

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 27 July 1982

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

## PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Attorney-General (Hon. K. T. Griffin)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Justices Act, 1921-1982—Rules—Fees.

Valuation of Land Act, 1971-1981—Regulations—Notice of Valuation.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. C. M. Hill)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Building Act, 1970-1982—Regulations—Sliding Doors and Salt Damp—Amendment.

Corporation of Thebarton—By-laws—

No. 9—Bees.

No. 11—Fires.

No. 12—Flags and Flagpoles.

No. 13—Garbage Receptacles.

No. 14—Gas.

No. 16—Horses and Cattle.

No. 18—Inflammable Undergrowth.

No. 21—Nuisances.

No. 22—Public Health.

No. 26—Parklands and Reserves.

No. 27—Restaurants and Fish Shops.

No. 29—Streets and Footways.

No. 45—Rubbish Tips.

By the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. J. C. Burdett)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Chiropractors Act, 1979—Regulations—Training Colleges.

Forestry Act, 1950-1981—Proclamation—Hundred of Barossa—Forest Reserve.

Shop Trading Hours Act, 1977-1980—Regulations—Motor Spirit and Lubricants Employees.

## QUESTIONS

## PROMOTIONAL BOOK

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about a promotional book.

**The PRESIDENT:** Is leave granted?

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** No.

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

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** First, is the Attorney-General aware that a week ago today the Premier told the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly, who had asked about the matter, that the Government had in fact had printed at Griffin Press 100 000 copies of a promotional book on South Australia. He added that this was the third edition of such a book. The print run of such a size naturally attracted the attention of the honourable member.

Secondly, is the Attorney-General aware that a reliable authority in the publishing business is of the view that the largest print run anybody could reasonably justify for a regional book such as this would be 7 000 copies or, most optimistically, 10 000 copies? Thirdly, can the Attorney-General advise whether the earlier edition of the book has been retailing at \$14.95, but that it was in fact seen last weekend in bookshops 'remaindered' at \$6 a copy?

Fourthly, is the Attorney-General aware that the Premier said that he thought that perhaps 50 000 copies had been

printed in total for the first two editions that that third edition would make the total 150 000?

Fifthly, does the Attorney-General agree that the unit cost for such a book at Griffin Press would be at least \$4.50? Sixthly, does the Attorney-General therefore agree that the Government must have spent, at the very least, \$450 000 just in printing costs, ignoring editorial costs (if there were substantial changes between editions), distribution and binding costs? Seventhly, why is the booklet not available for perusal by honourable members in this place when the Premier said last week in the House of Assembly that it could be made available to honourable members?

Eighthly, can the Attorney-General therefore respond to the following specific questions: (a) who gave the order for such a massive print run; (b) is the book to be sold or given away; (c) what changes have been made between the second edition and the new edition; (d) if the book is to be given away, who will be the recipients; and (e) what is the total cost of production, including editorial time, photography, design work and printing, binding and distribution?

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** I am certainly aware that 100 000 copies of the promotional booklet on South Australia, the third edition, is being prepared. It is a well received booklet within South Australia, outside the boundaries of this State, and overseas. It is very much sought after to promote South Australia, and that is what the book is designed to do.

For anyone to suggest that such a book could only justify a print run of 7 000 copies is quite nonsensical, because the first two editions have certainly gone to a much larger print run than that small number. If we want to promote South Australia, we have to use all available means, including the sort of high quality promotional book which is the subject of this question. If the Leader is suggesting that this should not have been done, one must then question where his priorities lie, and whether, in fact, he really is proud of South Australia and wants to promote it.

Certainly, the Government is taking every available opportunity to promote South Australia. That has been fairly obvious in the promotional activities which have been undertaken by the Department of Tourism, the Premier, and the State Development Branch of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. We believe that South Australia has a good, positive story to sell in the other States and overseas. We will not pull back on promoting South Australia, because any promotion will have distinct benefits and advantages for the people of South Australia through increased tourism and expanded job opportunities. I do not make any apology for the fact that this book is going into its third edition. It will be widely available to promote South Australia positively in a way which demonstrates that this Government is proud of South Australia. As a number of details in the question require information to be supplied by other Ministers, those parts of the question will be referred to those Ministers and I will endeavour to bring back a reply.

## VICTOR HARBOR COUNCIL

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** Has the Minister of Local Government replies to the questions I asked on 20 July about the Victor Harbor council?

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

1. I find from inquiries within my department that this was the letter referred to in my officers' report which I tabled in the Chamber on 1 June 1982. I tabled the letter, together with the letter from the Ombudsman, on 8 June 1982.

2. The letter states four factors which concerned the State Planning Authority. These were contained in the letter which I tabled on 8 June 1982. The administration of the Planning and Development Act is committed to the Minister of Environment and Planning. I have no jurisdiction in this area.

3. No.

4. No.

5. No. These are matters for the Minister of Environment and Planning, and I have asked him to comment.

6. None.

7. No. Mr Arland informs me that over a period of 15 years he has owned successively three properties in Victor Harbor, the last of which was sold in October 1979.

8. Questions 1 to 5 are matters under the Planning and Development Act and I have referred the question to the Minister of Environment and Planning.

9. The clerk of a council is responsible to that council. Except under the provisions of section 295 of the Local Government Act, I have no power to direct a council or its administration. I am sure both council and clerk are now fully aware of their responsibilities in this matter.

10. No.

11. My officers' report does not indicate in any respect that the council staff purposely withheld information from the council. I believe now that council and staff are more clearly aware of the need for all information to be available when decisions are taken.

12. The Secretary of the Municipal Officers Association informs me that the District Clerk of Victor Harbor is a member in good standing. The clerk informs me he joined the M.O.A. approximately October/November 1981.

13. The clerk no doubt had his own reasons for joining. Most town and district clerks are members of the M.O.A.

14. The Secretary of the Municipal Officers Association informs me he may have said words to that effect in statements to the press at that time. The M.O.A. view is that a clerk can only be dismissed for due cause and by due processes contained in the M.O.A. award and related legislation.

I understand that in December 1981 the M.O.A. made an application to the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission to vary the award to the effect that the District Clerk of Victor Harbor should not be dismissed on grounds that the council was not competent to make a decision on dismissal. The hearing has been adjourned *sine die*.

15. I have inquired as requested and have been informed that neither the Local Government Association Industrial Officer, the M.O.A. Secretary, Mr Kelly, nor the clerk have any recollection of any figure.

16. If the council dismisses the clerk and the dismissal is found to be without cause or due process, the district clerk is quite entitled to sue for wrongful dismissal. If successful, the court would assess damages. If the clerk and the council decide to negotiate a payout figure, and reach agreement on an amount upon which the clerk would voluntarily resign, the parties are perfectly entitled to do so. The council is in a generally healthy financial position.

17. Yes. I appointed two officers of the Department of Local Government to inspect the accounts, records and other procedures of the council.

18. No. There is no supplementary report unless the honourable member is referring to the administrator's response to the report, which he sent me on 7 June 1982. The administrator has made that report available to the *Victor Harbor Times*. I can table the report if the honourable member wishes.

19. Yes, but the method of reporting has since been amended in accordance with the recommendation in the report to the administrator's satisfaction.

20. If the honourable member can supply specific details, I shall provide the information.

21. No. The report states on page 4, 'A bank reconciliation is prepared and tabled monthly as required by the accounting regulations. A check of the reconciliation statements with the statement provided by the bank verified the accuracy of the statement tabled.' The report went on to set out a better method to inform the council of the monthly financial position, and this has been carried out to the administrator's satisfaction.

## HAMPSTEAD CENTRE

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

**The PRESIDENT:** Is leave granted?

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** No.

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

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** That is a very puerile and irrational denial—

*The Hon. N. K. Foster interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Hon. Mr Foster will come to order.

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** He should be in intensive care if he—

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! Does the Hon. Mr Foster intend to come to order when he is called or will I have to take further action?

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** Is the Minister aware that since 1 July 1982 there has been no medical officer on the premises of the Hampstead Centre between the hours of 11 p.m. and 8 a.m. (that leaves in excess of 200 people, some of whom are medically unstable, without proper medical supervision during those hours)? Is the Minister also aware that this system, which provides for obtaining help from as far away as the Royal Adelaide Hospital, leaves a considerable time gap between determining the necessity for summoning such help and the actual arrival of such help? Is the Minister aware that a person suffering a cardiac arrest would be unable to receive the necessary emergency treatment without a qualified person being present, in other words, a medical officer? Is the Minister also aware (and, if she is not, she should be) that persons in the spinal injuries unit, many of whom are gravely disabled and who are subject to sudden medical changes in their condition, would face equally long waiting periods before a doctor could be present? Will the Minister take whatever action is necessary to restore full and adequate medical supervision at the Hampstead Centre immediately?

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

## PRESS GALLERY ACCOMMODATION

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking you, Mr President, a question on the student newspaper *On Dit*.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON:** I understand that you, Mr President, were recently unable to accede to a request by the student newspaper *On Dit* for space in the press gallery for its reporters. I have only to look up to see how full the press boxes are. Whilst this paper is typical of student newspapers—full of a lot of weird and wonderful things—it has recently commenced a column headed 'In State Parliament'. Indeed, it appears to be a very competently written, objective, mature and factual report of Parliamentary proceedings. I submit that that should receive some encouragement. There are some minor inaccuracies; for example, I was described as a member of the National Country Party instead of the Liberal Party.

The Standing Orders and customs of this Chamber generally forbid the taking of notes or the writing of documents in the public galleries. Obviously some notes must have been taken without your noticing. I wonder whether you, Mr President, would consider providing a place of official recognition in the public gallery where they could take notes without being in breach of Standing Orders, as I believe the column has merit.

**The PRESIDENT:** In reply I can only say that the accommodation situation is one of concern at all times. I appreciate that correspondents wish to report Parliament and sometimes there is insufficient room in the press gallery for them. *On Dit* asked for, and was granted, permission to cover part of the final stages of the Roxby Downs Indenture Bill. It was also granted permission to report the opening ceremony.

They are the two occasions on which *On Dit* has approached me for space in the press gallery. I am very conscious of the fact that the press gallery is crowded, and I have considered this problem. However, I do not intend to allow reporters to report from the public gallery. We will have to look at the possibility of making a further section of the public gallery available to the press if we are going to have further requests. I hope that explanation satisfies the honourable member.

## PUBLICITY

**The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA:** Does the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs have a reply to a question I asked on 21 July about publicity?

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** Mr Medwell did not contact the South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission prior to publishing the article headed 'Please help us build Australia' in the *Sunday Mail* on 18 July 1982. Following publication of the article, the Chairman of the Ethnic Affairs Commission has arranged an interview with the Editor of the *Sunday Mail* involving Mr Medwell to discuss the intentions and ideas expressed in the article. The commission also intends to prepare a reply for publication in the *Sunday Mail* in response to Mr Medwell's article. I understand that the commission tried to obtain space to do this in last week's *Sunday Mail*, but space was not available. The commission hopes to have a reply published in the next edition of the *Sunday Mail*.

In a democratic society, all people are free to express their ideas, and the South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission cannot and does not intend to curtail this freedom. The commission is aware of the attitudes and prejudices that still exist in our society. The commission has recently employed a public relations officer to initiate and co-ordinate cultural awareness programmes and to liaise with different community and professional groups, including the media, in order to change the type of negative attitudes expressed in the article quoted by the honourable member. Obviously, attitudes do not change overnight and no doubt there will be misinformed ideas published from time to time. Those

that need a reply shall be answered, but often it is wiser to allow certain issues to subside rather than give them extra exposure by repeated claims, counter claims and accusations.

## TAFE PROGRAMMES

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** My question is directed to the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Education, and it concerns TAFE programmes. Is the Minister aware that recent census data indicates that a large proportion of Australian migrants list lack of ability to speak English adequately as their major problem? Does the Minister agree that this could be an important factor which inhibits such people from enrolling for non language and language-related programmes run by TAFE? Is the Minister also aware that TAFE keeps no statistics on the participation rate of non-native English speakers enrolled in its programmes (although it is believed to be low)?

Does the Minister agree that such statistics would be helpful to TAFE for planning its programmes and, if so, will he ask TAFE to collect such statistics in future, as recommended by the 1978 inquiry into post-secondary education, the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs Survey of 1980 and both the Language Programme Committee and the General Studies Committee of the department?

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** I will refer those questions to the Minister of Education in another place and bring down a reply.

## OBJECTIONABLE ADVERTISEMENT

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs a question about an objectionable advertisement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON:** I have before me a photocopy of a page of the *Australasian Post* of 22 July 1982. An advertisement on that page reads as follows:

Ugly tattoos! Now you can remove them safely and effectively with a 'Do-it-yourself' Kit containing a non-acid chemical solution, does not leave noticeable scars. 1 000s of satisfied users, money back guarantee. Write now for brochure, enclosing 27c stamp. Medi-Pro Services, 2nd floor, 160 Albert Road, South Melbourne 3205. Not for sale in Western Australia

I draw to the attention of honourable members the tiny print at the foot of the advertisement 'Not for sale in Western Australia'. I recall some peripheral press publicity occurring at the time of Western Australia's banning this product. I am not fully aware of the technical aspects, but I suspect that it is probably a very simple strong alkaline solution which renders opaque the superficial layers of the skin and makes the tattoo appear to pale.

If the action of the chemical is not deep enough it will leave no scar and the tattoo will return—probably shortly after 'thousands of satisfied users' have sent in their testimonials. On the other hand, if the strength and length of application were sufficient to truly destroy the pigment deeper in the skin it would make a mockery of the claim that it leaves no scars because, to my knowledge, there is no way of removing a tattoo that leaves no scars.

I object to this, not only because of the very shonky claims of the advertisement but also because the sound of the advertisement implies that it is a potentially dangerous fluid. The whole ethics of this group Medi-Pro Services must be questioned. It is not clear from the advertisement what the cost of the material is, but in so many cases a chemical that might cost 5c to put in a small bottle is sold for \$10, and so the advertisement smacks also of unfair

trading. Will the Minister arrange for this matter to be investigated, and perhaps arrange to obtain the reasons from the Western Australia Government for its ban so that future advertisements may read 'Not for sale in South Australia'?

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** Obviously, there are connotations in this advertisement that relate to the Unfair Advertising Act as well as health aspects. Certainly, I will call for an investigation to be instituted and bring down a detailed reply.

### LOCAL PRODUCTS

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Premier, a question about preference for local products.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** We are constantly assailed by slogans telling us what a great State we live in.

**The Hon. R. J. Ritson:** Hear, hear!

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** At least there are still some people left who agree with that statement. Other slogans tell us that we should buy South Australian products and be proud of South Australia. Many books praise South Australia (some would say too many) yet, when it comes to the Government's actually doing something in support of its policy, it always falls down. My attention was drawn to a letter to the Editor in yesterday's *Advertiser* by Mr T. Carroll. His letter headed 'Need for local content' states in part:

It is surprising to hear Mr Brown and Mr Tonkin urging people to buy local products and to support local industry, when they, as members of a State Government, are doing just the opposite.

The law courts project now being erected in Victoria Square is to have imported ceiling tiles, when local manufacturers are either laying off staff or working short hours.

The letter goes on to detail a similar problem involving a Federal Government project, but it is the State project for which this Government has responsibility. Judging from that letter, and having spoken to Mr Carroll, I point out that it appears that the State Government is not requesting builders engaged in building work for the Government to use South Australian products to ensure that South Australians are employed.

The industry to which I have just referred, the building industry, particularly the plastering industry, is depressed and many plasterers are being laid off or working short time. It appears that the Government is taking no action in this area.

What is the origin of the ceiling tiles used in the new law courts building in Victoria Square? Were tenders called for the supply of the ceiling tiles? If so, did any South Australian tile manufacturers tender for the order? Finally, will the Government explain to the Council why it is not insisting on South Australian products being used in South Australian Government building projects.

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** This question really should be directed to the Minister of Public Works, because the Public Buildings Department has the general management of the law courts project. I will refer that question to him and arrange for a reply to be obtained.

### HOME OWNERSHIP

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** Has the Minister of Housing a reply to my question of 20 July about home ownership?

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** The report referred to by the honourable member was prepared as a joint submission to the South Australian Government by the Women's Infor-

mation Switchboard and Shelter of S.A. Inc., and not by the Emergency Housing Office. The report makes the following recommendations specifically in respect of lone parents: (a) that a small proportion of the State Bank's concessional loan funds should be used to increase the number of low-income earners able to obtain home ownership, through schemes such as deferred mortgage repayments and rental purchase; (b) that lone parents forced to sell or re-finance the family home as part of a divorce be made exempt from stamp duty payments on purchasing another home.

The South Australian Government is examining schemes it could adopt to assist lone parents to keep their homes. The above recommendations are being taken into account in this examination. I have a copy of the report which I will make available to the honourable member.

### ETHNIC WOMEN PATIENTS

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** Has the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs a reply to my question of 21 July about ethnic women patients?

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** The Ethnic Womens Advisory Committee is scheduled to examine and comment on the report on ethnic women patients in South Australian Government hospitals by J. Connelly of the Womens Advisory Office at its next meeting on Monday 9 August 1982. The committee's comments on the report will then be forwarded to me through the Ethnic Affairs Commission and I will be pleased to advise the honourable member of the committee's views as soon as the information has been made available.

### HOUSING TRUST

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** Has the Minister of Housing a reply to my question of 22 July about the Housing Trust?

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** The South Australian Housing Trust provides information to the Department of Social Security in regard to some of its tenants. This is provided under section 141 of the Social Security Act which requires the Housing Trust to provide a confidential report on persons. The information provided is that which might affect the grant of payment of a pension, allowance, endowment or benefit under the Social Security Act. The only information which the trust provides is that which has been obtained from the tenants themselves and is contained in what the trust terms as its 'house docket'. This information would have been received when the tenant applied for a reduction in rent, or for permission to have extra persons living in the trust rental property. The honourable member can be assured that this information is treated in a most confidential way and is not communicated by telephone. The department provides a special form for supplying the necessary information.

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** I wish to ask a supplementary question. Will the Minister reply to the question I asked whether Housing Trust tenant application forms could include on them a statement that the information supplied may be passed on to the Department of Social Security, so that tenants would realise that the information they were providing was not necessarily limited in its circulation to within the Housing Trust?

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** I will have a look at that question and let the honourable member know.

### MINIMUM GRAPE PRICES

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs about minimum grape prices.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** Some weeks ago, there was a conference of interested parties on the matter of enforcing minimum price arrangements for wine grapes. I think that the conference was convened by the Prices Commissioner (or it may have been the Minister). A number of representatives of grapegrowers attended that conference, as did other people interested in the question of grape prices. The question of how the prices orders could be enforced was discussed.

I recently received information from wine grapegrowers concerned that the situation is deteriorating. They are finding it more and more difficult to get the terms of payment laid down by the Prices Commissioner enforced. To be specific, wine grapegrowers have complained to me about the situation in the Southern Vales; I believe that three wineries that buy grapes in that area have been slow in making payments to the growers. The winery the growers complain most frequently about is one situated in the Barossa Valley, the Krondorf Winery, which evidently has been very slow in paying growers for grapes that have been delivered.

Will the Minister say whether there have been any specific recommendations as to how minimum prices can be better enforced? If so, can the Minister inform the Council what those recommendations are? If there have not been any recommendations, is there any in which the Minister can take action in the interim in an attempt to get the terms of payment to growers enforced more satisfactorily?

