim to its validity is reduced to a small number of services, some insignificant and some valuable, but limited.

The commission seems to have failed in its main task of becoming the authoritative voice for the migrant, of providing a viable challenge to existing situations, and of developing a comprehensive policy statement which would indicate and detail the manner in which it perceives its role and how it is going to achieve it. These words are spoken by many migrants in criticism of the Government which has created this body and then, with the greatest of cynicism, has ensured that it would become ineffectual through the appointments made, the limitations to its resources, and the lack of concern for its ineffectiveness.

Finally, while I am just about to finish my speech, I would like to conclude my remarks on a very unfortunate aspect of this lucky country, which reflects realistically that the amassing of immense wealth by the few has grown at the same time as has the poverty of the many in our community. It is a fact that the richest 2 000 Australians earn as much as the poorest 2 500 000. It is also a fact that 5 per cent of rich Australians earn 70 per cent of income from interest, rent, dividends and shares. And there are people in this very Chamber who, in defence of this inequality, and in the fear that any change may attack their own disproportionate wealth, are prepared to cry 'wolf' at our effort to alter this injustice. They have endeavoured to paint socialism, which is a frame for social justice for all, and a fair distribution of wealth, with unacceptable colours. This trick may be clever, but it does them little honour when it is plainly done to cover their greed, self interest, and lack of concern for the less fortunate.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I wish to support the motion, and in doing so I congratulate the Governor on the excellent Speech with which he opened the Parliament. Indeed, it is the best Speech that has been heard in my time in Parliament. It contained a resume of a very excellent period of Government in this State. I wish also to extend my sympathies to the families of those members who passed away: Sir John McLeay, Sir Philip McBride, and Jim Dunford in particular. We all had our little differences with Jim Dunford from time to time, as did, no doubt, members of his own Party, but nevertheless he had a sense of humour and an open approach that I certainly appreciated. I sincerely regret that he is not with us now.

The other person to whom I wish to refer is the late Ted Dawes. Every member in his Chamber would have known Ted as a friend and a helper. Certainly, in my 11 years in this place he was of tremendous assistance. He always had a smile in the morning: no matter how bad one felt, one always got a smile from Ted. Some mornings, that was very much appreciated. It was a shock to me to find that he was no longer with us. I wish to contain my further remarks to one subject.

The Hon. G. L. Bruce: Monarto?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Monarto is finished now, because we managed to sell the useless piece of real estate which the previous Government foisted on the taxpayers of the State and for which it paid an enormous sum. That is all over. I trust that we will see no more of it. The subject to which I wish to refer for a little time is uranium. That matter will be around for some time to come, because we are only just beginning the saga of uranium.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You can't talk about anything else.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I can see that the two left-wing members of the Council are leaving forthwith, because of course I will refer to their performance at the Federal Conference, how they voted, and what their thoughts are now. We would be very interested to know. I believe that they have left the Council principally because they do not want to answer any questions that I may put to them about the future.

The question of uranium first became a subject of interest in this Council in November 1979, when a select committee was mooted by the newly founded Opposition in this State. The committee was designed specifically to embarrass the new Government. The Opposition believed that it would be a good idea and that it would come out against us. It even opened up the select committee to the public for that purpose.

We managed to put a little common sense into the terms of reference, and away we went for two years. It did not turn out quite as members opposite expected. In fact, it turned against them, because one member looked at the evidence properly, went through it and came out with a proper conclusion—the only conclusion to which one could come.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: He changed his mind.

The Hon. G. L. Bruce: Who was the member?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The Hon. Norman Foster. He was very sensible.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: And members opposite put him on the committee.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Yes. He listened to the evidence, as we all did. Some members, such as the Hon. Mr Milne, did not come to the same sensible conclusion. For a moment we thought that Mr Milne would come to that conclusion, but he failed to do so. The Hon. Mr Foster changed his mind and came to the conclusion to which any sensible person would have come, after listening to the evidence, and that was that uranium mining should proceed in this State.

The Hon. G. L. Bruce: Why didn't he write that up in the select committee report?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Perhaps the honourable member had better ask him that. If the honourable member wants some detail of what happened on the committee, I would be prepared to give it. I can tell the Hon. Mr Bruce that Mr Foster had nothing to do with the report that was drawn up supposedly in his name. If the Hon. Mr Bruce asks Mr Foster, he will get that answer. The Hon. Mr Foster did not do anything towards that report and he became very cross because it did not reflect his views at all. He was strong-armed into keeping quiet about it at that time by various members.

I do not want to give details of what happened at the meetings, because that is in the past. I am sure Mr Foster will be willing to tell honourable members about this matter publicly if that is what they want. He will go through it detail by detail, and members opposite will not like what they hear. It is for Mr Foster to say. The end result was that we had a select committee report and we also had a member who had his eyes opened by the various items of sensible evidence that we received. So we went on.

The next surprise, when the Roxby Downs Bill was first introduced in the House of Assembly, was that there appeared in the *Sunday Mail* an article supposedly leaked by the A.W.U., although I believe that it was more than that. I will quote a little of that article, because I think it probably indicates some of the reasons why the Hon. Mr Foster finally changed his mind on this matter. The A.W.U. eventually had a meeting, at which it decided that it would approve the mining of uranium. Mr Dunnery stated:

> We have to accept there are workers already mining and processing uranium in the Northern Territory under the Miscellaneous Workers Union. Mr Dolan of the A.C.T.U. has been up to tell them they shouldn't be working but they are still there. It's a problem, but where is Mr Dolan going to find our workers other jobs that pay $600 a week? . . .
>
> Mr Dunnery said: While we have members who want to work at Roxby Downs we'll be looking after their interests.

Mr Bannon, in regard to the same subject, on 18 April 1982 stated:

> . . . the A.W.U. decision had 'complicated an already murky issue'.

I will refer to the murky issue later in relation to the present policy of the Labor Party. He further stated:

> The only complication I see is that the A.L.P. will seem to have been compromised by this act of the A.W.U. in the public's mind. The Government's stand has been very showy all along, and this development makes it all the more difficult for us to explain the issue clearly to the people.

I will say a little more about that later. I believe it has become even more difficult for the Labor Party since then. The General Secretary of the Federal A.W.U. stated:

It is quite clear from what I have been told over the last couple of days that the South Australian branch of the federation, that is the A.W.U., has decided to comply with A.W.U. policy. I think they have seen the light of day.

The article referred to Mr Dunnery, the State Secretary, and further stated:

Mr Dunnery is a paid officer of the Federal branch of the A.W.U., let's have no qualms about that . . . he is an officer of the federation and is bound by federation policy as laid down by the federation's annual convention from time to time. The convention has laid down a policy since 1975 which, in brief, supports the mining and export of uranium.

Mr Dunnery is still there, I think. He made his original statement on the Sunday and it took the A.L.P. until Tuesday to get him back into line. He made no comment in relation to this matter on the Monday.

What he is doing now is operating under a State registered union but, in fact, he still has to comply with Federal policy, which supports the mining of uranium. After that, and after the Party had drawn Mr Dunnery back into line, it got him to say he had not said the things that had already been printed in the papers (and I hate to accuse the man of not telling the truth, but I believe he was directly quoted). I think that it is an unfortunate fact of life that journalists in this State are accused of misquoting something that people have said when those people regret having said it. I believe that was the case in this instance.

We went through the Roxby Downs debate (and nobody wants a recap of that, because it was a lengthy debate), most detail of which would be well known to members. It was a surprising debate, and provided some insight for me into how the A.L.P. operated on people who do not have a very solid front on a matter. After that, there was the A.L.P. Federal conference, an interesting meeting indeed. We saw there a clear attempt to wriggle out of the situation they are in.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: They don't really know what they want.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: No, they do not. I have a copy of their policy amendments.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: All three pages?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Yes, all three pages. The original policy consisted of one page, but there were 3½ pages of amendments. I think one could say that it is fairly obvious that about 20 people sat down and said 'I will support it if you put this in', and so on, until they had the whole 20 bits down, and what they all agreed to has ended up as a most incredible document.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You have limited experience, then.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I suppose that, in the honourable member's outfit, I have. It is a most surprising document. The editorial in the *News* of 8 July 1982 under the heading 'Halfway to Where?' stated:

The Labor Party's logical position on its revised uranium policy is that of the woman who believes she is only a little bit pregnant. It is permissible to mine uranium with copper and gold. It is permissible to dig in existing holes in the ground, yet broadly and philosophically speaking uranium mining and exploitation are reprehensible.