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** No recommendations have come to me as yet. I will take action to ascertain whether any recommendations were made and, if so, what they are. I will also investigate means of trying to enforce the provisions of the prices order, if that is the complaint. I suggest that the honourable member tell his constituents who have spoken to him about this matter that, if they have complaints about the actual enforcement of prices orders which have been made, they refer those complaints directly to my department, to the Acting Prices Commissioner, so that action may be taken.

### REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* replies to questions without notice without my reading them. These replies have been sent to the respective members by letter.

Leave granted.

### ROYAL COMMISSIONS

In reply to the **Hon. C. J. SUMNER** (15 June).

I have examined the docket again and have had discussions with my officers. I see no reason to vary my earlier decision, and that is: the question as to whether or not the Government will bear the costs of either or both parties generally should await the final resolution of the litigation. The difficulty which presents itself at the moment is one of determining the facts. If the alleged defamation was motivated by malice then a qualified privilege is excluded and the protection thereby afforded would not apply. Obviously the Government cannot make any decision on that matter of evidence. The question was referred to during the hearing on the preliminary point before Justice Mitchell but she did not

deem it necessary to determine that matter at that stage. Accordingly, when the finding of facts is made by the court I will be in a better position to make a decision.

### SUPERANNUATION FUND

In reply to the **Hon. C. W. CREEDON** (3 June).

I understand that there has always been in existence a pamphlet giving information about the Superannuation Fund along the lines described by the honourable member. The pamphlet has been widely distributed through employing authorities and employee organisations. In view of various changes to the Act, the pamphlet is being rewritten and enlarged and it is the intention of the board to issue the revised booklet to all existing contributors as well as to all new entrants to the Government's employment and subsequently to circularise contributors if there is any further change to the scheme's operation.

### COMMONWEALTH GAMES

In reply to the **Hon. C. J. SUMNER** (18 June).

South Australian Government employees who have been selected to compete in the XII Commonwealth Games in Brisbane, will be entitled to special leave with pay to attend this event, subject to them satisfying the requirements concerning the maximum period of special leave with pay to be granted for these purposes and to the approval of the Public Service Board.

### TRANSPORTATION CORRIDORS

In reply to the **Hon. N. K. FOSTER** (16 June).

The most recent traffic volume information available to the Highways Department results from studies undertaken prior to and in March 1980, before the Britannia corner was reconstructed. Although the corner itself has been reconstructed, work is still proceeding on Fullarton Road (south) and this may affect present traffic activity.

On the basis of the information gained earlier, the following comments are offered in response to the particular points raised by the honourable member:

- (a) approximately 1 200 vehicles per day (vpd) turned right from Fullarton Road (north) towards the city;
- (b) approximately 350 (vpd) turned left from Fullarton Road (north) into Kensington Road while approximately 3 800 (vpd) continued onto Fullarton Road (south);
- (c) the annual average daily two-way traffic volumes on the roads leading to the intersection were as follows:

Fullarton Road (north) . . . . .	12 000 vpd
Kensington Road . . . . .	19 500 vpd
Fullarton Road (south) . . . . .	30 500 vpd
Wakefield Road . . . . .	15 500 vpd
Dequetteville Terrace . . . . .	21 500 vpd

- (d) Although the Fullarton Road (north) approach carried the lowest two-way traffic volume, it is still an important link in the arterial road network.

The department has considered the closure of this road, but does not favour such action as it would require those vehicles currently using the road to find alternative routes in the area, viz. Angas Street, Kent Town, Sydenham Road and Osmond Terrace. This would create other traffic problems elsewhere and affect the amenity of those areas.

- (e) A preliminary review of accidents indicates that of the 53 accidents recorded at the corner in 1981, 10 might have been avoided had Fullarton Road (north) been closed. The closure of the road may result in the transfer of accidents to other locations e.g. Dequetteville Terrace/Angas Street junction, Kent Town.
- (f) Closure of Fullarton Road (north) may improve traffic safety at the corner but delays for most traffic would not be reduced significantly. This is because the same volume of traffic would be seeking to pass through the intersection and would be diverted to Dequetteville Terrace and Kensington Road. The current level of traffic congestion would remain essentially the same.

The Highways Department will shortly be erecting signs to direct motorists to the approach lane appropriate to the turning manoeuvre they wish to make. This is expected to facilitate traffic movements at the Britannia corner intersection.

### MOTOR BIKES

In reply to the **Hon. C. W. CREEDON** (9 June).

Motor cycles are not covered by the Secondhand Motor Vehicles Act but motor cycle wreckers would require a licence under the Secondhand Dealers Act which is administered by the Police Department. As sellers of motor cycles do not fall under the Secondhand Motor Vehicles Act they are not required to display the notices prescribed under that Act on motor cycles offered for sale. The only control over their activities would be that provided by the Secondhand Dealers Act. However, if a salesman denied that a motor cycle he was endeavouring to sell had been wrecked or was a composite vehicle as in the circumstances described by the honourable member, the contract, if entered into, could be rescinded under common law. Further, it is likely that the seller could be prosecuted under Section 4 of the Misrepresentation Act.

### COURT FACILITIES

In reply to the **Hon. C. J. SUMNER** (16 June).

*Closure of Suburban Courts:* Court facilities are being upgraded on an ongoing basis in accordance with departmental priorities and available funds. Closure of the Norwood Court to which the honourable member refers was initiated by the previous Government. During this current financial year Courts of Summary Jurisdiction at Prospect, Unley, Henley Beach and Darlington were closed. These courts were primarily used for hearing minor traffic matters and following the introduction of the Traffic Infringement Notice Scheme their continued use could not be justified. A Special Magistrate had not sat at Prospect or Henley Beach for several years and presided only one day per month at Unley. A Magistrate will continue to sit at Darlington two days per week as the Court of Summary Jurisdiction, Glenelg sitting at Darlington.

*Night Courts:* Night court sittings in Whyalla were terminated because of lack of demand. The Clerk of Court had difficulty in putting together a court list sufficient to convene the court. It would appear that in the Whyalla area a number of the population are shift workers and can therefore attend, and appear to prefer to attend, during the daylight hours. Magistrates have never sat in night courts which were presided over by Justices of the Peace. Justices of the Peace were, and continue to be, prepared to sit if there is a proven demand. I am advised that a similar

experiment in New South Wales was discontinued for precisely the same reasons as has been our experience in Whyalla.

*Gumeracha Court:* This building is classified by the National Trust and all renovations were performed by the Public Buildings Department. The following resume outlines this Department's involvement in the building.

14.8.79 Public Buildings Department requested to replace torn linoleum with carpet or linoleum, repaint walls and provide strip heaters in the courtroom only.

12.10.79 Honourable the Attorney-General advised by Public Buildings Department of its intention to upgrade the building. Estimate of expenditure \$200 000.

13.8.80 Public Buildings Department advised of Courts Department requirements and that facilities and furnishings to be kept to a minimum.

The Courthouse is used for the hearing of unsatisfied judgment summonses once every two months (12 matters per hearing) and once per month for minor traffic offences. A Special Magistrate does not attend at this Court. The department's needs at Gumeracha are minimal and the extensive renovations were not undertaken at our initiative.

*Port Adelaide:* I agree the existing court complex is inadequate and imposes restrictions on facilities which can be made available for the profession and for the public. For this reason proposal to build a new complete Police/Courts Complex at Port Adelaide has been in existence since 1979. The Commissioner of Police, however, places a higher priority on a new complex for Holden Hill, which is to be undertaken in the next two financial years. Based on the current indicated priorities of the Commissioner, the proposed complex for Port Adelaide will rank after the completion of the Holden Hill Complex. The existing buildings are not able to be satisfactorily upgraded as suggested by the honourable member, primarily due to lack of space, the age and condition of the buildings. On current indications, the complex at Port Adelaide will not be available for some 5-6 years.

### STATE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

In reply to the **Hon. ANNE LEVY** (23 March).

State development is not considered by the Government to be the sole province of males. The whole South Australian community has a responsibility in the development of the State and the Government is concerned to obtain input from all sections of society. In appointing persons to the State Development Council, the selection is based solely upon the contribution which it is believed that a particular individual can make to the Council's work of advising the Premier on matters concerning the State's development. The Council is not based on representatives from industry and community organisations because the opportunity exists elsewhere for communications between such organisations and the Government.

Both males and females are already considered for appointment to the Council and when the appropriate opportunity exists a woman could be appointed. Regrettably at the time of appointment of members of the State Development Council no women were appointed, but it is to be hoped that as vacancies arise from time to time on the Council, some women with the necessary background can be appointed. I am certain that the honourable member would agree however, that it would be inappropriate to appoint a woman merely as a gesture of tokenism. The document 'South Australia—A Strategy for the Future' was distributed and available to a wide cross-section of the South Australian community, including women's organisations. I am pleased to report that public submissions to the

Council and expressions of interest in the strategy study have come from a considerable number of both men and women throughout the State.

### TISSUE TRANSPLANTS

In reply to the **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS** (3 June).

The honourable member's information that New South Wales and Victorian drivers' licences provide for the holder to indicate his wish, in the event of death, to donate his kidneys or other organs for transplant surgery, is completely inaccurate. Neither State has such a provision on its drivers' licences. I understand the interstate licensing authorities share the concerns of this State, as expressed in the reply of 1 April 1982, to the honourable member's previous question, particularly with respect to the need to positively identify licence holders in these circumstances

### REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** I, too, seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* replies to questions without notice without my reading them. These replies have been sent to the respective members by letter.

Leave granted.

### EXERCISE PROGRAMMES

In reply to the **Hon. L. H. DAVIS** (9 June).

The reference in the *Australian* of 24 May 1982, was in relation to a report of an Australia-wide research project funded by the Menzies Foundation. This project replicated the South Australian Schools Health and Physical Exercise (SHAPE) programme conducted in eight Adelaide schools during 1978. The results of the Australia-wide survey paralleled the Adelaide experience and showed that the organisational format and curriculum materials developed in South Australia were transportable and usable in other systems. A full report of the proceedings of the project is not yet to hand. You also asked whether it was the Minister's intention to extend this or similar exercise programmes to all South Australian schools.

An increasing number of South Australian schools have already taken up the issue of daily physical education and it is the Minister's intention to encourage those not already involved to consider doing so. The Government has provided a sum of \$60 000 to assist in the publication of curriculum materials for daily physical education in primary schools. These materials will provide an added impetus to the implementation of daily physical education in our primary schools. It is anticipated that they will be available to schools by Term III of this year. The Minister of Education has recently distributed an expert Report on Physical Education and Sport in South Australian schools, and indicated the Government's attitude to this important area of the school curriculum.

### VICTOR HARBOR COUNCIL

In reply to the **Hon. K. L. MILNE** (17 June).

1. The honourable member mentioned there is a suggestion from the area of Victor Harbor that the information I have been getting might be a 'cover up'. I also note that in a letter to the *Victor Harbor Times* of 16 June 1982, that one councillor suggested a report from my officers, which was published in full in that paper was a 'white wash' and

'barely covered the surface'. On the other hand the Mayor of Victor Harbor has written to the *Victor Harbor Times* on 23 June stating that the report was balanced and the recommendations constructive. I am confident that the independent reports from the Ombudsman, the State Planning Authority and officers of my department which set out a number of circumstances quite clearly can in no way be seen as a cover up.

2. I have been most closely involved in all developments since the various reports have been received. Now that the council has been reinstated it is up to the council to demonstrate that it can perform. I do not of course have jurisdiction over matters arising from the reports of the Ombudsman or the State Planning Authority and my colleague the Minister of Planning is pursuing matters pertaining to administration of the Planning and Development Act according to his own powers.

3. The council now has advice from its solicitors that with two exceptions the meetings that were not properly called as prescribed by the Act are nevertheless valid, and the decisions made thereat are valid. The two special meetings of the council which the council's solicitors have found to be illegal did not deal with matters of any consequence and were in fact the subject of further action at validly constituted meetings.

4. The report revealed some deficiencies in the accuracy of financial reporting and procedurally in disposing of an item of plant. There was nothing illegal in these actions. Similarly, the report was critical, as was the State Planning Authority and Ombudsman reports, of the way in which the council arrived at building and planning decisions. The decisions nevertheless were taken by the council in these matters and as a consequence are now settled and cannot be reopened. There is no value whatsoever in further pursuing these matters.

### WORK TRAINING

In reply to the **Hon. M. S. FELEPPA** (9 June).

All the Department of Technical and Further Education vocational courses are available to unemployed persons who can meet normal course entry criteria. The Department of Technical and Further Education has developed and conducts a range of courses specifically prepared for unemployed young people, conducted within the department's Transition Education Programme.

Course categories for 15 to 19 year old unemployed youth:

- Pre-vocational Trade Courses
- Pre-vocational General
- Pre-vocational (non-traditional) for Girls
- Vocational Preparation Courses
- Foundation Courses.

Course categories for 15 to 24 year old unemployed youth.

21 departmental Certificate Courses have been approved by the Commonwealth Government in the Special Youth Programme Scheme.

The total number of specific courses provided is 126.

- (a) Courses in the Pre-vocational Trades area are funded 76 per cent by the State Government and 24 per cent from Federal funds.



- (b) The Australian Bureau of Statistics, the Labour Force Australia May 1982 (Preliminary) does not provide a State by State breakdown of 15 to 19 year old unemployed persons. However, the Department of Technical and Further Education provides 2 369 places in courses within the department's Transition Education Programme. No departmental records are kept on the young people taking advantage of the Special Youth Programme Scheme and competing with other persons for places in the department's normal courses. These courses are funded by the State Government.

(c) It is expected that this situation will continue.

In addition to educational offerings, there are a number of other programmes which aim to assist the young unemployed. The Youth Bureau of the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment, have compiled a list of Programmes for Unemployed. There are some 40 metropolitan and nine country programmes and services listed. The vast majority of these have a focus on the preparation of young people for employment and the development of work-related skills.

There are five State Government services and programmes which are relevant to unemployed youth. These are the Community Improvement Through Youth Programme (CITY), the services of the Department of Community Welfare (i.e. youth workers and related services and resources), the Self-Employment Ventures Scheme, the services of the Transition Education Unit of the Education Department and the Youth Bureau within the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment. The State Government also provides financial support to eight non-government programmes for the unemployed, through the Community Welfare Grants Advisory Committee. Again, these are described in the publication and include the Elizabeth Project Involving the Community, the Lutheran Counselling and Welfare Service, the S.H.A.U.N. Community Centre, the Thebarton Resource Centre, the Port Adelaide Unemployed Self-Help Service, the Henley Unemployed Group, A.C.T. Port Lincoln and Workmate Inc. Recently funds were made available through the Local Government Assistance Fund to assist in the establishment of three pilot casual work bureaux.

There are a number of other specific initiatives this State Government has taken to improve the employment position of young people. Pay-roll tax refunds and exemptions are offered to employers who hire additional young people. The Government has made special efforts to increase the number of apprentices employed in Government departments and instrumentalities. In 1981, an additional 46 apprentices were employed in the public sector to utilise excess training capacity. These apprentices will be transferred to suitable employers in the private sector any time after the first year of their training. Two Group Apprenticeship Schemes have been commenced. The schemes are operated by the Master Builders Association of South Australia and the Metal Industries Association of South Australia, and employment has been provided for up to 120 additional apprentices.

Given the scope of the services outlined, it is most difficult to provide a reliable figure regarding the proportion of young unemployed involved in programmes at any particular time. I understand that 2 369 students have enrolled in various courses run by the Department of Technical and Further Education, during 1982. With regard to services within the portfolio of my colleague the honourable the Minister of Industrial Affairs, I can advise you that during 1981, 1 820 young people approached the Community Improvement Through Youth Programmes for the first time. A total of 150 projects were developed and implemented by unemployed youth during this year. The Self-Employment Ventures Scheme received 2 118 general inquiries during

1981. Formal applications for assistance under the scheme totalled 75, of which 26 were approved, three withdrawn and 46 not approved. Through the Pay-roll Tax Refund Scheme, 1 334 young workers were employed during the calendar years 1980 and 1981. This involved the provision of refunds to 901 employers.

This data provides you with an indication of the substantial numbers of young unemployed people who have been assisted by services and programmes supported by this Government. You will appreciate that this Government has taken steps, both individually and in co-operation with the Federal Government to ensure that the young unemployed are provided with a range of opportunities to improve their employment skills.

#### STATE LIBRARY

In reply to the **Hon. ANNE LEVY** (17 June).

Past experience indicated that no more than nine of the 495 items borrowed will not be returned. This figure cannot be confirmed until the annual stocktake is performed early in 1983.

#### AUSTRALIAN FISHING INDUSTRY COUNCIL

In reply to the **Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON** (9 June).

The honourable member has asked whether the Government had reviewed its policy of funding the Australian Fishing Industry Council (AFIC). The honourable member will recall that in December 1976, the South Australian Government announced that it would support the establishment of a full-time executive officer for the South Australian Branch of the Australian Fishing Industry Council. At that time, the Government increased licence fees to all professional fishermen and transferred the amount of the increase to AFIC. In February 1977, it was agreed that an annual grant to AFIC would be made from the Fisheries Research and Development Fund, subject to the submission of a detailed budget from AFIC. It was agreed that this grant was to be financed by increased fishing and fish dealer licence fees approved specifically for financing AFIC. It was envisaged that the grant, together with the continued subscription income of AFIC, would provide sufficient funds to meet the basic costs of an Executive Officer and Secretary.

The honourable member fully supported the arrangements whereby AFIC would be funded, stating, and I quote the honourable member:

I believe it is essential to assist the development of the Council so that it can become an effective voice for the fishing industry in this State. The fishing industry has a unique relationship with the Government, and the appointment of AFIC of a full-time Executive Officer will be invaluable in management matters.

The present Government recognises the capacity and readiness of the fishing industry to participate and contribute to the development of fisheries management policies, and we will continue to seek ongoing consultation with the Australian Fishing Industry as the representative of the catching and processing sector. Over the past 12 months, the Government has negotiated with the Australian Fishing Industry Council on a draft set of guidelines for the funding of AFIC. It is anticipated that these guidelines will be formalised into an arrangement between AFIC and the South Australian Government to operate in the near future.

#### POLICE HANDGUNS

In reply to the **Hon. C. J. SUMNER** (17 June).

It is the Police Department's policy that officers deployed in sensitive areas such as Rundle Mall, Parliament House



or sporting venues, processions, parades, etc. are not issued with the Smith and Wesson .357 revolver. If they are to be armed at all, in those circumstances they are issued with the .38 Browning automatic pistol, which is carried concealed. Only patrol personnel are issued with the Smith and Wesson, which is worn exposed. However, a patrol may be tasked to a sensitive area, and it follows that in those circumstances it is not possible to guarantee that patrolmen wearing exposed firearms would not be sighted in those sensitive areas. Due to a late sitting of Parliament on 16 June, one officer was taken off patrol duties at short notice to provide additional security at Parliament House.

Later, another officer, who was the duty patrol supervisor at the time, attended at Parliament House to ensure that the police officers there were aware of their specific duties. After about 10 minutes, he resumed routine patrol supervisory duties. In such circumstances where the only police personnel available to take over security at Parliament House at short notice are mobile patrolmen, there is usually no opportunity to divest them of their basic uniform equipment (including the exposed firearm), as would be the case in a pre-rostered operation. This situation particularly applies during night shift when there is only sufficient manpower available to meet basic patrol commitments. Any extraordinary activities arising must necessarily be dealt with from the ranks of the mobile patrol members.

### SPARC

In reply to the **Hon. ANNE LEVY** (15 June).

The following information is provided in response to your questions concerning the Schools Performing Arts Review Committee.

1. In the five months since the establishment of the Schools Performing Arts Review Committee, 55 companies throughout Australia have registered full details of productions for school children proposed for South Australia.

2. When an occasion arose where the details of a performance were not adequate or where schools had been uneasy about a particular performance, expressed in the feed-back forms which are regularly forwarded to SPARC's base at Carclew, an interview was arranged with the Director of that company for further clarification. To date, 10 companies have been asked to further clarify and discuss a performance with the Director of Carclew on behalf of SPARC.

3. In addition, 30 schools have requested further information about registered companies and on all occasions SPARC has been able to supply the required information.

4. Both Independent and Catholic Schools have been invited to use the facilities of SPARC.

5. There have been to date two listings in the Education Department's Gazette of all registered companies. These appeared at the beginning of Terms 1 and 2 and there will be an amended list published at the commencement of Term 3.

6. All interstate Ministers of Art have been informed of the existence of SPARC and have furnished details to companies working in other States, who wish to tour to South Australia.

7. A select committee from the Western Australian Legislative Council and officers of the Victorian Ministry of the Arts have visited Carclew to examine the SPARC model, to ascertain to what extent it should be used in those States.

8. Last week the Australia Council sent one of its five directors to South Australia to look at SPARC and the council is discussing the possibility of using it as a national model (emanating from Carclew) for the clear dissemination of information to schools throughout Australia, as a way of

helping Principals to make a more informed decision as to which companies should visit their schools.

The Australia Council sees this as part of its responsibility for the ongoing implementation of the recommendations of the Australia Council/Schools Commission Report on Education in the Arts, presented in 1977.

9. To date there has been no confusion between SPARC (the Schools Performing Arts Review Committee) and SPARC (the Single Pregnant and After-Resource Centre).

### SCALE FISH LICENCES

In reply to the **Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON** (16 June).

The Government intends to implement transferability of licences in the marine scale fishery once a number of matters have been further discussed and resolved with the fishing industry.

### WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMISSION

In reply to the **Hon. J. R. CORNWALL** (17 June).

I have obtained a full report concerning the disposal of asbestos waste by Waste Management Services Pty Ltd. I can now advise that at a meeting of the South Australian Waste Management Commission held on 29 April 1982, consideration was given to an application from Waste Management Services Pty Ltd dated 13 April 1982, seeking the commission's approval for the disposal of waste asbestos insulation at the company's licensed depot at Garden Island.

The Waste Management Commission resolved to grant such approval subject to the waste being packaged and disposed of in accordance with the South Australian Health Commission Technical Bulletin No. 22 'Code of Practice for the safe disposal of Waste Asbestos Insulation'. Subsequent disposals have been in accord with Technical Bulletin No. 22 and to the satisfaction of the South Australian Health Commission and the South Australian Waste Management Commission.

The Waste Management Commission has not been asked to consider nor has it considered the matter of prosecution of Waste Management Services Pty Ltd. As a member of the commission, Mr Glen McMahon has declared his interest in any matters under discussion, by the commission, relating to Garden Island or Waste Management Services Pty Ltd and has refrained from taking part in the discussion and voting on such matters, as required by the South Australian Waste Management Commission Act. I am not aware of any ground requiring the termination of Mr McMahon's membership of the commission.

### HOUSING TRUST

In reply to the **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS** (10 June).

All construction of dwellings for the South Australian Housing Trust is carried out by builders on a contract basis. The number of workers and the proportions of employees and subcontractors engaged on construction projects at any given time is unknown. Moreover, the numbers and proportions would vary day to day as projects or parts of projects are completed and new contracts commence.

Much of the builders' work is carried out by subcontractors but many of these subcontractors would themselves employ tradesmen and pay the applicable pay-roll tax. All Housing Trust maintenance is carried out by contractors who work to a tendered price, an agreed schedule of rates or a negotiated hourly rate depending on the nature, location and size of the jobs undertaken. The firms engaged in this work vary

from self-employed individuals to substantial concerns employing a number of tradesmen. Again, information is not available on numbers which are self-employed and those working for a wage. Responsibility for paying any necessary pay-roll tax in respect of employed tradesmen rests with the individual contractors.

## REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** I also seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* replies to questions without notice without my reading them. These replies have been sent to the respective members by letter.

Leave granted.

## HEALTH AIDS

In reply to the **Hon. G. L. BRUCE** (2 June).

The South Australian Health Commission has agreed, as a matter of policy, to provide to Commonwealth eligible patients free issue of syringes, needles and alcohol swabs to insulin-dependent diabetic patients. Within the metropolitan area this free issue will be provided through the outpatient facilities of metropolitan teaching hospitals.

Discussions are presently being conducted with the Pharmacy Guild of Australia for the provision of the supply of syringes, needles and swabs through community pharmacists in non-metropolitan areas. It is anticipated that these discussions will be concluded shortly and that a date for implementation of this scheme can be announced soon. This scheme will correct anomalies that currently exist for insulin-dependent diabetics who live in country areas and who presently are required to pay for their syringes, needles and swabs.

## D.N.A.

In reply to the **Hon. ANNE LEVY** (9 June).

The National Committee to monitor recombinant D.N.A. has a responsibility to ensure that bio-safety committees in the various States adhere to its guidelines. Therefore, all bio-safety committees, be they in institutions or Government departments, will be required to abide by the guidelines as set down from time to time.

In future, no group or individual researcher who plans to undertake work in the field of recombinant D.N.A. will be able to do so without having the project approved by an appropriate bio-safety committee. That bio-safety committee will have the responsibility to ensure that the guidelines as laid down by the National Committee are adhered to by those undertaking the work.

The Minister of Health is in the process of developing a statement to be sent to those institutions and Government departments which may contemplate working in this area in the future.

## EYE DISEASES

In reply to the **Hon. L. H. DAVIS** (17 June).

The Minister of Health informs me that staff of the Child, Adolescent and Family Health Service Inc. (formerly the Mothers and Babies Health Association and the School Health Branch of the S.A. Health Commission) have undertaken vision screening of infants and young children as part of their health surveillance programmes for many years. At present approximately 80 per cent of infants under 1 year

old, 40 per cent of 4 year olds and 90 per cent of 5 year olds are covered by the existing programmes. Exact figures are not available because service clubs, such as Lions International, also periodically conduct vision screening programmes in the community.

Children detected through such programmes are referred either to their family's general practitioner or directly to an appropriate specialist (where the family has no designated G.P.) for further assessment and treatment.

There are many other conditions in children besides amblyopia which should be diagnosed and managed as early in life as possible in order that children have an opportunity to achieve their maximum potential.

Following the merging of Mothers and Babies Health Association the School Health Branch and Child, Adolescent and Family Psychiatric Services to form the Child, Adolescent and Family Health Service (C.A.F.H.S.) a committee has been established to review current screening programmes and to make recommendations for the timing and content of such programmes in future. The recommendations, which are expected to recommend a shift of screening resources towards the younger child, will shortly be considered by the Board of Management of C.A.F.H.S.

Nevertheless there are practical difficulties in achieving high penetration with screening programmes directed at pre-school children because they are not necessarily users of any community services. Strategies to achieve maximum coverage of this age group are therefore also being considered at this time.

## FOREIGN DOCTORS

In reply to the **Hon. M. S. FELEPPA** (16 June).

The Minister of Health informs me that the training programme for foreign doctors conducted at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is designed to enable these doctors to gain clinical experience in the Australian health system. Without this experience it would be difficult, if not impossible, for many of them to pass the qualifying examination conducted by the Australian Medical Examinations Council. The successful completion of the A.M.E.C. examination is essential if these doctors wish to be registered as medical practitioners in Australia.

Admission to the programme is not restricted to particular ethnic groups. Provided a doctor has sufficient command of the English language to have a reasonable chance of passing the A.M.E.C. examination, he or she may be eligible to participate in the programme. Although the bulk of trainees have been of Asian origin this merely reflects the fact that a relatively large proportion of doctors wishing to participate in the programme happen to be from Asian countries. European doctors trained in Poland have been accepted into the programme in the past and it is envisaged that doctors from other European countries will participate in the future.

The doctors conducting the programme consider that it has benefited both the participants and the hospital, and hope that similar programmes will be established in other hospitals so that the skills and knowledge of doctors trained overseas can be effectively utilised in the provision of health care.

## MEDICAL ETHICS

In reply to the **Hon. J. R. CORNWALL** (8 June).

The case mentioned by the honourable member is, in fact, the first complaint of this type. If the honourable member would like to make the name of the patient and

the doctor available to the hospital, the Board of Management will investigate this complaint and take appropriate action. The board itself has not received any complaints.

As a result of this allegation of 'touting' the hospital issued a further instruction on 15 June 1982, reaffirming the board's policy on patient election and stressing that medical staff should in no way bias a patient's choice.

The two major allegations contained in a letter by a group of doctors, tabled by the honourable member have, on examination, no basis of fact. The first allegation was, and I quote 'as far as we are concerned, you can almost guarantee that if you are privately insured and you attend the Casualty Department of the Lyell McEwin Hospital with an abdominal pain, you will be converted to a private patient and have an appendectomy irrespective of whether you need it or not'.

However, a survey of patients seen at the Casualty Department of the Lyell McEwin Hospital in the week commencing 1 May 1982, showed a very different picture. During that week, 41 patients presented with abdominal pain. Nineteen of these had private insurance and of these, three were admitted to hospital. None of the three admitted subsequently had an appendectomy. The other allegation by the group of doctors was, and I quote, 'furthermore, if you are not insured and you happen to attend casualty at 2 o'clock in the morning with a perforated ulcer, you can almost guarantee that you will be transferred to some other metropolitan hospital because it is not worthwhile for the specialist to come in and treat you'.

Again, the facts are very different. In the six months to January 1982, before medical staffing changes were introduced at the hospital, an average of 77 patients per month were transferred from the casualty department to other metropolitan hospitals because the staffing and facilities of the hospital were not suitable for these patients to be treated at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. Since staffing changes were introduced in February, the average number of transfers has reduced by almost half to 39 per month. Clearly, the Lyell McEwin Hospital is now providing a more comprehensive service for treating emergency conditions.

There is no evidence of 'widespread touting' for private patients in the casualty department of the Lyell McEwin Hospital, nor, indeed, any evidence that patients do not exercise complete freedom of choice as to their status as either private or hospital patients.

The Hospital Board has issued a further instruction to its medical staff on this matter and will investigate any individual complaint that patients are being coerced in their election choice. Allegations of over-servicing of private patients and failure to treat uninsured patients are clearly not substantiated by an examination of the facts.

In reply to the **Hon. J. R. CORNWALL** (15 June).

The appointment of staff, including medical staff, by incorporated hospitals is principally a matter for the hospital concerned. Visiting medical staff have a one or three year contract and a Medical Appointments Committee reviews not only clinical privileges within that hospital, but also the medical practitioners' performance. The hospital concerned in the incident referred to by the honourable member has investigated the matter fully and considered that the written apology made by the medical practitioner was sufficient in this case. The Minister of Health does not intend to interfere with the role given to the Boards of Management of hospitals to manage their own services.

#### ASBESTOS DISPOSAL

In reply to the **Hon. J. R. CORNWALL** (2 June).

As Garden Island is not an incorporated area of the State the proper disposal of some asbestos waste is the concern

of the Central Board of Health under the provisions of the Health Act.

At its meeting on 10 June 1982, the board resolved that Waste Management Services Pty Ltd, within 30 days, deal with the asbestos waste that was deposited on 3 March 1982, so that it conforms with the requirements of the S.A. Health Commission Technical Bulletin No. 22 (Code of Practice for the Safe Disposal of Asbestos Wastes) by the provision of additional cover or its relocation.

At this stage the Central Board of Health has not resolved to prosecute the company and will determine what action is appropriate should the matter not be finalised in the time given.

#### POTATO BOARD

In reply to the **Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON** (1 June).

1. Yes. The details provided by the board explaining the circumstances surrounding the pre-poll payments are subject to further investigation.

2. There is insufficient evidence at this stage to justify the holding of another poll.

#### MEAT HYGIENE

In reply to the **Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON** (16 June).

1. There was no Select Committee recommendation specifying a slaughterhouse throughput limit of 5 000 sheep equivalent units per annum neither was there a recommendation restricting a slaughterhouse proprietor's own retail outlets to two.

2. The Authority, under Section 24 of the Meat Hygiene Act, 1980, has specified quotas to seven slaughterhouse licencees who were identified as wholesale meat suppliers engaged in wholesale trading business prior to the proclamation of the Act (12 February 1981).

D. R. and P. D. Thorpe, Kangarilla.

M. Mangiola, Angle Vale.

D. J. Vantijn, Willunga.

R. M. and J. A. Viney, Nuriootpa.

A. B. White, Naracoorte.

W. and L. Jarmyn, Willaston.

Males Meats Pty Ltd, Mannum.

3. Of those country slaughterhouses listed in answer 2, two are known to have exceeded their specified quotas. Those two licencees have been advised that their excess production in 1981-82 will be deducted from their 1982-83 quota.

4. Refer to answer 3 above.

#### QUESTIONS RESUMED

##### TAX EVASION

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** Will the Attorney-General, representing the Treasurer, examine the statements made by the Commonwealth Treasurer (Mr Howard) in respect of tax evasion? Is the Attorney-General aware that there is a suggestion coming from some sources that complementary legislation between the States and the Federal Government is necessary in this matter? If that is the case, will the Attorney co-operate in that endeavour by ensuring that South Australia is directly involved in such tax evasion legislation? Will the Attorney support such legislation being made retrospective, as has been suggested in the report of the Federal Treasurer's statement? Will the Attorney say whether or not tax evasion legislation should not, in fact,

include reference to exorbitant profits being made by individuals as a result of company takeover arrangements and transactions?

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** I have seen reports in the daily press of the comments made by the Commonwealth Treasurer about retrospective legislation. I think those comments were reported in a weekend newspaper and then, again, earlier this week. I have not had the detail of what he had to say perused by any of my officers, but I will certainly ensure that that is done. I have also seen a report of the suggestion by the Victorian Premier, Mr Cain, that his State would be prepared to pass complementary legislation to enable Federal tax evasion laws to be fully implemented. I do not know the full details of what the Victorian Premier had in mind. I have always been of the view that the Commonwealth Government had some very wide powers in the area of tax evasion, and that it is really the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government to ensure that its laws are sufficiently precise (and, in many cases, wide enough) to ensure adequate power to collect taxes which had been evaded.

I cannot see that any complementary legislation might be necessary within the State arena. In fact, I would be surprised if such legislation were necessary. I rather suspect that the Victorian Premier was embarking on a bit of political tub-thumping in this area of tax evasion. I will certainly have the details investigated so that I may find out exactly what the Federal Treasurer and the Victorian Premier had in mind.

So far as retrospectivity is concerned, again that really depends on what sort of legislation the Commonwealth Government finally introduces and what sort of complementary legislation, if any, is needed and might be contemplated by the Victorian Government. The last question relates to profits made by persons engaged in takeovers. It is not my understanding that the Federal Treasurer addressed any of his remarks to that sort of position when he spoke about tax evasion on the weekend. If he makes some policy statement on that, we will look at it carefully.

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** In the event of such legislation being carried, will the Attorney-General, representing the Treasurer, ensure that the money so collected will be distributed to the States?

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** Again, I think that that question is speculative. We do not know what legislation is likely to be introduced.

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** You should.

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** It has only just been announced by the Federal Treasurer. All we know is what appears in the newspaper reports and, while those reports are adequate for general information, they do not deal with the technical aspects which must be addressed before the questions to which the Hon. Mr Foster referred can be addressed responsibly.

### COMPUTERS

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** My question is addressed to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health. Has the South Australian Health Commission recently acquired, or is it about to acquire, a large main frame I.B.M. or Facom computer? Is the computer to be installed in the offices of the Health Commission? Is it to be integrated with the multi-million dollar centralised computer equipment that the Government recently announced it was acquiring for other Government departments? If not, why not?

Have plans to acquire the Health Commission computer been proceeded with despite the fact that the hospitals

computer fiasco is still the subject of a Public Accounts Committee inquiry? What is the estimated cost of the computer? Was the computer purchase assessed and approved by the Automatic Data Processing Board? If not, why not? What are the major functions it is hoped that the main frame computer will perform? Did the proposed purchase or lease go to tender? If not, why not?

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

### MIGRANTS-POLICE COMMITTEE

**The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA:** My question is directed to the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs and relates to a question I asked previously. The Minister may recall that on 8 June I asked him whether or not the Migrants-Police Working Party Committee had completed its report. At that time, the Minister said that he would investigate the matter and bring a reply back to this Chamber. On 15 June, the Minister indicated that the committee Chairman, Mr N. Manos, Senior Special Magistrate, would probably present the report to the Premier on 18 June. Has the report been presented? If so, when will a copy of the report be tabled?

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** The Chairman of the committee and one of its officers, I think its Executive Officer, came to Parliament House and the Chairman presented that report to the Premier in my presence. That report now has to be looked at closely and processed. This work is now taking place. I shall be happy to obtain an interim report on any matters that would be of interest to the honourable member. I cannot say at this stage whether or not the report will be tabled. The committee, it is fair to say, can be assumed to be a committee of the Ethnic Affairs Commission, even though that committee was sitting prior to this Government's coming to office. Nevertheless, since the commission has been established it has been looked on as one of the commission's committees. I will refer the matter to the commission and endeavour to obtain a copy of the report for the honourable member, so that he can become cognisant of the information in the report and of its findings. So that the honourable member can be satisfied about the matter, I will obtain a report as to the present stage of its processing.

### ORGANISATION AND STAFFING OF SUPPORT SERVICES TO PARLIAMENT REPORT

**The PRESIDENT** laid on the table the report of the Review Team on the Organisation and Staffing of Support Services to Parliament.

### BIRTHLINE

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a question about Birthline.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** People may know that there is an organisation in South Australia known as Birthline which is a voluntary organisation in receipt of a Government grant and which counsels women with unwanted pregnancies who wish to continue those pregnancies, advising them of the various support services available to them. Birthline sometimes advertises as a group which will counsel anyone with an unwanted pregnancy. This could be regarded as misinformation, since Birthline is completely opposed to abortion and refuses to counsel anyone that an abortion may be the best answer in their situation.

I understand that Birthline conducts sessions at the Morphett Vale Community Health Centre, which is a Government sponsored community health centre in close liaison with the Flinders Medical Centre. Birthline is one of a number of voluntary groups using the facilities of that community health centre. Other services provided at the Morphett Vale Community Health Centre are a child/adolescent and family health service and voluntary groups, such as the Who Cares group, the New Mums Coffee Mornings Group and the Nursing Mothers Association. The centre also provides facilities for such meetings as the combined community health nurses' meetings and the Kindergarten Union Directors' meetings. Birthline provides two sessions a week, run in one case by a paid co-ordinator-counsellor and also volunteer counsellors.