That is very interesting. We now have three types of uranium in this country. We have uranium in the Northern Territory, coming out of the holes, and that is all right; that does not do what Dr Cornwall said—produce atomic bombs and all the dreadful things he accused us of being in favour of. Then we have the copperised uranium from Roxby Downs, a special breed, because it is mixed with another mineral—

The Hon. L. H. Davis: That is called 'off the hook uranium'.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is very good. Part 10 *(c)* of this new and extraordinary document states that the A.L.P. will:

Consider applications for the export of uranium mined incidentally to the mining of other minerals on a case-by-case basis and on the criteria of whether in the opinion of a Labor Government the mining of such minerals is in the national interest.

That really says the lot! It says that it is all right, perhaps, if they decide it is all right; it is nothing to do with the people; it gets back to a Labor Government. It is a most extraordinary document. It starts by saying the following:

An incoming A.L.P. Government is already committed to repudiate all existing commitments . . . Understanding the difficulties which could be encountered in the implementation of that commitment our minimum position would be a total unequivocal commitment to phase out Australia's involvement in the uranium industry and that certain conditions as outlined will and must be applied to those mines existing in production as of July 1982.

I recommend that everyone should read this document, because it really is an extraordinary one, put together by one of the biggest committees ever; it covers everything. It reminds me of an auction I went to in the South-East where there were ewes and lambs for sale. The auctioneer started off by speaking of ewes in lamb, and a potential buyer cried out, 'What are they in lamb to?' The owner said, 'What do they want?' That is what the policy seems like. The auctioneer in that case was my father.

Let me go through what was said at the A.L.P. conference. The mover of this extraordinary amendment, Mr Hogg, had to leave his delegation and have a proxy in his place, because the left wing of the Victorian Labor Party would not allow him to move this amendment while he was part of their delegation. It would be interesting to know how many Parties there are in the Labor Party—on my count there are four.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: What happened to Mr Hogg?

The Hon. J. A. Carnie: He is in trouble.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: They are not sending him mail any more. Yes, he is in trouble. He put the lie to the motion when, during his attempts to put it, he said what was reported in the *Australian Financial Review* of 8 July 1982 as follows:

The mover of the amendment, Mr Bob Hogg, the Victorian State secretary, maintained during the debate that it did not amount to approval for uranium mining. He said what he was endeavouring to do was throw the responsibility to where it belonged—that is to the people who were using the industry as a method of profit, with no concern for the society. The policy set a series of conditions which, he said, 'candidly, I do not believe they will be able to meet.'

In other words, the whole thing was a waste of time. At the beginning, he moved it as a cynical exercise, because he said he did not believe anybody would be able to meet the criterion laid down in that amendment. I agree with that, because frankly I do not think anybody could meet them. Mr Hayden was quoted in the same article, as follows:

Mr Hayden, the Opposition Leader, warned delegates that a future Labor Government would have only one economic option, a massive devaluation, to cope with the massive flight of capital which would accompany Labor's repudiation of uranium contracts.

He then got a bit emotional and said:

It would really screw the economy, all activity. It could be devastating in its effects. We would almost become a banana republic in the standards of the condition of the economy.

I think one could say that the debate on Roxby Downs and the attitude taken by the A.L.P. were totally opposite to that. I commend Mr Hayden for recognising the facts of life; they tried to do exactly what he was saying.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That is totally untrue. Roxby Downs is not even going.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The Leader knows the reality of that. He knew where he was in that debate, and that Roxby Downs would not proceed further without sup-

port. He has been told that by the companies and by us countless times. I am surprised that such an intelligent fellow as the Leader cannot listen to what he is told and understand simple economic facts. One can see that there were very polite people at the A.L.P. national conference from the following report:

Throughout the debate demonstrators at the rear of the conference hall heckled speakers for a change and when the names of those who opposed the change were called each received a rousing round of applause from the demonstrators and from party members present as observers. Those who voted for change were booed and hissed, and it seems likely that the divisions within the party will be felt for some time.