**The Hon. R. J. Ritson:** You aren't against people being helped to continue a pregnancy?

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** I am certainly not against it if that is what they wish; they should be given all the help they can be given.

**The Hon. R. J. Ritson:** You aren't trying to protect people from being exposed to that?

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** What I am concerned about is people thinking that they are going to get dispassionate counselling as to all the possible options available to them, when in fact the organisation counselling them is committed to an anti-abortion position, so that the possibility of an abortion will not be discussed in an unbiased manner with the woman who may or may not be considering an abortion in her situation. My question relates to the fact that Birthline is operating from the Morphett Vale Community Health Centre.

I wonder whether the Minister could determine the policy of the Morphett Vale Community Health Centre if a woman with an unwanted pregnancy approaches it? Is she referred directly to the Birthline counsellors who, as I have stated, refuse to counsel on abortion, or is she referred first to a trained counsellor who can help her consider all possible options including abortion and, if she decides to continue with her pregnancy, she is then referred to a Birthline counsellor? This is a very important question in view of the fact that the Morphett Vale Community Health Centre is a Government-funded health centre and Birthline does, to some people, give the false impression that it will counsel regarding all possible options for a woman with an unwanted pregnancy without indicating the restricted counselling area it provides.

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

### RURAL ADJUSTMENT LOANS

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a question on interest rates for rural adjustment loans.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** Some weeks ago I raised this matter by way of a question. I did not receive an answer to that question on interest rates being charged by the Commonwealth Rural Adjustment Scheme and the interest rates that were being handed on by the State to farmers who are seeking funds under the Rural Adjustment Scheme. Since then, I have received more information from people who have been clients of the department. I believe there is some confusion between the statements being made by the Minister of Agriculture announcing the interest rates for rural adjustment loans and the interest rates being indicated by officers of the department who, for a number of areas, have indicated different interest rates from those announced by the Minister. What are the interest rates being charged under the Rural Adjustment Scheme for various types of lending—farm build-up, farm improvement, and temporary construction? Could the Minister make a public announcement to clear up this apparent anomaly between what he has announced and what is being said by officers of his department?

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

### JULIA FARR CENTRE

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** I direct my question to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health. Twelve months ago the Minister of Health announced a wide-ranging inquiry into the management and affairs of the Julia Farr Centre, known at that time as the Home for Incurables. Has that inquiry been completed? If so, how long ago was it completed? Has a report been prepared based on the findings of the inquiry? What were the principal findings of the inquiry, and will the Minister publish or table the report in future for the benefit of all interested parties and the South Australian public?

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

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from 22 July. Page 101.)

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** I join with honourable members in supporting the adoption of the Address in Reply which was delivered by His Excellency the Governor, Sir Donald Dunstan. Mention has already been made of the death of three former members of Parliament. I refer to Sir John McLeay and the Right Honourable Sir Phillip McBride, who both served in the Commonwealth Parliament with great distinction and who were key figures in the Liberal Party. The third member was the Hon. Jim Dunford whose sudden death was a shock to all members in this place. He will be remembered for his strength and determination and his stand for what he believed was right. He was regarded by both his colleagues in the Labor Party and members of the Liberal Party as a good bloke. I join with my colleagues in placing on record my sympathy to the families of Sir John McLeay, the Right Honourable Sir Phillip McBride and the Hon. Jim Dunford. I would also like to record my sorrow at the passing of the head messenger of the Legislative Council, Mr Ted Dawes.

His Excellency's Speech referred to the down-turn in the international and Australian economies. The Governor observed that the United States and European economic

communities have been experiencing severe economic downturn for the past two years, and that Australia first felt the effects of this international recession earlier this year. The reality of the situation is that there has been a down-turn for nearly three years. The slump has been deepening and not receding, despite regular claims over the past 12 months that there is light at the end of the economic tunnel. In Western Germany unemployment has nearly doubled since 1979 to 6.8 per cent and is forecast to rise to 7.5 per cent by the year's end.

Italy, with 9.6 per cent unemployment at the end of 1981, seems likely to reach 11 per cent by the end of 1982. Britain, with unemployment at 11.5 per cent at the end of 1981, is currently experiencing unemployment in excess of 13 per cent. That figure seems likely to remain for at least the balance of 1982. However, the inflation rate of 1981 is easing considerably during 1982 in Britain, France and Italy. In America, the current unemployment rate is 9 per cent and rising, and Canada has an unemployment rate well into double figures. South-East Asian countries such as South Korea, Singapore, Taiwan and Hong Kong, whose annual growth has been close to double figures in the 1970s, have also been affected with a perceptible slowing in economic growth in the past six to nine months.

One does not have to be an economics graduate to realise the extraordinary degree of interdependence that exists between countries in regard to trade. A weakening in the American and European economies will cut back exports from South-East Asian countries and, in turn, impact on the Australian economy. Indeed, Australia's largest public company, B.H.P., only last week gave notice that it is feeling the chill economic winds. It reported the first yearly loss in its steel division for more than 50 years.

Therefore, it was with some surprise that I heard the Leader of the Opposition draw the rather startling conclusion on *Nationwide* last night that the South Australian downturn, according to some economic indicators, was a consequence of the economic policies of the Tonkin Government. It is perhaps understandable that the Hon. Dr Cornwall's unique and persuasive ability to turn pessimism into a cottage industry is contagious, at least amongst his colleagues. It is unforgivable that Mr Bannon has chosen to ignore the fact that the current economic down-turn has been more severe and more profound in its global implications than has anything since the Great Depression.

It has smitten countries whether they be governed by capitalists, socialists or communists, whether they be energy rich or poor, agriculturally strong or weak, or situated in the Northern Hemisphere or the Southern Hemisphere. Mr Bannon should not have too many illusions about the ability of a provincial government presiding over a little more than one million people in a world of four billion to, Canute-like, stop the economic back wash reaching our shores.

I did not intend to comment on the state of the economy in this speech, but in such difficult times I believe it to be singularly unhelpful and destructive for the Labor Party to be talking the economy down and, indeed, taking positive action to ensure it stays down by voting against proposals such as the Roxby Downs Indenture Bill. Therefore, I was pleased to hear of the following incident from a most reliable source within the Labor Party. On Friday 18 June, honourable members will recall that the Roxby Downs Indenture Bill was recommitted and passed by this Chamber just before lunch time. The Federal Shadow Minister of National Developments and Energy, Mr Paul Keating, was in Adelaide to address a Labor business men's luncheon. Mr Bannon announced to the gathering that the Roxby Downs Bill had passed because the Hon. Mr Norm Foster had crossed the floor. There was spontaneous applause from a significant section of those present. At least some Labor members

recognised the folly of putting 1 000 jobs in jeopardy at a time of rising unemployment.

In the television interview last night, the Leader of the Opposition pointed out that South Australia is the only State in which State Public Service employment has been reduced in recent years. In the debate on the Supply and Appropriation Bills in June, I pointed out that, in the period August 1972 to August 1979, public sector employment in South Australia had increased by some 27 per cent (or 22 000 people), while private sector employment had remained virtually static. In the three years since the Tonkin Government came to office in September 1979, public sector employment has been cut by over 3 000 people, nearly 3 per cent, while private sector employment has grown by 6 per cent—an additional 25 000 people.

The growth in the South Australian public sector in the early 1970s was higher than for all States combined, for each State individually and for all Commonwealth authorities. After 1977-78, public sector growth in South Australia was cut back significantly, especially when the Tonkin Government took office in September 1979. The strong growth in the Government sector in employment terms until 1977-78 helped dampen South Australia's unemployment rate. I seek leave to insert a statistical table in *Hansard* without reading it.

Leave granted.

Unemployment Rates in South Australia and Australia

Period	Australia %	South Australia %	Difference %
August 1977	5.7	6.3	0.6
August 1978	6.2	7.4	1.2
August 1979	5.8	7.6	1.8
August 1980	5.9	8.0	2.1
August 1981	5.6	8.0	2.4
June 1982 (preliminary estimate)	6.5	7.5	1.0

Source: Australian A.B.S. Time Series Microfiche (EUR)  
The Labour Force South Australia 6201.4

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** The table shows that in August 1977 South Australia's unemployment rate was 6.3 per cent, 0.6 per cent higher than the national average of 5.7 per cent. Just before the Labor Party left office in August 1979, South Australia's unemployment rate had grown to 7.6 per cent, 1.8 per cent higher than the national average. The economy was certainly deteriorating in unemployment terms, and that deterioration continued for the first two years of the Tonkin Government's term of office as it attempted to remedy the situation.

In fact, by August 1981, South Australia's unemployment rate was 8 per cent, some 2.4 per cent higher than Australia's national average of 5.6 per cent. The Hon. Mr Sumner may care to observe and perhaps comment on the fact that, in June 1982, the latest estimate of unemployment figures available shows that South Australia's unemployment rate was 7.5 per cent, only 1 per cent higher than the national average of 6.5 per cent. South Australia's unemployment rate is closer to the other States than at any time since 1977. That is a heartening performance in a difficult economic climate. This trend is reinforced by the fact that from June 1981 to June 1982 the percentage unemployed in South Australia increased at a significantly lesser rate than applied in all other States at a time when all countries are experiencing an increase in unemployment.

This performance is all the more meritorious when one remembers that Mr Bannon rightly claimed that South Australia was the only State in which public sector employment had declined. It is worth noting that the South Australian example is now being followed with alacrity by the New South Wales Labor Government, where Mr Wran is slashing Public Service employment willy nilly, and in Tasmania where the recently elected Liberal Government has inherited a record budgetary deficit.

The other economic indicator that unfortunately continues to be distorted is the population growth. The simple fact is that in the 1981 calendar year South Australia's population increased by 13 100. That is the biggest increase since 1974. In fact, it is a dramatic improvement on the previous three years. In 1978, the increase was 6 400; in 1979 it was 5 400; and in 1980 it was 7 700. As can be seen, the population increase in 1981 was equal to the combined increases of both 1979 and 1980. In fact, the 1981 December quarterly increase of 4 151 was the largest quarterly increase since June 1974.

I would hope that the Opposition can be more constructive in its approach to economic matters. To date there has been little evidence that it has understood that South Australia's growth will not be strengthened by massive doses of Government spending. The experience under the Labor Government of the 1970s is evidence enough of that proposition. The Labor Party publication, 'South Australia's economic future, stage I', was released in late May. That is claimed to be the first stage of its policy formulation in the economic area—a perusal of the document makes that abundantly clear. There is very little new in this publication, although heavy publicity in recent weeks has been given to the formation of a South Australian enterprise fund. I will be interested to hear more details about this proposal.

In his Speech, the Governor also referred to the expansion of community and domiciliary programmes already undertaken by the Government, especially to meet the needs of the rapidly ageing population. Of course, this is not only in respect of the ageing population but also relates to the sick in the community. During the course of the debate in 1980 on the Natural Death Bill, introduced by the Hon. Mr Blevins, I became aware of the hospice movement, which has as its central aim the care of the dying when all hope of cure has gone, in assisting persons to accept an inevitable death with as much dignity and comfort as possible. Its central belief is that dying is a part of living. The word 'hospice' is derived from the Latin word *hospes*, which can mean 'host' or 'guest'. Hospital, hostel and host are more common derivatives. The hospice movement of this century has been pioneered by Dr Ceciley Saunders through the St Christophers Hospice in London, and Dr Elisabeth Kubler Ross in the U.S.A. in the late 1960s.

Indeed, the concept of hospice arguably dates back 2 000 years, well before the hospice of Turmarin in Syria in 474 A.D. and the Knights Hospitallers of the Order of St John of Jerusalem at the time of the Crusades in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. It was the Hospitaller Knights which, as history records, cared for the dying in a unique way. Although those knights provided accommodation for travellers from far off lands, the weary and the sick, they separated patients with incurable diseases from all other patients. In medieval times the concept was simple. The many way stations provided a respite, refreshment and care for pilgrims and travellers. The dying were also seen as voyagers and pilgrims to be cared for.

We have come a long way since those medieval days. Medical technology has enabled us to prolong life in a most dramatic fashion. In 1400, life expectancy was about 35 years; it increased to 40 years in 1850 and to 47 years in 1900. Today in Australia the average life expectancy is over

73 years. Death can now be staved off and beaten in intensive care units. Yet, until the hospice movement commenced about 15 years ago a dying patient was moved to the end of the ward, the blinds were pulled down and they were left alone. Nurses took longer to answer a bell rung by a dying patient. We live in a death-denying society. There is a tendency for death in Western society to be placed in a watertight compartment: out of sight and out of mind. Yet the Royal Victoria Hospital, Montreal, in its brochure outlining Palliative Care Service, states:

Philosophers, poets and the seasons themselves remind us that life is cyclic. As a society we must re-examine our attitudes towards death as part of the life cycle. As health care givers we must be more concerned about the experiences of the 70 per cent of Canadians who died in institutions. We must strive to establish new standards in terminal care. We must re-examine a medical mentality that equates aggressive investigations and therapeutic intervention with 'good medical care'. We must develop clearer concepts of what is appropriate care for the terminally ill.

Late last year my wife and I were fortunate enough to be in Montreal on the only day in the month when the Royal Victoria Hospital Palliative Care Service was open to the public. Royal Victoria is the teaching hospital for McGill University. Dr Balfour Mount has been the Director of the Palliative Care Service since it was opened in January 1975, with the support of the hospital, the provincial Government and a philanthropic foundation.

Dr Mount is Canada's leading authority on the hospice movement and, with his support team, discussed the service and answered queries before showing us through the unit. The Palliative Care Unit is perhaps unique in that, whilst it is a converted hospital ward, it is still attached to the hospital. Conventional wisdom may suggest that such a unit is more likely to succeed if it is free standing and directly removed from a hospital setting.

However, Dr Mount observed in a paper presented to the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada in 1978, as follows:

The Palliative Care Service at the Royal Victoria Hospital was opened in January 1975. It has demonstrated that the needs of the terminally ill and their families can be met within the general hospital setting with a service that includes:

- a trained multidisciplinary team,
- a hospital ward, home visiting team, and consultation service,
- emphasis on specialised nursing care and the treatment of pain,
- concern for the patients' psychological, emotional and spiritual needs,
- treatment and care of the patient and the family as a unit, and
- continuation of staff involvement with the family during bereavement.

Dr Mount emphasised the importance of changing our goals in the care of the dying to emphasise the quality of survival rather than the length of survival. He believed that while the medical profession in Canada was adapting to this changed emphasis it was not comfortable with the proposition. Prior to the formation of the unit in 1975 a survey was undertaken which provided some fascinating results. The same questions were put to patients, doctors, nurses, social workers, clergy, and so on. For example, to the question, 'Should a patient be told that he is terminally ill', 78 per cent of patients said, 'Yes' but only 13 per cent of doctors responded affirmatively.



There was a similar response to the question, 'Are patients able to adapt to the truth regarding a hopeless prognosis?' All categories—doctors, nurses, social workers and clergy—believed they were aware of the emotional needs of patients who they knew were terminally ill. Most interesting was the fact that all categories denied that they avoided discussions relating to death and dying with the terminally ill, but about 70 per cent of each category claimed that all other categories avoided such discussions.

Further, 84 per cent of physicians who felt they would want to know their own prognosis if they were fatally ill thought that their patients would also like to know their prognosis, but only 45 per cent of physicians not wanting to know their own prognosis believed that their patients desired honesty in communication of that fact.

Music therapy in the Palliative Care Unit at Montreal has been actively pursued. A trained music therapist has been brought in as part of the multi-disciplinary health care team. Music has been a bridge between people when words may not be appropriate or adequate.

A family room and small kitchen enable family meals and relaxation in a homely setting. Families are encouraged to bring in their own food. Families and friends are assisted to share in and understand the dying process. There is less and less talk about the weather. Patient-to-patient relationships are encouraged. Pets are accepted. It is a multi-cultural, multi-religious unit. There are three patients per four-bed ward, and provision exists for up to 13 patients at any one time. Provision for single room accommodation also exists for those who may be physically or psychologically scarred. At any one time the support staff is about 15 people, including volunteers. There is a projected need for 24 beds in the unit. The average length of stay for a patient in a unit is 15 to 20 days.

In addition to the unit which functions as an autonomous unit with Dr Mount responsible only to the hospital administrator there is a home care service caring for up to 40 patients at any one time. The home care team consists of one sister and three nurses who make one or two calls a week, although in some cases patients are coping well enough to make do with just a phone call. This external aspect of the Palliative Care Unit is funded through the in-patient services, and its effectiveness relies much on a proper co-ordination of various home care services.

The unit is staffed by a multi-disciplinary team. Family members are encouraged to assist in patient care. Heavy emphasis is placed on volunteer help, both men and women, to assist nurses, visit families, help with administration, run errands, make phone calls and visit the bereaved.

Volunteers are active in fund raising and there is a long waiting list of volunteers. Many volunteers are relatives of people who have previously died in the unit. Palliative care demands attention in regard to small individual needs. It demands time. Therefore, all hospices in both Europe and North America place a heavy emphasis on volunteer participation.

In fact, there is now a four-week training programme on death and dying for all medical students at Montreal Hospital and this has assisted terminal cases being referred by the general hospital to the unit more readily than was the case when the unit first opened.

As I have previously stated, pain control is important. Dr Mount believes there is still a tragic inadequacy of pain control in North American hospitals. An oral narcotic mixture of morphine with phenothiazine has proved most satisfactory in 75 per cent to 80 per cent of patients with intractable cancer pain and in 90 per cent of patients in the Palliative Care Unit. Dr Mount observes that it is in the other 10 per cent of patients where heroin has a possible

role. Whether the alternative is heroin rather than methadone has not been resolved to his satisfaction.

The hospice movement has mushroomed around the world. There are possibly close to 100 hospices in the United States and over 40 in England providing total care for the patient and his or her family through an inter-disciplinary team available on a 24-hours-a-day seven-days-a-week basis. The term 'hospice' embraces not only a unit that cares solely for the dying, whether it be attached to a hospital or not, but also provides a full scope home care service. It is a programme rather than just a building.

In 1976 the European Public Health Committee established a select committee to study the attitude of health profession members caring for the patient during a period when it is known that death cannot be far away. Its final report, published in 1981, only confirmed the view that the hospice movement has a vital role to play in providing health professionals and society at large with a better understanding of, and attitude to, death and dying.

In Australia there are few genuine hospices; nevertheless, there has been a steadily growing interest in the concept in recent years. For example, in 1980 the Federal Government funded a three-year pilot project for the City Mission in North Fitzroy which is based primarily on home care. In Sydney, the Sacred Heart Hospice, founded in 1890, is a 110-bed hospice run by the Sisters of Charity. It cares only for the terminally ill. In South Australia the Mary Potter Nursing Home attached to Calvary Hospital would perhaps best be described as a quasi-hospice. This is a 21-bed nursing home physically separate from the hospital. Most patients, although not necessarily all, are terminally ill. There is a volunteer programme and both pre-admission and bereavement counselling—essential ingredients of a palliative care service.

The most important development in South Australia has undoubtedly been the formation of the Southern Hospice Association. In October 1981 that association published a report on the care of the terminally ill following a study of health service resources in the southern region. Information was sought from general practitioners, medical specialists, hospital and nursing home matrons, a range of home care services, Government, community and religious organisations in the southern region.