There were some South Australians there.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: The 11 South Australians there were united?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: There was some difference between them. I think the vote was six to five. Even members of this House, the Hon. Mr Blevins and the Hon. Miss Wiese, opposed each other.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Are they right wingers?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I think one is left and one right, from the way they operated. I am surprised, because I always thought that the Hon. Miss Wiese was left wing, but I am learning every day. Miss Levy and Miss Wiese were opposed to each other on this amendment. They will have to answer for their sins at the next meeting of the A.L.P.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: Have they had a debriefing yet?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: It was a bit difficult. I understand the following was stated in regard to Miss Wiese:

Ms Wiese is a member of the South Australian Legislative Council which only a fortnight ago had its second vote on the Roxby Downs indenture Bill in which former A.L.P. member Mr Norm Foster voted with the Government to pass the Bill.

She said that the A.L.P. in South Australia needed 'room to move'.

I do not quite know what that means. I think it means that they are trying to shift. It also states that her comments were echoed by Mr Bannon because it had become an employment issue. He has learnt a bit over a period of time although he is a bit slow. Miss Wiese attracted some attention because she was the only woman in favour of change. That is a credit to her.

It was stated by a delegate that the amendment would wreck Labor's policy and it would encourage A.L.P. voters to defect to the Australian Democrats. Mr Milne will be pleased to hear that. That was the problem all through the Roxby Downs debate. They were both fighting for the anti-uranium vote. The article stated, 'She is a leader of the anti-uranium movement in South Australia'. Maybe it should read, 'She used to be . . . ', as I think they would have sacked her. The article further states:

Ms Barbara Wiese, a leader of the anti-uranium movement in South Australia, supported Mr Hogg and said his amendment made Labor's policy workable and would ensure the Party remained anti-uranium.

That is where I become a little confused. It also states:

Ms Wiese said the Hogg policy would allow Labor to win government in South Australia and federally.

'What in the hell can we do if we are not in government?' she asked. 'We retain our principles but we are utterly powerless.'

Miss Wiese said that she would give up her principles to get into Government. That is a bit poor. She said that the amendments were still anti-uranium. The article continues:

The spokesman on the environment, Mr Stewart West, said the Hogg draft was 'irresponsible' and was in effect a 'pro-mining amendment'.

He described it as 'three pages of verbose nonsense' to achieve the final capitulation of the Party on uranium.

So, we have two members of the A.L.P. at the same conference, one in favour of the amendment and saying it is anti-uranium and one against the amendment saying it is pro-uranium. No wonder the public do not know where the Labor Party stands. I refer also to Mr John Scott from down south who is really worried about the effects of uranium because it has got into the jelly beans at Thebarton.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: Not even Dr Cornwall joined him in that.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: No. However, he believes that all the sweets have been coated with uranium for some time. However, it is not over yet. We are going to see more contortions on the part of Labor Party members over uranium. They are all in favour of it but they do not want to go any further now because they do not want uranium conversion. Of course, the Opposition spokesman on Mines and Energy, the Hon. Mr Payne, on 7 July 1982 in the *Advertiser* stated:

'Our policy on the matter is clear—we oppose the mining and processing of uranium,' he said.

I assume he meant the conversion plant because it was my impression that the Labor Party was in favour of uranium mining, particularly at Roxby Downs; or is that the case? Frankly, once you get to the point of mining at Roxby Downs there is no point leaving it there because the uranium conversion plant is much safer than mining. Mining is safe, but conversion is safer. On page 4433 of *Hansard* in 1982, Dr Cornwall stated:

Our policy clearly states that we will not permit the mining, milling, further processing or export of uranium unless and until we are satisfied that it is safe to provide it to customer countries. In other words we have adopted a 'play it safe' or 'wait and see' attitude.

That was stated in the Roxby Downs debate. In the last three weeks that has all changed. Everything is all right now. Everything must be cleared up overseas as the Labor Party claims it does not now mind uranium mining at Roxby Downs; if it does not believe that, it should say so. We are waiting to hear a final clarification on its stand on Roxby Downs. One would have to assume that it is now in favour of uranium mining. Dr Cornwall also said, in relation to uranium enrichment:

Some mention should be made here of the nonsense which has been talked about a uranium enrichment plant at Port Pirie. Enrichment is one of the least dangerous processes in an otherwise extraordinarily dangerous cycle. If the industry were ever proved to be safe and adequately safeguarded I would have little objection on physical or environmental grounds to an enrichment plant being built at Pirie.