The report observed that in South Australia nearly 10 000 persons died in 1981 and about 16 per cent or 1 600 of those died of cancer. The Canadian experience has been that up to 70 per cent of deaths from cancer occur in hospital. The paucity of health statistics makes it difficult to assess the position in Australia, but in Western Australia, Dr Frey, a leader in the Australian hospice movement, estimates that the figure is 65 per cent, with the remaining 35 per cent of cancer deaths occurring at home or in nursing homes. The report of the Southern Hospice Association made the following observations:

A responsibility for any hospice programme will be to work towards a better collection of information about terminally-ill persons, to monitor the statistics which become available and to estimate its own influence upon them.

A major aim of any hospice programme is to increase the proportion of persons who die at home or who remain there until shortly before death. To the extent that it succeeds in this, it facilitates better care, easier bereavement and a reduced cost.

The study showed that both consumers and providers of care for the dying in the southern region of Adelaide strongly favoured care at home for as long as possible rather than a hospital or nursing home. It comes as no surprise to find that the European and American experience of recent years is mirrored in Adelaide.

If home care services are preferred they need to be strengthened and better co-ordinated, not only between home care services but also between hospitals and home care services. For example, the survey revealed that general practitioners felt public (but not private) hospitals sometimes released terminally-ill patients at inappropriate times such as weekends when there would be great difficulty in obtaining a doctor and home care service support at all.

A particular difficulty was the absence of a 24-hour service, although I understand that the Flinders Medical Centre recently initiated such a service within that hospital. The report observes that the generally accepted rule is 50 in-patient beds for terminal care for each 1 000 000 of population.

I have already touched on the controversy which surrounds the question of whether these beds are better attached to a hospital, or elsewhere. In Adelaide, for example, Kalyra Hospital has established a palliative care wing which is in a tranquil setting and is highly regarded. Unfortunately, it is not easily accessible to public transport, and this is a limiting factor.

Quite sensibly, the report goes on to argue that, initially, the focus in South Australia should be on education and training—for example, formal seminars for established doctors and nurses on communication, death and dying, and pain control. Similarly, a programme of training for volunteers and home care services also needs to be better developed. It is pleasing to note that a programme to prepare volunteers to work alongside nurses in the oncology unit at Flinders Medical Centre has operated since 1981 and is regarded as most successful.

Perhaps not surprisingly consumer expectations have been low. They really do not know what services they have been missing that are being provided in hospices in Europe and America. There is, perhaps, a general reluctance in Adelaide and elsewhere to criticise those engaged in health care.

The report observed that there is also a need to focus on the development of a management centre which will act as a resource centre in the southern region to manage and co-ordinate an education programme, and to develop and co-ordinate home care services. We need that education programme to cover not only the health profession but also volunteers in the community. There is a need to provide respite beds for terminal care. Management skills rather than buildings are the first need, although physical facilities will also be required. The report then sets out at page 12 the barriers to good hospice care in Adelaide, as follows:

Inadequate discharge planning; lack of night-time and weekend home support services; lack of facilities for respite; lack of communication between general practitioner and medical specialist, inhibiting general practitioner follow-up and involvement after referral to hospital, and delaying 'handing over' after discharge; lack of appropriate beds for respite and terminal care-beds which are available on the basis of need and not on the ability to pay; inadequate training for those who care for the dying and bereaved; lack of resources for bereavement follow-up; inadequate training for health professionals in the management of pain in terminal illness; and lack of volunteers trained and assigned to assist terminally ill individuals and their families.

To those barriers may be added the barrier of lack of communication between volunteer groups and the lack, perhaps, of a resources directory. That report from the Southern Hospices Association should be commended because it does establish some guidelines and ground rules. The impressive thing about the document is that it is a co-operative venture between representatives from the Flinders Medical Centre, the Repatriation Hospital, Daws Road, the Anti-Cancer Foundation, Royal Adelaide Hospital, Mary Potter Wing, general practitioners, radiotherapists and community health centres.

Finally, in respect to the hospice movement, I would like to quote from Dr Balfour Mount of the Royal Victorian Hospital in Montreal when he evaluated comparative care services at that hospital and concluded as follows:

Its impact cannot be measured in milligrams, per cent or mean survival times. It is difficult to quantitate and ascribe a statistical significance to a lessening of loneliness or pain, or an easing of anxiety or the pangs of bereavement. In these areas, case reports are probably more significant than attempts at documentation. We have learned a great deal in our research.

The conclusion is that the care of the dying and their families can be greatly improved. The cost involved is minimal—insignificant in the light of the suffering alleviated. There is, in fact, a saving in costs per patient treated. A palliative care service can make it possible for more patients to die at home. It can free active treatment beds in an acute hospital and increase the number of teaching beds in institutions where that is a primary concern.

The Governor's Speech also took note of the Government's commitment to continue to improve the quality of community welfare services. I want to briefly review the progress in this very important area over the past three years. Honourable members will remember that in 1977 the then Labor Government decided that the Community Welfare Act should be reviewed and submissions were received from the public, interested bodies and the staff of the Department for Community Welfare. Recommendations were then made to the Minister of Community Welfare, and a Community Welfare Act Review Committee, under the Chairmanship of Professor Ray Brown, was established. From that committee a report was prepared in the form of draft legislation.

However, following the change in Government in September 1979, the draft legislation prepared by the previous Labor Government was reviewed and the present Government believed that there was a gap in the report, namely, that the opinions of clients of the Department for Community Welfare had not been canvassed. Their opinions, of course, are a valuable tool in assessing the benefit and relevance of community welfare services.

Therefore, the current Minister of Community Welfare, the Hon. Mr Burdett, established the Community Welfare Advisory Committee on the delivery of community welfare services under the Chairmanship of Professor Leah Mann.

The Mann Report was brought down in 1980. It recommended that a major overhaul of welfare services was not required but, nevertheless, there were some deficiencies in some areas of service delivery. The report noted that there was a wide spectrum of people who used the department's services, but those groups who were most in need of the services (for example, the elderly, those who were least formally educated and ethnic minority groups generally) were the ones who least knew about the services offered by the Department for Community Welfare.

The Mann Report called for consumer rights and protection through the establishment of an appeals board, welfare ombudsman, consumer forums, and a Children's Interest Bureau. It recommended a change in the relationship between the consumer and the Department for Community Welfare. The Mann Report also noted the need to support families and urged the department to promote its stated policy of supporting the family unit and its objective of reconciling families in conflict. In 1980, after consideration of the Mann Report, the amending Bill went to Parliament and was subsequently passed by both Houses.

The major features of the amending Bill were that it updated and made more implicit principles of community participation and services for individuals and families in need. It sought to repeal, and in effect it did repeal, sections which were no longer relevant, such as sections relating to Aboriginal reserves, and made changes in line with the Family Law Act.

There were several specific changes that should be particularly noted. One change was that clients should be seen as

having an important role as a partner with the Department for Community Welfare in determining the services to be provided. The observations and views of clients were, from the time of the passage of this Bill, to be noted. This particularly applied in the new initiatives of the programme advisory panels and consumer forums. Another change was that importance was given to providing services as a matter of priority to individuals and groups in priority areas, for example, the unemployed, single parents, migrants, the aged, and people living in isolated areas or difficult circumstances.

Another feature of the amendment to the Act was the provision of, or facilitating the provision of, services to strengthen the family unit. Particular attention was given to reducing the incidence of disruption of family relationships or minimising the effects. The amended Act also sought to ensure a high quality of service through review as well as licensing provisions.

There were several new initiatives contained in the amendments and they included programme advisory panels, consumer forums (which enabled clients to give their opinion of departmental services), a Children's Interest Bureau (established for consideration of issues relating to the well-being of children) the licensing of foster care agencies, and family day care agencies, and an appeals board (established as an independent board to hear complaints about decisions of the department and to make recommendations to the Minister).

The family research unit, which was established in October 1979, was in accord with the Government's policy on families. It had the following terms of reference: first, to develop, implement and provide a consultancy service on family impact statements; secondly, to examine the status and wellbeing of families; and, thirdly, to recommend ways to the Government of strengthening the family unit.

This Government has placed particular emphasis on family impact statements which are a *pro forma* assessment of the impact on families of proposals being put forward by all Government departments and authorities. This assessment includes consideration of economic and general wellbeing of the family, the family's freedom to make decisions without undue control by others, family relationships, family formation (for example, whether the decision will influence a couple in having children), and family structure (for example, whether a decision will encourage young people to leave home or deter families from caring for aged members within the home). Each department and authority undertakes its own assessment. The assessment and the outcome, that is, the family impact statement, are included in submissions to Cabinet.

In the period 1980-81, 12 public forums throughout the States were hosted to enable families to discuss their current concerns for families. The forums, together with a survey project undertaken in conjunction with the Victorian Institute of Family Studies, formed the basis of the Familiespeak Project which provided information on families in South Australia.

In that same time, the department conducted the following small-scale research projects to look at key areas of departmental interaction with families: the emergency financial assistance applicants (Gawler District Office), crisis points for young people seeking emergency financial assistance (Glenelg/Brighton district office), and Mount Gambier also undertook a research project on supporting parents. There was investigation undertaken into the problems of unattached refugee youth, together with youth homelessness and youth shelters.

I understand that four studies are currently being undertaken into Children's Aid Panels (Norwood and Port Lincoln), school experiences of children in foster care (Campbelltown), budget advice (Woodville), and also an adopted persons contact register.

There have been several significant initiatives that have been undertaken by the current Government in the area of community welfare. They have been initiatives developed either through amendments to the Act or programmes which follow through the commitment of this Government to the community welfare area. It is important to recognise that the previous Government also made a significant contribution in the area of community welfare.

One would hope that there is a degree of bi-partisanship in this area of concern for the community—for the family and the children of families. I would commend the current Government on the initiatives it has taken in this programme. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion for adoption of the Address in Reply.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (Leader of the Opposition):** I support the motion. Other honourable members have referred to the death of former members of Parliament. On previous occasions I have spoken on behalf of the Opposition in expressing sympathy and condolences on behalf of myself and the Opposition on the death of Sir John McLeay and the Hon. Jim Dunford. I would also like to express my sympathy and condolences to the family of Ted Dawes, the head messenger of the Legislative Council for many years. His death came as a shock to all honourable members as he was with us such a short time ago.

This is the fourth Address in Reply debate responding to a Governor's Speech prepared by the Liberal Government. The Speech has been given in the context that there will be an election within the next eight months. It is therefore an appropriate time for the Parliament and indeed the people to assess the Government's performance over the previous three years. In 1981, in the Address in Reply debate on 6 August, I comprehensively covered the issue of the Government's performance up to that time. I have commented in other debates on its performance, particularly in the area of the economy and State finances. I think a summary of the points made would be as follows.

First, compared to its promises and the prospectus it offered the electors before the last election, its performance on any objective analysis has been far from satisfactory. The unsatisfactory nature of its performance ranges from such serious issues as the economy, State finances and unemployment to almost petty issues where the Premier, for example, made great play of his providing smaller cars for Government service yet he still drives around in an eight-cylinder car. He made great play of the public relations apparatus of the previous Government. It was often referred to by the Premier when he was in Opposition and he promised to reduce the number of press secretaries. A subsequent increase has been evidenced in their numbers.

Whether it is the more serious issues or the more petty issues, across the board the Government's performance in terms of its promises or prospectus announced before the last election has been, to say the least, less than satisfactory. The second point I would make is that in some areas it has been not only unsatisfactory but also plain incompetent. One area where that has occurred has been that of State finances where at least \$80 000 000 has been wasted by the State Government through deferring or not spending Loan money on capital works but using it to prop up the day-to-day functions of the Government. That has been done in unprecedented fashion. It can only be described as incompetence. The third impression one gets of the Government

is that of singular non-achievement. It is indecisive and dithering. It has dithered over the West Lakes lights. It exhibited quite an incredible performance of indecisiveness and dithering over the petrol crisis issue in 1981. We had the bankcard fiasco, which has been fully debated in this place.

The fourth point which has now become clear to the community is that the Government is, compared to the previous Government, an inaccessible Government generally. Groups have difficulty in seeing Government Ministers and their communications with the community and community groups are less than satisfactory. The final point in this general assessment of the Government is that at times it has been simply deceitful. It was deceitful on the question of on-the-spot fines. The Attorney-General's report on the Salisbury case would also have to come into that category. In past debates I have covered those issues, and the performance of the Government could be summarised in the way that I have just indicated to the Council.

There are other quite disturbing aspects of the Government's performance which come into the area of deceit and dishonesty. They perhaps relate more to the character of the Premier than to the Government as a whole. The Premier cannot resist the temptation to be deceitful. The first matter I refer to is his continual boasting and bragging about matters which are clearly not his Government's doing and not the responsibility of his Government. There have been a number of common examples of that. We will no doubt hear more of those matters as the election draws closer. The international hotel will no doubt be opened shortly amidst great fanfare and claims of credit by the Government. We know that before the last election Mr Tonkin was very critical of planning for an international hotel in Victoria Square and the negotiations for it were in fact conducted by the previous Government.

The second matter (and this is the matter I wish to give some attention to this afternoon) is the very dishonest use of statistics which the Government, particularly the Premier, has engaged in to bolster his and the Government's position. I will refer to those statistics in more detail, particularly in relation to unemployment, during the course of my speech. I refer specifically to the Governor's Speech which I believe was a much more political Speech than is usually given to the Governor by the Government. I do not criticise the Governor for that. He has to read out whatever Speech is given to him. There is no question that the Speech from the Governor was more Party political than has been the case in the past. I believe that the Governor has unwittingly given credence to Government propaganda on a number of issues, particularly on the economic position of the State.

The Government quite deliberately decided to use the Governor in a political way to peddle its propaganda about the state of South Australia's economy. That was regrettable because, to anyone attending the opening of Parliament, the political nature of the Speech was obvious and, indeed, much more obvious than it had been in previous years. I would like to direct my remarks to the state of the economy and the question of unemployment. Last October in debate on the Budget I presented facts to the Council on the state of the South Australian economy. I do not believe that the situation has changed appreciably since that material was given to the Council.

At that time, having incorporated a number of economic indicators in *Hansard*, I said:

I do not wish to dwell on these indicators, but I provide them so that honourable members will have the opportunity to peruse them. The fact is that all the major economic and demographic indicators—population, labour force, employment, unemployment, job vacancies, registration of new motor vehicles, retail sales of goods, building approvals, and new dwelling finances—show South

Australia as appreciably worse off than the general position in Australia, and its position has worsened appreciably since 1979.

I then appealed to honourable members opposite, but what I said has clearly fallen on deaf ears, particularly in the case of the Hon. Mr Davis. I said:

I make an appeal to honourable members on the back bench not to toady to their front bench colleagues and merely prattle the propaganda that the Premier puts out on behalf of his Government but to try to make a realistic analysis of what is happening in this State. Clearly the situation is difficult. There is no point in the Premier's making grandiose statements and promises about the future when the facts belie those promises and projections to the future. The Government obviously has to sit down and have a good think about where it is going.

Clearly, the Government has not heeded my advice. I also said that if the Government did not follow my advice it would not be in power after the next election. I think that is becoming clearer and clearer as time goes by.

**The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw:** What is clear?

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** It is clear that unless the Government and the Premier decide to realistically appraise what is happening to the South Australian economy they will not be in power after the next election. That will not particularly bother me, but honourable members opposite seem to be living in some kind of—

**The Hon. Barbara Wiese:** Cloud cuckoo land.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** Yes, cloud cuckoo land. They are living in an atmosphere of complete unreality—that is the phrase that I would have used, but I thank the Hon. Miss Wiese for her help. I do not believe that South Australia's general position has changed since I drew attention to those economic indicators in October last year.

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** You mentioned population growth. Would you care to comment about that? South Australia's population growth is now the best it has been since 1974.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** It is quite likely that Western Australia will have a higher population than South Australia within the next few months. There has been a substantial population drain from South Australia which, in the reasonably near future, will probably lead to South Australia's having the lowest population of any State on the mainland.

Paragraph 4 of the Governor's Speech states:

The international and Australian economic climates remain a matter of concern.

It was interesting that the Hon. Mr Davis dwelt on the international and national comparisons in his contribution today. It might have been useful if he and his Premier had dealt with the international and national factors that were influencing the South Australian economy before 1979. In fact, during debate on the Budget in 1979, commenting on the Premier's speech I said:

There are no interstate comparisons, and that seems odd. There is no reference in the speech to details of Commonwealth or national economic factors. There is no reference to international factors and how they impinge on the economy. As during the election campaign, it has been a simplistic attempt to lay the whole of the blame at the feet of the Labor Government of the previous 10 years. My first prediction is that next year much more will be said about international factors, Federal Government policies, and how the State's ability to manage its economy depends much on external factors.

I merely mention that to show that before 1979 the Premier did not mention international or national factors at all. He did not mention the national increase in unemployment

during those years. Indeed, he did not do that in his first Budget speech to Parliament following the 1979 election. However, reference is made about the factors in paragraph 4 of the Governor's Speech as he opened the forty-fourth Parliament of this Government.

In the last Budget Papers the Premier placed great emphasis on national and international factors. I have no doubt that, if the Premier presents the next Budget before the election, he will place great emphasis on national and international factors. It is quite clear that the Hon. Mr Davis has now adopted that argument, because he told the Chamber that the current situation has nothing to do with the South Australian Government. It is a matter of concern that exists in the international and Australian economic climates.

Over the years, in speaking about economic matters, I have never indicated that South Australia is an island. I have always acknowledged that the State's capacity to influence the economy is limited by what is happening internationally and nationally. I have consistently taken that position. The tragedy is that people like the Premier, who continues to be deceitful about this issue or does not understand the economy, now make such a play of the international and Australian factors, as the Premier did by way of the Governor's Speech, yet in 1979 said that the only thing that mattered was the State Government's policy. The propaganda that I refer to as having been put into the mouth of the Governor is contained in the Governor's Speech as follows:

Despite these economic difficulties key economic indicators continue to show that the South Australian economy is faring better than other States.

While unemployment has risen nationally by 27.5 per cent over the last year the rise in South Australia has been only 3 per cent.

Employment in this State's manufacturing industry has increased by four times the national average during the past year.

If the Government believes that the key economic indicators show that the South Australian economy is faring better than the economies of other States, it has an incredible capacity for self-delusion.

I have already mentioned the economic indicators I spoke of in this Chamber in October last year, which show that that statement about the South Australian economy is simply not true. I do not believe that the situation has changed up to the present time. I am afraid that that statement is simply incorrect. However, the Government chose to allow the Governor to make that statement to Parliament knowing that it was incorrect. The Governor's Speech also contains a claim about the increase in unemployment in South Australia being only 3 per cent, whereas nationally it has been 27.5 per cent over the previous year.

Of course, in relation to unemployment figures the result one gets depends on which months one compares. I intend to indicate to the Council that the Government has been most deceitful in its use of statistics in regard to unemployment, particularly over the past three years. The situation is that the latest A.B.S. figures show that unemployment in Australia increased from 350 000 to 446 600 from June 1981 to June 1982, an increase of 27.5 per cent in the past 12 months. It is worth bearing in mind, especially as the Hon. Mr Davis has just resumed his seat, that it is a Party of his political philosophy that has been in Government during that time at a national level. Nevertheless, there has been an increase of 27.5 per cent in unemployment in Australia over the past 12 months. That is a disastrous increase.