Conversion is no different from enrichment; it is just an earlier stage of enrichment and will lead to an enrichment plant. We have an extraordinary situation now where the Labor Party does not know where it stands on this issue. It has the most extraordinary policy that one could ever read. No sensible person could come to any conclusion on it at all. It is a policy for all seasons, yet everybody who has anything to do with it claims it is still anti-uranium. How can the Labor Party stand up before the public and say that uranium is no longer a problem in South Australia when it has left the public far more confused?

I have a lot more time for people like the Hon. Mr Blevins and the Hon. Anne Levy who have retained their stand on this matter and who are clear in what they believe. They have not tried to put it over the public. People who have shifted on this issue in the Labor Party and who believe that the extraordinary document they have produced is fooling the people of this country, have another think coming. People are not going to believe it. They could not possibly put it before the public and say, 'Here is a clear statement of what we believe' as it is just so confused. I will again read out paragraph 10 *(c)* which states:

Consider applications for the export of uranium mined incidentally to the mining of other minerals on a case-by-case basis.

What does 'incidentally' mean? In percentage terms, will it be 30 per cent uranium, 40 per cent or 50 per cent?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It could even be 1 per cent.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Yes, but if it is 1 per cent it will probably be all right. This document does not say that Roxby Downs is supported by the Labor Party. Do members opposite now support Roxby Downs? When the time comes for the partners to proceed with the mining operation will members opposite try to stop them?

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: We won't.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I am very interested to hear that. I will be interested to hear what happens next month when delegates give their reports. The document continues:

> . . . on the criteria of whether in the opinion of a Labor Government the mining of such minerals is in the national interest.

What on earth does that mean? I do not know how the Hon. Mr Sumner can say that he will not oppose mining at Roxby Downs when *The Herald,* South Australia's Labor voice, commenting on some of the media criticism of the Labor Party in July stated:

> Reprinted in its entirety on page 4 of *The Herald* is the full text of the uranium policy as adopted by the 35th Biennial conference of the Australian Labor Party.
>
> It remains an anti-uranium policy. Contrasted with the wishful thinking of the media monopolies, the policy stands as a reaffirmation, rather than the overthrow of the Party's opposition to the mining and export of uranium.

The Labor Party cannot have it both ways. The Hon. Mr Sumner just said that his Party will not oppose mining at Roxby Downs.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Perhaps he means that they will not stop it in the first year.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is correct. The Labor Party has said that it will phase out these mines. It will be interesting to see whether that takes 50 years, 100 years, 10 years or 12 months. As Mr Hogg said in Victoria, it is probable that no mining company will be able to meet the conditions imposed by the Labor Party. The Labor Party's conference document has been skilfully designed to cover every possible contingency.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: From John Bannon to Peter Duncan.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is dead right. That is a very good point indeed—from John Bannon to Peter Duncan. I am sure that is the situation at the moment, because there is a big rift in the Labor Party. It is unfortunate to see an Opposition so divided in relation to an issue such as this. The Hon. Mr Blevins, an honest, upright man of great principles, is sticking by his words.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: And he is standing by his State conference, too.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Yes. When he comes to answer for his sins he will have nothing to answer for, but other members of his Party will have a problem. The Hon. Miss Wiese has already paid a price for her sins because she is no longer a member of the executive. The Hon. Miss Wiese is clearly out of favour and I think she will be in a bit of trouble explaining her position at the conference.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: She is certainly not in as much trouble as the Hon. Mr Carnie; he has been speared right out of your Party.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: She could be in more trouble. The Labor Party is completely divided, with no policy at all in relation to this matter. The Labor Party did have a policy at one time, but it has no policy now. In fact, it is a mixture of contrasting policies. The people of South Australia could not look at the Labor Party policy and find that Roxby Downs is safe. The Labor Party's policy is to either keep it going or phase it out altogether. Even if the Labor Party decides to keep it going, the very restrictive conditions will make it impossible to mine the material. I believe the Opposition is attempting to put it over the people of this State. The Opposition has no policy at all and its ranks are divided. I support the motion.

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMMERCIAL BANK OF AUSTRALIA LIMITED (MERGER) BILL

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 16 passed.

Clause 17—'Duties.'

The CHAIRMAN: No question will be put on this clause in erased type, because it is a money clause.

Schedule, preamble and title passed.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (Leader of the Opposition): — I have chosen this moment to speak to this Bill. My remarks will also apply to the Commercial Banking Company of Sydney Limited (Merger) Bill. During the second reading explanation on both Bills, I made no substantive comment beyond saying that the Bills had to go to a select committee and that I would support the second reading to enable them to go to a select committee and be considered in that way. The select committee has reported and has approved the passage of the Bills.

In the case of The Commercial Bank of Australia Limited (Merger) Bill, which is the Bill we are considering at the moment, evidence was received from representatives of the Bank of New South Wales and the Chief Manager, who was concerned with the merger. They indicated to the select committee that they supported the Bill and also indicated that there would be no disadvantage to employees, customers or depositors as a result of the merger. They also indicated the reason why the Bill was necessary, which was to facilitate the merger and to make life easier for employees, customers and depositors by not requiring individual transactions for each customer or depositor to shift an account or loan from one bank to another, and also to protect its employees by ensuring that the same rights and conditions employees had in their employment with the Commercial Bank would apply when the employees' employment was transferred to the Bank of New South Wales.

The select committee was not necessarily concerned with the principle of the merger of the banks, but was concerned about facilitating that merger, given that it was a *fait accompli.* Not to approve the Bill would be to simply be bloody-minded, even though one might not have initially approved the merger.

The principles involved in the Bill are the same principles as were contained in the Bill considered earlier by the Chamber to facilitate the takeover of the Bank of Adelaide by the Australian and New Zealand Bank. This Chamber and the Parliament of the State approved that legislation.

The only evidence given to the committee was from those representatives of the Bank of New South Wales and the Commercial Bank of Australia, as I have mentioned. The Australian Bank Employees Union was specifically contacted and it did not wish to make any representations to the committee and it was taken from that that it had no objection to the legislation.

In the case of the Bank of Adelaide and the Australian and New Zealand Bank merger, the Australian Bank Employees Union did give evidence because it was concerned

about some of the conditions of employment following the takeover situation. However, in this case there was no such evidence given and, accordingly, there did not seem to be any concern that the select committee or the Council should be worried about as far as employees' rights are concerned.

The select committee report also indicates that similar legislation has been supported by the Governments of New South Wales, Victoria, Northern Territory, Queensland, Tasmania and Western Australia, that is, all the other Governments in Australia and, at this time, legislation has been passed in New South Wales, Victoria, and the Northern Territory.

The only other point I wish to make is that it seems slightly ironic that the Federal Government, a Government which is supposed to be pro free enterprise and pro competition in the Australian economy has, with considerable alacrity, agreed to a number of banking mergers over the past few years. In particular, I refer to the takeover of the Bank of Adelaide by the Australian and New Zealand Bank and now the two matters we are concerned with here, namely, the Commercial Bank of Australia merging with the Bank of New South Wales, and the Commercial Banking Company of Sydney merging with the National Bank.

It may well be that the Federal Government can be criticised for approving these mergers and the increased monopolisation of the banking system in Australia. It seems strange that it has, in recent times, been very enthusiastic about supporting mergers and squeezing out these smaller banks in the banking system, decreasing the competition and getting closer to a more monopolistic position as far as, at least, the banking system in this country is concerned.

That seems rather odd, given the alleged commitment to free enterprise competition. Nevertheless, as I said, the Bills do not deal with the principle of the merger. That has already been decided upon and the Bills merely faciliate and make the actual carrying out of the merger easier from the point of view of all concerned. Accordingly, I do not intend to oppose the legislation.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: As the Leader of the Opposition has said, this Bill is designed to facilitate administrative arrangements for the merger. It does not deal with the merits of the merger, and quite rightly so. The merger has been undertaken under the provisions of the takeover legislation in various States and Territories of Australia; the shareholders made a decision and the Federal Government made a decision with respect to banking licences.

All we are asked to do in this instance is to facilitate administrative arrangements that would save the banks, the Government and customers of the banks, a considerable amount of time and trouble by allowing administrative arrangements to be undertaken by legislation, rather than each customer having his or her dealings with the bank being dealt with separately in each instance.

Bill read a third time and passed.

COMMERCIAL BANKING COMPANY OF SYDNEY LIMITED (MERGER) BILL

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 15 passed.

Clause 16—'Duties.'

The CHAIRMAN: I point out that clause 16 is in erased type, being a money clause. No question will be put on this clause, and we will present it to the House of Assembly in erased type.

Preamble and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.42 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 27 July at 2.15 p.m.