For South Australia, the unemployment figure for June 1981 was 44 300, and it was 45 600 in June 1982, an increase of about 3 per cent. On the face of it, one can see that the claim made by the Governor in his Speech is technically

correct, but it can and will be seen from tables that I intend to have inserted in *Hansard* that monthly comparisons can show great fluctuations. For example, if the February 1981 and February 1982 figures are compared, honourable members will find that unemployment increased by 14 per cent for Australia and by 10 per cent for South Australia. It depends on which month one compares.

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** It's less than the Australian average, and that was the worst that you could find.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** No, it was not. I have already indicated the figures which are used to support the proposition in the Governor's Speech. Unfortunately, that is not the end of the matter. It would be quite disastrous if South Australia's unemployment rate increased at the same rate as the national rate, because South Australia is already suffering from having the highest unemployment rate in mainland Australia. It is starting from a high base.

The statistics which the Governor has given to Parliament at the instigation of the Government do not really tell the whole story. One can look at the figures for an increase or decrease in employment in Australia, which is a figure that the Government is particularly enthusiastic about referring to, although I do not know why, as I will indicate. If we compare June 1981 and June 1982, there has been a loss of 3 400 jobs in South Australia, yet over that period national employment fell by only 300. The reduction in the number of people actually employed in South Australia over that period has been much greater than the reduction in the number of people employed nationally during that period. These figures tend to provide some balance to the figures given by the Governor in his Speech.

The next statistic which the Governor referred to was employment in manufacturing. I find this to be simply dishonest. The use of statistics in this way really does the Government no credit at all. I believe from the research that I have had undertaken by the Parliamentary Research Service that the basis for the incredible claim that employment in this State's manufacturing industries has increased by four times the national average in the past year is that national employment in manufacturing has increased from 1 238 000 for the March quarter in 1981 to 1 242 900 for the March quarter of 1982. This represents an increase of 4 900 jobs, or a percentage increase of .0039 per cent. That is the situation in Australia.

In South Australia the nearest comparable figures are for February 1981 and February 1982. They show an increase from 119 700 to 121 600, or 1 900 jobs. This represents an increase of .016 per cent, which is indeed four times the national increase.

The increase in manufacturing jobs nationally was .0039 per cent, and in South Australia it was .016 per cent, and the Government uses those figures as the basis for a claim that the increase in manufacturing jobs in South Australia has been four times the national increase. If the Government has to resort to that sort of statistical manoeuvring in order to boost its claims, if it must resort to having the Governor give credence to its political propaganda in that way, then it must be extremely desperate.

The next matter to which I wish to refer concerns unemployment. Tragically, this matter has been given considerable prominence in the press over the past few days because of the disastrous cut-backs in employment that have occurred in South Australia during the past week or so. However, before embarking on this matter, and to ensure that no-one accuses me of distorting statistics, I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* two tables of a purely statistical nature.

Leave granted.

## SOUTH AUSTRALIA—EMPLOYMENT, UNEMPLOYMENT AND LABOUR FORCE GROWTH 1979-82

	Employed population (000's)	Compared to same month previous year	Monthly fluctuations in employed population	Cumulative jobs created	Civilian population 15 + (000's)	Cumulative additions to civilian population 15 +	Labour force (000's)	Monthly fluctuations to labour force	Cumulative additions to labour force	Population 15 + not in labour force (000's)	Cumulative additions to population 15 + not in labour force	Unemployed (000's)	Compared to same month previous year	Cumulative fluctuations in unemployment	Unemployment rate %	Duration of unemployment weeks	Full-time employed workers (000's)	Part-time employed workers (000's)	Labour force participation rate %
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
Sep. 79	554.3	-1 300	+6 900	—	974.5	—	600.2	+7 500	—	374.4	—	45.9	-1 000	—	7.6	33.1	454.9	99.4	61.6
Oct.	550.7	+3 500	-3 600	-3 600	975.6	+1 100	594.6	-5 600	-5 600	381.0	+6 700	44.0	-1 700	-1 900	7.4	33.0	448.4	102.3	60.9
Nov.	550.6	+4 500	-100	-3 700	976.8	+2 300	589.2	-4 400	-11 000	387.6	+13 300	38.6	-5 600	-7 300	6.6	36.4	452.6	97.3	60.3
Dec.	562.2	-7 700	+11 600	+7 900	978.4	+3 900	606.8	+17 600	+6 600	371.6	-2 800	44.6	-2 300	-1 300	7.4	35.7	460.4	101.8	62.0
Jan. 80	547.0	-7 700	-15 200	-7 300	979.8	+5 300	594.9	-11 900	-5 300	384.9	+10 500	47.9	+2 000	+2 000	8.0	34.1	456.3	90.8	60.7
Feb.	552.4	-6 100	+5 400	-1 900	981.1	+6 600	601.3	+6 400	+1 100	379.7	+5 300	48.9	-700	+3 000	8.1	36.9	458.9	93.5	61.3
Mar.	560.0	+300	+7 600	+5 700	982.2	+7 700	604.5	+3 200	+4 300	377.7	+3 300	44.5	-3 700	-1 400	7.4	36.9	457.2	102.8	61.5
Apr.	552.9	+1 600	-7 100	-1 400	983.2	+8 700	598.9	-5 600	-1 300	384.3	+9 900	46.0	+4 600	+1 100	7.7	38.3	453.0	99.9	60.9
May	549.1	-3 600	-3 800	-5 200	984.1	+9 600	599.7	+800	-500	384.4	+10 000	50.6	+6 100	+4 700	8.4	39.1	451.3	97.8	60.9
June	550.6	-3 100	+1 500	-3 700	985.0	+10 500	598.7	-1 000	-1 500	386.3	+11 900	48.2	+3 600	+2 300	8.0	37.8	457.9	92.7	60.8
July	552.3	-6 900	+1 700	-2 000	985.5	+11 000	597.3	-1 400	-2 900	388.2	+13 800	45.0	+6 500	-900	7.5	40.4	455.7	96.7	60.6
Aug.	550.4	+3 000	-1 900	-3 900	986.6	+12 100	598.1	+800	-2 100	388.4	+14 000	47.7	+2 400	+1 800	8.0	39.8	454.4	96.0	60.6
Sep.	552.4	-1 900	+2 000	-1 900	987.6	+13 100	602.4	+4 300	+2 200	385.2	+10 800	50.0	+4 100	+4 100	8.3	38.3	459.4	93.0	61.0
Oct.	553.5	+2 800	+1 100	-800	988.9	+14 400	600.1	-2 300	-100	388.8	+14 400	46.6	+2 600	+700	7.8	45.7	456.1	97.4	60.7
Nov.	554.5	+3 900	+1 000	+200	990.2	+15 700	598.2	-1 900	-2 000	392.0	+17 600	43.7	+5 100	-2 200	7.3	43.2	454.3	100.2	60.4
Dec.	565.2	+3 000	+10 700	+10 900	991.9	+17 400	611.4	+13 200	+11 200	380.5	+6 100	46.2	+1 600	+300	7.6	38.1	463.3	101.9	61.6
Jan. 81	549.4	+2 400	-15 800	-4 900	992.6	+18 100	599.7	-11 700	-500	392.9	+18 500	50.3	+2 400	+4 400	8.4	39.6	460.4	89.0	60.4
Feb.	560.2	+7 800	+10 800	+5 900	992.7	+18 200	606.5	+6 800	+6 300	386.2	+11 800	46.3	-2 600	+400	7.6	43.2	465.1	95.1	61.1
Mar.	568.3	+8 300	+8 100	+14 000	993.4	+18 900	613.5	+7 000	+13 300	380.1	+5 700	45.0	+500	-900	7.3	40.0	466.1	102.2	61.7
Apr.	564.0	+11 100	-4 300	+9 700	994.4	+19 900	610.5	-3 000	+10 300	383.9	+9 500	46.5	+500	+600	7.5	40.0	464.6	99.3	61.4
May	561.3	+12 200	-2 700	+7 000	994.6	+20 100	607.9	-2 600	+7 700	386.7	+12 300	46.6	-4 000	+700	7.7	45.1	457.4	104.0	61.1
June	559.6	+9 000	-1 700	+5 300	994.9	+20 400	603.9	-4 000	+3 700	391.0	+16 600	44.3	-3 900	-1 600	7.3	47.6	459.1	100.5	60.7
July	558.1	+5 800	-1 500	+3 800	995.4	+20 900	606.9	+3 000	+6 700	388.5	+14 100	48.8	+3 800	+2 900	8.0	44.1	456.8	101.3	61.0
Aug.	556.3	+5 900	-1 800	+2 000	996.0	+21 500	604.5	-2 400	+4 300	391.4	+17 000	48.3	+600	+2 400	8.0	47.7	457.6	98.6	60.7
Sep.	566.8	+14 400	+10 500	+12 500	996.8	+22 300	614.6	+10 100	+14 400	382.2	+7 800	47.7	-2 300	+1 800	7.8	46.6	465.5	101.3	61.7
Oct.	559.4	+5 900	-7 400	+5 100	997.4	+22 900	608.6	-6 000	+8 600	388.8	+14 400	49.2	+2 600	+3 300	8.1	45.3	457.2	102.2	61.0
Nov.	564.0	+9 500	+4 600	+9 700	998.8	+24 300	609.8	+1 200	+9 800	389.0	+14 600	45.8	+2 100	-100	7.5	46.8	458.8	105.2	61.1
Dec.	569.5	+4 300	+5 500	+15 200	999.7	+25 200	619.3	+9 500	+19 300	380.4	+6 000	49.6	+3 400	+3 700	8.0	40.6	467.5	102.0	61.9
Jan. 82	558.3	+8 900	-11 200	+4 000	1 000.5	+26 000	607.3	-12 000	+7 100	393.1	+18 700	49.1	-1 200	+3 200	8.1	36.2	466.3	92.0	60.7
Feb.	565.7	+5 500	+7 400	+11 400	1 001.5	+27 000	616.5	+9 200	+16 300	385.0	+10 600	50.6	+4 300	+4 700	8.2	41.4	464.9	100.8	61.6
Mar.	571.2	+2 900	+5 500	+16 900	1 002.6	+28 100	618.1	+1 600	+17 900	384.5	+10 100	46.9	+1 900	+1 000	7.6	—	463.9	107.3	61.7
April*	563.7	-300	-7 500	+9 400	1 003.5	+29 000	608.6	-9 500	+8 400	395.0	+20 600	44.9	-1 600	-1 000	7.4	—	456.2	107.5	60.6
May*	560.7	-600	-3 000	+6 400	1 005.1	+30 600	607.8	-800	+7 600	397.3	+22 900	47.1	+500	+1 200	7.8	—	453.7	107.0	60.5
June*	556.2	-3 400	-4 500	+1 900	1 006.4	+31 900	602.3	-5 500	+2 100	404.1	+29 700	46.1	+1 800	+200	7.7	—	452.2	104.0	59.8

\*Preliminary Figures (Subject to Revision)

Source: A.B.S. Various Employment Statistics

If figures for August 1979 are used as the base, the following results are obtained:

	Employed Population	Cumulative Jobs Created	Labour Force	Cumulative Additions to Labour Force	Population not in Labour Force	Cumulative Additions to Population not in Labour Force	Unemployed	Cumulative Fluctuations in Unemployment
August 1979	547.4		592.7		380.9		45.3	
June 1982	556.2	8 800	602.3	9 600	404.1	23 200	46.1	+800

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** I have had this material inserted in *Hansard* because it is useful for all honourable members and the public to be able to refer to it in order to get to the bottom of the claims and counter claims about unemployment in this State. Unfortunately, politicians tend to use statistics dishonestly. The Premier is an expert at it and honourable members, if they peruse these tables, will see what the various claims are all about and will be able to assess the claims made by the Premier.

Dealing more specifically with unemployment, I point out that the starting point is the 1979 election. At that time the Liberal Party made two specific promises about jobs. One was jobs for young people—7 000 new jobs. In December of that year, the Premier updated his predictions to 10 000, but at the time of the election he referred to 7 000 jobs. That was to be the result, he said, of Liberal employment incentives which would create 7 000 new jobs for people under the age of 20 years. The other specific promise was 10 000 new jobs from Liberal plans to develop mining and resources. It is interesting to see how these promises measure up.

Early in the Parliament, in 1979, I asked the Attorney-General whether he was willing to give any indication to Parliament about when he thought the 17 000 jobs would be created. He said that he could not give an approximate date by when they would be created.

Despite a number of questions that were asked of the Attorney-General, he was not able to give any date by which these jobs would be created. He said, in response to my question, that during the course of the election campaign no specific date was given by which the jobs would be created. He said that it was stated during that campaign that, as a result of Liberal Party policies, those additional jobs would be created in the South Australian community. I specifically asked the date, of course, and he declined to provide it. I suppose we know now why he declined my invitation, because the fact is that the performance on the 17 000 jobs has been quite unsatisfactory.

When talking about mining and resources the Government promised 10 000 jobs. It is now clear, as a result of what has happened over recent years, that the 10 000 jobs talked about as arising in mining and resources will not be created, even assuming Roxby Downs does go ahead, about which there is still a considerable question mark because the feasibility study has not been completed and because of the economic position of the market for uranium and copper. Those 10 000 jobs promised in 1979 by the Liberal Party—

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** You ought to be ashamed to talk about it.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** About what?

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** Your performance on Roxby Downs—it was disgraceful.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** The Hon. Mr Hill interjects, but I would like him to say whether the Liberal Party made this promise in 1979. Clearly it did. Also, when does he anticipate that the 10 000 jobs promised will be produced for the South Australian community, because it is quite clear they have not been produced?

**The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw:** They have been.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** Not even the Hon. Mr Laidlaw can sustain that claim. The 10 000 jobs which the Liberal

Party was talking about and which it implied would occur within a short time of the Government's taking office really relate to 1990, even if Roxby Downs goes ahead. As to the other specific promise that was made by the Liberal Party of 7 000 jobs for people under 20 years, the figures are quite devastating. Mr Bannon asked the following question in the House of Assembly on Tuesday 1 June:

How many jobs for young people were created under the Government's Pay-roll Tax Incentive Schemes between November 1979 and November 1981.

That is, in the first two years of the Liberal Government, how many jobs for young people were created under this scheme? The answer was 1 340. That compares with a promise of 7 000 jobs.

In terms of that specific promise of 7 000 jobs we have, in fact, 1 340 jobs. Again, that is not a very satisfactory position from the point of view of the South Australian community.

The other matter to which I wish to refer relates to the use of statistics and to some of the Premier's claims about the number of jobs that have been created. On 13 February this year, the Premier was reported in the *Advertiser* as having told a Liberal Party State Council meeting that the Government had created 22 100 jobs since coming to office. That, of course, was one of the most blatant misuses of statistics that the Premier has ever indulged in.

Those honourable members who watched *Nationwide* last night would have heard the Hon. Dean Brown, Minister of Industrial Affairs, claiming that only 8 800 additional jobs have been created since this Government came to office. I am not sure what has happened to the more than 15 000 jobs which the Premier apparently created in February 1982 but which had disappeared by July of 1982 when Dean Brown was speaking last night. I ask honourable members, if they want to get to the truth of this matter, to look at the table I have had incorporated in *Hansard*. For the Premier to arrive at a figure of 22 100 jobs he was comparing the employed population in South Australia in August 1979 with the employed population in South Australia in February 1982.

**The Hon. B. A. Chatterton:** No account of the seasonal factors.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** That was taking no account of the seasonal factors at all. There were 565 700 employed people in South Australia in February 1982. In August 1979 there were 547 400, so the Premier then made a calculation, and he cannot add up, apparently—

**The Hon. B. A. Chatterton:** Or subtract.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:**—or subtract, because if one compares those two figures one arrives at a figure of an 18 300 increase in the number of people employed in South Australia. If one takes comparative figures between August 1979 and March 1982 one arrives at a figure of 22 800 jobs added to the workforce, so it must have been figures like that that the Premier was referring to in February 1982 when he arrived at his figure of 22 100 jobs. That is, quite frankly, grossly dishonest. It is a fraud on the people of South Australia, on the public and the Parliament, to give such figures.

Of course, if one now compares the figures which this Government refers to, those of August 1979, with the present



time, then one arrives at a figure of 8 800 additional jobs created, the figure to which the Hon. Dean Brown referred. To show how false this use of statistics is one has only to compare the figures for September 1979 with those of June 1982. If one does that, just shifts the starting point from August 1979 to September 1979, the number of so-called jobs created, the number of people added to the work force, is 1 900. What is the justification for using the August 1979 figure? There is none at all.

Why should the Government use August 1979 figures when it was not elected then? Indeed, the September 1979 figures probably are not the correct figures to use, anyhow, because this Government's so-called economic policies would not have operated from as early as then. First, it is quite wrong to use August 1979 as a starting point. Secondly, it is quite wrong to compare unemployment figures on a cumulative basis and not compare a month from one year with the same month of the previous year so that seasonal factors can be taken into account.

Thirdly, it is quite wrong to make cumulative additions to those figures for those who have been added to the work force without taking into account those people who are seeking work. Fourthly, it is wrong to not consider the labour force participation rate, but that does not seem to bother the Premier. Let me indicate to the Chamber what can be done with these statistics. I could do the exercise that the Premier has done, but I will take November 1979 which shows that the unemployment rate in South Australia was 38 600. I can take February 1982 when 50 600 people were unemployed in this State. That means that, during the period of this Government, if one compares those figures in February 1982 there was an increase in unemployment of 12 000, which is a 30 per cent increase in unemployment.

That is the sort of distortion that one can get with these figures. Indeed, one can look at December 1979 and compare it with June 1982 in number of people in employment. In December 1979 there were 562 200 people employed in the South Australian work force and in June 1982 the figure was 556 200. If one uses those figures, there is a 6 000 decrease in the number of people participating in the South Australian work force. I am not going to claim that these are proper comparisons, but that is the sort of shenanigans that the Premier engages in. Of course, he has been completely found out.

What one has to do is look at the trends. The fact is that the trends in unemployment over the period of this Government, and in the other areas of economic indicators, have not been particularly good. More people are unemployed now than were unemployed in September 1979. The unemployment rate is 7.7 per cent, compared to 7.6 per cent in September 1979, so the Government, despite its promises, has made absolutely no impact on the employment position.

What the Government should be concerned about, but apparently is not, is the deterioration in the number of people employed in South Australia which has occurred over the past three months, April, May and June, and which, undoubtedly, has been exacerbated this month because of the lay-offs recently announced.

The other disturbing factor which is ignored by the Government is the labour force participation rate, that is, the number of people in the labour force as a percentage of the civilian population over 15 years of age; it is simply the number of people as part of the labour force compared with the general population. The labour force participation rate in September 1979 was 61.6 per cent and in June 1982 it was 59.8 per cent. For the first time since this Government came to office the labour force participation rate has gone down below 60 per cent.

What that means is that more and more people are not considering themselves as part of the labour force; they have just tossed it in. They are not actively looking for work, because they cannot find it. That difference in the labour force participation rate is 1.8 per cent. If that is converted into actual people, there are 10 800 fewer people in the labour force now than there were in September 1979. Even if one accepts the Hon. Dean Brown's bodgie figures about the number of jobs being created, one can only accept them if one refuses to take into account the number of people who have actively left the labour force, and that can be conservatively estimated at 10 800.

The other factor which has to be referred to is the role that the agricultural sector has played in maintaining jobs in South Australia. If one compares the November 1980 figures with November 1981 figures, one can see that in November 1980 there were 40 200 jobs in the agricultural sector and in November 1981 the figure was 43 100 jobs, that is, a 2 900 job increase in the agricultural sector over that period. If one compares figures from February 1982 with November 1980, which is not particularly legitimate, the increase is 1 500 jobs in the agricultural sector.

The employment position in South Australia, in so far as it has been held up—it certainly has not been held up very well—has been held up because of considerable improvement in the agricultural sector. It appears that we are now in a position of having another devastating drought which can only worsen the unemployment position. It is interesting to note that, when honourable members have compared the unemployment rate in South Australia in 1979, they have not taken into account the fact that the years of 1979, 1978, and 1977 were all drought years.

A more realistic analysis of the unemployment situation can be given if we compare the South Australian average monthly unemployment for the six months to June 1979 and for the six months to June 1982. The fact is that the unemployment rate has increased in South Australia. The average monthly unemployment rate for the first six months of 1979 was 7.6 per cent. The average monthly unemployment rate for the first six months of 1982 was 7.8 per cent. There has been an increase in unemployment in South Australia since the Tonkin Government came to office.

I lament the fact that the Premier, in particular, seems to be hell bent on deceiving himself and on deceiving the people of South Australia and, in particular, seems to have no compunction at all about the deceitful and dishonest use of statistics. I am sure that any honourable member who studies the table I have had incorporated in *Hansard* will see that his claims are of little consequence. Certainly, the table will enable honourable members to form an objective view of what has happened to the unemployment situation in South Australia since 1979.

Frankly, I feel somewhat disturbed about the fact that politicians seem not to be able to do anything else but quote misleading statistics to each other. As I said, I think the Premier is particularly blameworthy in this respect. Yet, while the statistics are being distorted and misquoted, we have the incredible tragedy of unemployment in our community.

I was shocked, to say the least, by the action taken by the employer at the Mount Barker tannery. Those actions, quite simply, were disgraceful and disgusting. No notice was given to the employees, except the notice required under the award, and 100 jobs were lost.

**The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw:** Why don't you name Mr Spalvins and put it in *Hansard*?

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** The Hon. Mr Laidlaw has said that I should name Mr Spalvins and put it in *Hansard*. If that is what he wants me to do, I will do it. I find his actions absolutely disgusting and deplorable. This company

has been in operation for many years, and the people involved were employed and expected their jobs to continue. There was, as I understand it, no consultation with the employees and the union and, overnight, the employees lost their jobs.

If there is a move in the community for more realistic retrenchment provisions it will come about because of that sort of action by employers in this State. In the months preceding 20 July this year there had been a large number of jobs lost as follows: General Motors-Holden's, 220; Gerard Industries, 97; T.A.A., 40; SAPFOR, 75; Kelvinator Australia, 130; Messenger Press, 20; Kenwood, 50; Horwood Bagshaw, 107; Tubemakers, 95; John Shearer, 82; Hannafords, 8; BHP (Adelaide and Whyalla), 125; N.E.I. Engineering (Whyalla), 100; Panelboard (Mount Gambier), 5; and various South-East timber contractors, 15—a total of almost 1 200 jobs.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** You are a prophet of doom.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** I am not a prophet of doom. I want to indicate to the Council something which the Hon. Mr Hill and the Premier are not prepared to do. I refer to South Australia getting into a desperate economic position. There cannot be any doubt about it.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** Do you speak with authority? You had the State on its knees in 1979. It was in a complete mess and that is why the people threw you out. They turned to the Liberals and they will stick with them.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** After the inanities of those interjections I doubt very much whether the people are likely to stick with the Liberals, particularly with the Hon. Mr Hill. I am trying to indicate that a very severe social problem has arisen as a result of the deteriorating situation in the economy in this State. This weekend 254 jobs were lost. At the Mount Barker tannery 100 jobs were lost; at Clyde Engineering, 12; ATCO, 105; Wunderlich Aluminium Windows, 6; Dulux, 27; Simes and Martin Pty Ltd, 3; Steel Mains Pty Ltd, 1—a total of 254 jobs lost. In recent times there have been almost 1 500 jobs lost. I am surprised that honourable members opposite insist on interjecting when they know the tragedy of unemployment that is being visited upon the South Australian economy. Yet, they seem to laugh about it and seem not to think that there is any problem in South Australia. They apparently condone the actions of Mr Spalvins in not giving any notice to his employees before sacking them. Will they do anything about incorporating into State legislation some provisions requiring certain notice and payments on retrenchments? Of course, they will not because they see the people who are unemployed as statistics.

**The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw:** Poppycock.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** The Hon. Mr Laidlaw says 'poppycock' and he can indicate to me why he thinks it is poppycock. That is the only conclusion I can come to from what the Hon. Mr Hill has said in the last five to 10 minutes. I challenge the honourable member to look at the unemployment figures from 1979 in a table I have incorporated. During a large part of the time of the Labor Government the unemployment rate in this State was the lowest of any Australian State. That occurred for about three or four years of the Labor Government. Prior to 1979 there was a drought. I have indicated the situation in the agricultural sector which has helped improve the employment situation or hold up the employment situation to some extent in South Australia over the last couple of years. I do not know what the honourable member is going to say in 12 months time when the effects of the present drought are likely to be felt in this State. Quite frankly, his performance did little credit to him or to the Government of which he is a part. Behind those statistics there are the tragedies of dismissals such as those that occurred at Mount Barker. The whole Parliament should condemn the action of that employer.

The situation is difficult.

I indicated at the beginning of my speech that I recognise international and national factors that operate on the South Australian economy. The present Government claims credit when it wants to for the economic situation and it must also take some of the blame when the situation is as bad as it is at the present time. In terms of what it promised, it has certainly not produced. The 17 000 jobs which it promised before the last election have now become a sick joke. A number of things could be done and they have been outlined by the Leader of the Opposition in another place. There are some quite creative ideas about trying to improve the economic situation in so far as we can do it, given the international and national factors. I will not go into them all at the moment but they involve an injection of money into the building and construction industry noting that \$80 000 000 should have been spent on capital works but was withdrawn by the Government over the past two years because of its own incompetence. The ideas involve some job creation schemes and also the setting up of the South Australian Enterprise Fund which would harness the public and private sectors into trying to create investment in South Australia. I believe the fund is the sort of thing which indicates where we differ from honourable members opposite in the Liberal Government.

The Liberal Government adopted the proposition that the only thing a Government can do is get out of the way of business. Members opposite believe it has no other role. That is what the Premier said in his policy speech in 1979. On the other hand, the Labor Party believes that in times of serious economic trouble that the correct proposition is one of co-operation and partnership between the public and private sectors and not the approach which the Tonkin Government favours; namely, to run down the public sector and public construction projects in the hope that private enterprise will take up the slack. That obviously is a philosophy which, in this State over the past three years, has been proven to be completely barren. One only has to look at the results of such a philosophy in the United Kingdom which has a 13 per cent unemployment rate under the Thatcher Government to see that that philosophy has also been proven barren in that country.

That philosophy sees people as statistics and the economy as competing statistics between various groups in the community. It does not see the people behind the statistics and the enormous tragedies occurring in the Australian community and, indeed, in many parts of the world. I believe the only sensible response to that must be one which involves, first, Government intervention to try to stimulate the economy and, secondly, the Government's taking a lead in establishing a partnership with the private sector; the enterprise fund which has been suggested by the Leader of the Opposition is one such proposal.

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** Are you going to tell us what is happening in France?

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** I could do that. The situation in France shows that we are living in extremely difficult economic times. It would be hard to say that the situation in France is worse than the situation in the United Kingdom under the alternative proposition. I believe that Governments must realise that the room to manoeuvre in these situations is not particularly great and that the answers must rely on co-operation between the public and private sectors. The Government must ensure that there is some stimulation and improvement in economic activity in Australia and, indeed, in South Australia. I support the motion.

**The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW:** I thank His Excellency the Governor for his Speech when opening Parliament in which he gave details *inter alia* of initiatives to be taken by the

Government in an attempt to overcome the present world recession. Before speaking about the economy and taxation today I pay tribute to His Excellency as a person and as a Leader. I believe that His Excellency and Lady Dunstan will become well known and well liked by the people of South Australia and I wish them well. I also pay my respects to the family of the late Ted Dawes, Head Messenger of this Council, who died so prematurely. During my seven years in this Chamber Ted Dawes undertook many tasks on my behalf, always with courtesy and diligence.

This is my last Address in Reply speech, because I have chosen to retire at the time of the next election. When I sought preselection to the L.C.L. team in 1974 I told the Party State Council that I had associations as a non-executive with several public companies and that I had various community interests and, because of family obligations, I intended to continue with them. Despite these provisos, State Council selected me for the Legislative Council ticket and I entered this Chamber in 1975. That was the first occasion that L.C.L. State Council had been called upon to select candidates to contest Legislative Council elections based upon a State-wide adult franchise.

Naively, I believed that my outside activities would decrease. Instead of that, the companies have grown larger and the task of being a director has become much more complex. I thought at length about retiring and decided that at the age of 58 I should not ask the Liberal State Council to give me preselection for another six years (they probably would not have done so anyway).

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** What about Murray Hill? He's over 58.

**The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW:** I am only talking about myself. I only said that they would probably not select me. To do the job properly a Legislative Councillor should devote all of his or her time to the task, because it is now well remunerated and there is more that can be done to promote the Legislative Council.

The Governor said that the international and Australian economic climates remain a matter of concern, and I certainly concur with that comment. Some political leaders talk about things getting back to normal in the near future. I think that such statements are misleading because to my mind the present economic situation is the norm and is likely to remain so for several years to come. I ask honourable members to cast their minds back over the past 30 years and recall that, when the world economy has faltered, it has generally taken at least five years to recover. By coincidence, Mr Brian Loton, Managing Director of B.H.P., when commenting on the loss of \$150 000 000 by its steel division in 1981-82, said yesterday that it would take about five years to recover its previous competitive position. I presume he meant that it would be five years before the world's steel market recovers sufficiently to allow B.H.P. to improve its export position and increase its production runs.

The economies of North America, Europe, the Soviet Union and China began to decline about two years ago. Irrespective of what form of political Party was in power, unemployment increased dramatically and Governments found it impossible to find enough meaningful jobs for the young. Many foresaw that Australia would get caught up in recession eventually and now it has hit us. For a time we were insulated because wool, livestock, cereal, coal, alumina, and iron ore prices held firm. We were nearly self-sufficient in oil and gas and there were many huge mining projects in the course of construction. Each Government has an obligation to do everything possible to minimise the effects of this continuing recession. I admire the manner in which our State Government is tackling this problem.

The union leaders in Australia failed to foresee the coming economic collapse or, if they did see it, chose to ignore it.

They used their bargaining power by strikes in key industries to gain shorter working hours and higher wage agreements when they should have been warning their members to hold on to their jobs at all costs, reduce their personal debts and help to save their employers from going out of business. It is too late for Mr Dolan, the President of the A.C.T.U., to cry out, as he did last week, that unemployment in Australia could reach the levels of European countries by the end of 1982. When one considers that, whereas unemployment in Australia has risen to 6.4 per cent, in the United Kingdom it is 12 per cent, in Canada 10.2 per cent, in the United States of America 9.5 per cent, and under the socialist Government in France 8.5 per cent, this prophecy of Mr Dolan's is quite alarming. He and his fellow union leaders contributed to this crisis by being too greedy.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** Do you know how much an iron worker in Whyalla earns?

**The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW:** Yes, I have some idea.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** Could you bring a family up on that wage.

**The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW:** No, and I would not like to try.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** And you say that iron workers are greedy.

**The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW:** I am saying that in the circumstances the union leaders were greedy.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** Could you support a family on an iron worker's wage?

**The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW:** I would not want to bring up a family on that salary, but I would like to stay in a job. Recently the Industries Assistance Commission produced a 290-page report calling for general tariff reductions in Australia, in addition to those already in progress. It offered a series of options. First, all rates of protection above 20 per cent should be reduced to 20 per cent, with equal annual reductions over 10 years; or, secondly, all rates of protection should be reduced by 35 per cent over 10 years; or, thirdly, all rates of protection above 30 per cent should be reduced by half and rates between 30 per cent and 15 per cent should be reduced by 15 per cent over the next 10 years. The I.A.C. also put forward options which exclude the textile, footwear and motor vehicle industries, those three industries having been given substantially increased protection in recent years.

These proposals undoubtedly would have met with the approval of the Modest Farmer, the National Farmers Federation and their newly found allies, the heads of large mining companies and financial institutions. Despite the pressure applied by these strong sectional interests, Mr Fraser and his Cabinet last week rejected the I.A.C. proposals. During the past 10 years there has been already a significant phasing down of tariff, quota or bounty assistance in most industries except footwear, textiles and passenger vehicles. Instead of following the I.A.C. proposals, the Federal Government decided that there will be no further reductions in tariffs whilst the economy is depressed. Export market development grants will be increased. Accelerated depreciation for tax purposes of plant and equipment in the primary, secondary and mining industries will be allowed. Most pleasing to me is the introduction, much overdue, of depreciation on non-residential income producing buildings.

Since entering this Council I have continued to remind members that Australia has been about the only country in the Western world not to allow depreciation for tax purposes on factory buildings. I was always perplexed why the Whitlam Administration, when in power, proclaimed the need for improved working conditions in factories but did not bother to allow depreciation for tax purposes on factories as an inducement.

A few weeks ago, Hugh Hudson, in his role as economic consultant and research fellow at Monash University, produced a paper entitled 'The case against reduced protection for Australian manufacturing industry'. I am advised that it has been read widely by decision makers in Canberra like Mr Fraser and Mr Howard.

I wish to refer to certain arguments put forward by Hugh Hudson because I happen to agree with him. He said that it may seem a very simple proposition that reduced protection leading to cheaper consumer goods and a reallocation of resources to those industries with a comparative advantage will increase output and, by implication, the total welfare of the community. However, there are always complications in applying simple solutions to actual situations. Indeed, the complications may be so serious that the free-trade solution is worse than the so-called protectionist disease of 'inefficiency'.

If protection is reduced there will be significant declines in some manufacturing industries. In many cases to find new jobs the redundant labour force will need to move to other regions. The cost of relocation is probably greater in Australia than elsewhere because the country consists of small pockets of population scattered over a vast area. As one group moves to other areas, schools, hospitals, community facilities and public services become underutilised whilst new facilities have to be provided for in developing areas. The infrastructural costs of relocating labour resources must be borne in mind.

Any restructuring of industry leads to significant changes in asset values. Plant and equipment may be reduced to scrap value. Home values will also decline and, in view of the high percentage of home ownership in Australia amongst working families compared with other Western countries, the personal loss caused by forced sales of private homes may be quite traumatic.

The great increase of females in the workplace in Australia and the existence of more than one breadwinner in families slows down mobility of labour when only one of the breadwinners becomes unemployed. It is easy to argue that, if married women stayed at home and concentrated on their domestic chores, the problems of youth unemployment would be solved and mobility of labour would be restored. The fact remains that women today are as well educated as men; they demand and deserve an equal opportunity to get jobs; and, with the advent of the pill and abortion on demand, they can assure employers that they will not leave because of an unexpected pregnancy. I can think of occasions in the past when I have asked a personnel officer to employ women rather than men because they are more reliable, but I must be careful what I say in case some male accuses me of violating the Sex Discrimination Act.

If Australia reduces its level of protection unilaterally as has been suggested by some advocates of free trade, the effects of such must be offset by increasing exports in order to maintain a balance of international payments. While unemployment is spreading and world trade is static or declining, this is difficult to achieve. Countries increase their protective barriers and dump goods into whatever overseas markets they can enter, irrespective of price. Anti-dumping legislation exists but it is usually difficult to establish a dumping charge because manufacturers defend themselves, often successfully, by arguing that economy of scale achieved by longer production runs enables them to reduce prices.

I know of several instances where goods are being dumped into Australia at the present time. I suspect that the closure of the Johnson Tannery at Mount Barker with the loss of 110 jobs and the retrenchment by Michell of 16 workers from their tannery division at Thebarton was due to the dumping of imported leather goods.

Hugh Hudson concluded his paper by asserting that the economic situation in which Australia finds itself in 1982 is not one where reduced levels of protection should be contemplated. The Federal Government reached the same conclusion.

I have presented a few arguments in favour of maintaining protection, because we have heard so much in recent years from the Modest Farmer and the National Farmers Federation, and more recently from friends of mining companies, about the virtues of free trade. It is time that South Australians realise that the choice of free trade or protection is highly complex and that within this State about 3 500 persons are employed in mining, about 47 000 in primary production including fishing, and about 160 000 in manufacturing industry and construction.

The second matter to which I refer is taxation. The Governor said that the abolition of death and gift duties, the implementation of major land tax exemptions and stamp duty remissions on house purchases had contributed to reducing levels of State taxation to the lowest of any State except Queensland. That is a desirable objective. In effect, the States have little room to manoeuvre in the field of taxation. In 1975, two significant—

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** I am not sure that the Governor's claim that we have the lowest level stands up to scrutiny.

**The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW:** I said that it was a desirable objective.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** If the figure is like any of the other statistics used, one could not place too much credit on it.

**The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW:** In 1975 two significant reports about taxation were published. I refer to the Asprey Committee Report on taxation which had been initiated by Sir Billy Snedden in 1972 and the Matthews Report into the effects of inflation on taxation, which had been an initiative of Mr Whitlam and Mr Crean in 1974. A few of their recommendations were adopted, but it is difficult to make dramatic changes in taxation rules because such changes can have a devastating effect on many sectors of the community.

However, I believe that at some stage the Federal Government must treat all taxpayers alike and make everyone pay income tax as he or she earns income. Whilst under the present system employees have tax deducted weekly from their pay, self-employed persons do not have to pay income tax until up to 10 months after the end of the financial year in question. Workers have inevitably been dissatisfied about this. Union leaders have used this situation as an argument for wage increases.

Self-employed persons object to provisional taxation because it hurts the younger groups with rapidly increasing incomes. Many people in the employee sector do not understand the effects of provisional tax and believe that the self-employed have been favoured by free enterprise Governments through the deferral of the payment of tax. This growth becomes more apparent during periods of inflation. I suggest that provisional taxation should be abolished and that the self-employed should be required to pay tax, say, quarterly during the year in which it is earned, based on the gross income of the previous year or perhaps based on the average of the three previous years. The self-employed taxpayer would be given refunds after the end of each financial year on the same basis as applies to employees in the work force. This would be far more equitable.

Whilst on the subject of taxation, I wish to commend the Federal Treasurer (Mr Howard) for proposing legislation, even if it does have a retrospective effect, to recover up to \$450 000 000 from shareholders in companies involved in bottom-of-the-harbour schemes. I am sure that the vast majority of Australians find such practices utterly repugnant.

In years past the respective Taxation Commissioners have been frustrated in appeals to the High Court in attempts to stamp out tax evasion schemes. The attitude of the High Court is said to have changed and perhaps, with carefully worded legislation and a determined Treasurer, the promotion of tax avoidance schemes will be curbed.

Mr Howard proposes to make shareholders who benefited from the bottom-of-the-harbour schemes pay the tax that should be paid as company tax, because the companies involved have disappeared. This negates the principle that shareholders are never liable for the debts of the company.

I read with some glee that the shareholders must pay the back tax within 30 days after notice is given, and that any amount not paid by then will carry statutory penalty tax for late payment at the rate of 30 per cent per annum. This penalty tax will not be a deduction for income tax purposes. This will be in addition to the nominal fines for failure to lodge a return, omission of income or overclaiming expenses or late payment going back for the last 10 years.

The Taxation Commissioner stated that about 4 000 companies had been identified in which directors engaged in evading company tax by using bottom-of-the-harbor schemes and the like. I do not know, nor have I heard, whether any South Australian registered companies are involved in this practice. If they are, I have no time for the promoters. The Prime Minister said yesterday that both he and the Treasurer have given warnings in recent times that they are prepared to contemplate retrospectivity in legislation if they believe that it is really necessary. In the case of bottom-of-the-harbor schemes, Mr Howard denied that retrospectivity is proposed. He said yesterday that the liability was always there but that the tax had never been paid. Whether the legislation proposed is retrospective or not, I support the effects of the Prime Minister and Federal Treasurer to stamp out these rackets. I support the motion that the Address in Reply as read be adopted.

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** It is now seven years since I rose in the South Australian Legislative Council during the Address in Reply debate to give my maiden speech. At that time I felt, like most new members, that I had some talents to contribute to public life in this State. Certainly I believed with commendable, if somewhat naive, enthusiasm that we were charting a course to ensure the spiritual, emotional and material needs of all South Australians for the next generation and beyond. My ability remains but my enthusiasm has been tempered by the harsh realities of our time.

In 1982 many of the dreams of the 70s have been shattered. After seven years of increasing recession, we are plunging into what must now be realistically, if reluctantly, described as a depression. The economic malaise which is afflicting Western economies is nowhere more painfully obvious than in our own State. There is an enormous and understandable crisis of confidence. Business men throughout the State admit freely and realistically that they are no longer simply perturbed by the deepening gloom. They are alarmed and frightened by the events of the past two years. They are increasingly joining the ranks of the 'new poor' who have been created by the monetarist policies of conservative politicians at home and abroad.

There is no doubt that high and increasing interest rates are the greatest single problem confronting this nation and this State. What form of economic lunacy is it which dictates that we must keep interest rates at disastrously high levels in order to attract and retain billions of dollars of 'hot' foreign capital.

It is almost impossible to assess the full social cost of the policies of the Fraser Government, so enthusiastically embraced and supported by the Liberal Government in

South Australia. We are already in grave danger of wasting many of the talents of the new generation. There are young people who left school up to five years ago who have never had regular employment.

This is the best educated generation ever raised in Australia, despite some of the disastrous educational experiments of the 70s. It is a tragedy of enormous proportions that their high hopes and aspirations, raised and nurtured by their parents of my generation, have been destroyed. The social contract, carefully cultivated as an article of faith in Australia for three decades, has been broken.

I digress for a moment to illustrate clearly just what I am talking about. This particular case concerns a member of my family, one of my daughters who matriculated in 1980 and was offered admission to the economics faculty of the University of Adelaide. She did not take up an offer of employment here but, instead, chose to go to Sydney, where, within a week, she had three interviews for employment, and found a very good job with the Joint Coal Board of New South Wales. She had two promotions in the 12-month period during which she was employed and was on a salary in excess of \$12 000 before her twentieth birthday. However, she found that, socially, it was difficult for her to cope in Sydney. She had no friends there from her school days and found that accommodation was very expensive. She elected to return to Adelaide.

Since my daughter's return she has applied for more than 60 jobs over the past five months. I shall give a typical example of the sort of reply she receives from employers. I might say that she has not even had an interview for employment, let alone found a job. The reply I have here is a *pro forma* from McIlwraith Distributors. I would like to give them due credit for taking the trouble to reply to all the applicants for a particular job that was advertised. In an attempt to get this position my 20-year-old daughter was so desperate that she lowered her age and applied as a junior. The position was for a junior clerk with that company. The reply she received stated, among other things, the following:

To date we have received 134 applications for the position and it is therefore impossible to grant every applicant an interview. The position has now been filled; however, we will keep your application on file should any other suitable position become vacant in the future.

Here we have a well educated, intelligent, competent and able young woman with some work experience in a responsible position, who has excellent references from her former employers and yet who is quite unable to find a job of any description in South Australia in 1982—quite unable to find a job of any description at all! What are we doing to this generation? We are destroying them. If this situation continues for much longer we are going to lose a whole generation. In human terms, that is a tragedy of enormous consequence.

Exorbitant interest rates have had a particularly dramatic and traumatic effect on prospective home buyers in South Australia and on those already struggling with burgeoning mortgage repayments. The great Australian dream in 1982 has become the great Australian nightmare. Every rise in interest rates in the past 18 months has denied another 1 000 young South Australian couples the realistic hope of buying a new home. It has pushed the building industry further into recession. Every rise has forced an additional 10 000 couples already buying their houses into the ranks of the 'new poor'. In the meantime the working poor, those individuals and families below the poverty line despite regular employment, exceed 100 000 in South Australia. They have been conveniently categorised and cruelly stigmatised by the fifth Fraser health scheme.

What has been the response of the Tonkin Liberal Government to these huge economic and social problems? It is true and I admit freely, that the initiatives of State Governments have a relatively small impact on the overall state of the local and national economy. On the other hand, the more disastrous effects can certainly be ameliorated by a caring and competent State Administration. However, every major thrust of this conservative State Government, arguably the most reactionary and certainly the most incompetent in mainland Australia, has exacerbated the effects of the recession.

This Cabinet boasts that it has reduced public sector spending. This Administration is proud to be the only one in Australia which has significantly reduced employment in the public sector over three years. This gaggle of incompetents have presided with apparent equanimity over the greatest decline in the South Australian economy in half a century.

Have they devised a strategy for economic survival and revival in the 80s? Have they appealed to the innate common sense and intelligence of the electorate? Not at all. For almost three years we have been subjected to empty huffing and puffing, to idle boasting and to cruel distortions of reality. Now in a continuously debilitating pre-election atmosphere they can do no more than fiddle the figures and cook the books. Record deficits in the revenue account have been fiddled by blatant transfers of almost \$90 000 000 from the Loan account. The massive cutbacks in public works spending, which have further increased unemployment, have been misrepresented as a surplus.

So, what are the Government's plans to revive the dust bowl economy which it has created? It offers South Australians nothing but vague claims that we are going backwards more slowly than the rest of the country. What is the grand plan for economic revival? What visions does it have for South Australia in the 1980s and beyond? It has nothing but a series of hallucinations about a mythical resources boom. The distorted rhetoric and bullish posturing about a resources boom should be exposed for the cruel distortions which they are.

The only significant natural resources developed in South Australia in the past three years have been the Cooper Basin hydrocarbon deposits. The Cooper Basin deposits are very significant and are already providing some much needed employment. They were discovered as the result of initiatives taken by a relatively small number of enterprising South Australians in the early 1960s. Their further development was carefully nurtured by successive State Labor Governments throughout the 1970s. I applaud the present Government's ongoing support for the Cooper Basin developments, but I ask that it be kept in perspective.

What other minerals form part of this illusory boom? We have large low-grade deposits of coal scattered throughout the State. The largest of these occurs at Lake Phillipson. It is bigger than the fabulously rich high grade black coal deposits of Queensland's Bowen Basin. However, despite its size, Lake Phillipson is of very poor quality. It is not economically feasible to develop it in the medium term. There are other known deposits, notably at Port Wakefield, Sedan and in the South-East.

The Roxby Downs prospect has been touted *ad nauseam* by this Government as the panacea for South Australia's economic ills. Now that the indenture has been ratified, it is again worthwhile to realistically assess its potential. Roxby Downs is a very large, deep orebody containing copper deposits at low grades, varying from 1 per cent to 2 per cent. At full production capacity it would also produce approximately 2 000 tonnes of uranium as yellowcake annually and some gold and rare earths. Because of its depth, remote location and low grades, the cost of production would be high.

In 1982, production from copper mines and other base metal mines of much higher grades is being scaled down around Australia and around the world. Other mines have been closed and put on a 'care and maintenance' basis for the duration of the world recession. The future of uranium is, at best, highly speculative.

The final feasibility or pre-development work at Roxby Downs is now proceeding and will be completed by late 1984 or early in 1985. The joint venturers, B.P. and W.M.C., have very wisely given no commitment that it will be developed this side of 1990. Certainly, there is every indication that the partners are not yet anywhere near a position in which they might attempt to raise the very large amounts of capital required for its development. There are also very clear indications that, given current interest rates and the extremely poor market prospects which prevail at this time, any such attempt is not realistically contemplated in the medium term. Ironically, there is a real danger that the commercial development of Roxby Downs could be destroyed by this Government if it continues to exaggerate the realities. The Government should learn from the way political overkill by the Bjelke-Petersen Government destroyed the development of the Rundle shale deposits in Queensland. I repeat what I have said many times before, based on an overwhelming body of evidence: if Roxby Downs ever proceeds, it is a project for the 1990s and beyond.

I turn now to the health area. September last year saw the introduction of the fifth Fraser health scheme. This was significantly different from the four previous rearrangements. For the first time since July 1975, universal cover was removed. Prior to September 1981, all patients were assured of treatment as public patients in public hospitals free of charge at the point of delivery.

Under the new scheme, there are now four basic categories of patient. Those who hold Pensioner Health Benefit Cards and low income earners who are assessed as being eligible for health cards continue to be covered for public hospitalisation. The third category is insured patients, those who carry insurance ranging from basic hospital cover to medical, hospital and extras. The fourth category, comprising about 10 per cent of the population, consists of those who have no cover whatsoever. The reasons for people not insuring are many and varied. However, there is no doubt that the great majority are uninsured because they simply cannot afford it. And, as more and more people join the ranks of what I have previously referred to as the 'new poor', this number will continue to rise. In the event of sudden illness, their plight is desperate. To paraphrase my Federal colleague Neal Blewett, they are bad debts waiting to get under a bus.

The system is grossly inequitable and inhumane. It entrenches a two-tier system of medical and hospital care. My Federal colleagues in the Labor Party have consistently said, and I reiterate, that there is no such thing as a free system of health care. What must be developed is a system which is free of direct charge at the point of delivery. Contributions should be based on ability to pay and care delivered on the basis of medical need. How can anyone justify flat rate contributions under which single income families on an annual gross income of \$12 000 pay the same for their basic health cover as Premiers and Prime Ministers?

The present scheme is also grossly inefficient. It is impossible to check every patient's status at the time of admission. There is already a short-fall of income estimated Australia-wide at \$100 000 000. Fortunately, the South Australian situation has been buffered to some extent by the State Government's reluctant retention of the hospitals cost-sharing agreement.

It is interesting to note the role played by South Australia's Health Minister, Mrs Adamson, in support of the scheme.



She has been a consistent and vocal advocate of the user-pays philosophy on which the scheme is based. In the past 12 months the Minister has presided over the introduction of the scheme with unrestrained enthusiasm. Her achievements include a doubling of direct hospital charges, a 70 per cent rise in health insurance, loss of the universal cover, and an administrative disaster for South Australia's public hospitals. Debt collection has become the only growth industry in South Australia.

In the July 1982 edition of the *A.M.A. Gazette*, concern about the present position is analysed by Paul Gross, Director of the Institute of Health Economics and Technology Assessment. The institute is described as a private think-tank on health policy analysis in Australia. A table on page 45 of that edition shows that the proportion of total Commonwealth Budget outlays on health in the financial years 1977-78 to 1980-81 averaged a little over 10 per cent. Paul Gross estimates that that figure will fall dramatically to 7 per cent in 1981-82. He says:

... future increases in the real allocation to health can only come from four sources:

1. Savings in other areas of the Commonwealth Budget, particularly the social welfare budget . . .
2. Additional budgets from State Governments (who themselves are under extreme pressure to hold existing real levels of health expenditures.)
3. Additional allocations in the Commonwealth Budget.
4. Additional out-of-pocket payments by the consumer . . .

For this reason, anomalies in the current methods of means-testing, taxing and indexation of benefits should be of a major source of concern.

Unless the system is changed, it is clear that the assault on the pockets of ordinary South Australian wage and salary earners will continue and the devastation of our public hospital system will proceed.

I refer now to the 'Onlooker' column of the *Sunday Mail* of Sunday 25 July. Last week I revealed that 100 megalitres (or 22 million gallons) of highly polluted untreated water had flowed from the No. 1 outlet at the Happy Valley reservoir for a period of up to 12 hours on Monday 12 July. I said, quite accurately, that this polluted water had flowed into Adelaide's domestic supply. Those facts were accurate and were never contested by the Government. However, the Government claimed that all the contaminated water had been treated in zone pressure tanks.

In fact, some of the water was treated many hours later in seven zone pressure tanks. They were Darlington No. 1 and 2, Seaview Downs, Stuart, Seacliff, Pasadena and Clapham. It is impossible for the E. & W.S. Department or anyone else to say how much water passed untreated into Adelaide's domestic supply. What can be said with certainty, and can be substantiated, is that unchlorinated polluted water flowed from the No. 3 outlet for up to 12 hours and some found its way untreated into water mains.

According to Onlooker, the anonymous sage of South Australian politics, the Government 'was prepared and easily brushed Mr Cornwall aside . . . The Liberals scored one off Mr Cornwall and now talk freely about him being their best asset in the run up to the election'. If it takes a lot of obfuscation and the announcement of a further \$65 000 000 filtration plant to easily brush me aside, long may it continue! However, since I value my credibility above all else I thought that I should do an audit of my position in the light of these assertions. I have reviewed 15 different health areas where I have raised matters of public importance in the past 12 months based on stories attributed to me in Adelaide metropolitan newspapers and *the Australian*. I will take up some time of the Council talking about some of the more important and significant ones.

I refer first to water. At various times my colleagues and I have raised the question of treatment and monitoring of South Australia's water supply for *Naeglaria fowleri*, the

organism which causes amoebic meningitis. As a result, the safety of the State's domestic water supply has been restored after the disaster in the summer of 1980-81—a significant achievement.

I have also raised the question of chlorinated hydrocarbons or trihalomethanes in Adelaide's water. There is no dispute that these substances can cause cancer in some organs, notably the gut, liver and bladder. As a result of those disclosures the research and monitoring programme, which had been wound down by the Government as part of its programme to cut costs, was restored. I seem to have been somewhat less successful on the question of nitrates in Mount Gambier water. Little has been said since the matter was raised 12 months ago. However a lot more people in Mount Gambier are now very sensibly drinking rainwater. The manufacture of rainwater tanks is a growth industry in that area.

I turn to nursing homes. I would have thought that my campaign to ensure quality of care to elderly patients in nursing homes has been very successful, although certainly not yet complete. The level of self-regulation has improved markedly. In addition, a complete overhaul of the relevant regulations has been drafted and circulated. It is also proposed to stop proprietors eschewing their responsibility through nominee companies. If the Government wants to make nursing homes a major election issue, I will be delighted to accommodate them on my record.

Another issue I raised was that of excessive and unnecessary exposure to x-rays. On 23 March this year I was reported on this subject in the *Advertiser*. I said up to one-fifth of medical x-rays taken in Adelaide involved excessive radiation of patients. The position was even worse for country patients. These figures had been supplied to me by experts familiar with the report of the working party on human diagnostic radiography. The Minister of Health, Mrs Adamson, immediately disputed the claims. She said it was preposterous to suggest that the Government had delayed radiation control by two years. Yet within three months the Minister's own officers were making identical statements to mine about excessive and unnecessary radiation of patients. I am happy to say that steps are now being taken to correct these serious deficiencies.

I refer to lead levels in Port Pirie children. I first raised this issue in the *Advertiser* of 15 May and the *Australian* of 18 May. I also raised it on both radio and television. As a result, it became a matter of public interest and concern at both the State and national level. The matter remains unresolved at this time. However, both the B.H.A.S. and the Central Board of Health do appear to be initiating action which was long overdue. I think I have little need to apologise for my role in attempting to ensure the health and well being of children in Port Pirie or anywhere else.

I turn to the South Australian Health Commission. Unfortunately, I have had nowhere near as much success in this area. Twelve months ago I called for a Royal Commission into the S.A.H.C. I said it was bureaucratic, top heavy and incompetent. Since then most changes have been for the worse. The empire has struck back even further. Promotion is internal and based on patronage rather than ability. The number of appointments at Executive Officer level from within the ranks of the Commission has been burgeoning at an alarming rate. It has increased more than 400 per cent in three years. Many appointments have been made beyond the current competence of those promoted. Cronyism is rampant. Financial control is dismally defective. Lines of communication between the sectors and the corporate area have diminished. I shall give a comprehensive account of these problems during the budget debate when my research is complete.



I now refer to the subject of mental health. In the *Advertiser* of 11 January this year I gave comprehensive details of the cutbacks affecting the mental health area. At that time Glenside Hospital had four unfilled vacancies for qualified psychiatrists. Absenteeism among psychiatric nurses was running at 12 per cent because of intolerable working conditions. Spending in real terms at Hillcrest Hospital had been cut by 17 per cent over four successive budgets. Capital works expenditure had been frozen. All of these facts were carefully drawn from the hospitals' own figures.

I also said that the safety of patients and nurses was being jeopardised by staff cutbacks. At the time I was unable to refer to the tragic murder of a 27-year-old female patient in the acute admissions ward at Hillcrest late last year because the case was *sub judice*. The full facts have never been revealed because the 21-year-old male charged with the murder was eventually considered unfit to plead and has been detained at the Governor's pleasure. I am reluctant to raise the matter in deference to both families. However, some facts must be made known in the public interest. The murder was an unspeakable tragedy for both the victim's family and the family of the young man who was detained for it. He was a voluntary admission and his family were very pleased when he entered Atkinson Ward. That was turned into desperate grief for both families within 48 hours. Having inspected the building personally, I have little doubt that more adequate staffing in Atkinson Ward, a two-storey structure, would have prevented the tragedy.

I refer to bad debts in hospitals. In the *News* on 19 February this year I warned that South Australian public hospitals could face debts of at least \$2 000 000 because of uninsured patients. The article stated:

But the Health Minister, Mrs Adamson, said today there was no indication of a serious problem with bad debts.

I said:

My estimates are conservative and they are based on monthly figures to the end of January.

Again I was proved to be correct. One month later in the *Advertiser* of 19 March, an article appeared under the by-line of Barry Hailstone. It said *inter alia*:

Accounting and business procedures in Adelaide's major teaching hospitals are in chaos . . . Three hospitals—the Royal Adelaide, Queen Elizabeth and Flinders Medical Centre—are losing more than \$100 000 a month in unprocessed, lost or unpaid accounts . . . The hospitals deteriorating accounting systems follow changes in billing procedures introduced with the new health insurance scheme which came into effect on 1 September, coupled with problems compounded by delays in the introduction of computerised accounting and patient information systems . . . Senior health administration officials confirmed yesterday that it was an almost impossible task to decide the financial status of all patients.

My original figures were indeed conservative. In fact, the estimated figure for a full year shows a shortfall of closer to \$10 000 000, confirmed by figures arising out of the recent Premiers Conference. As I explained earlier in this speech, that figure is only ameliorated in South Australia because of the Commonwealth-State Hospitals Cost-Sharing Agreement which the Minister of Health publicly considered abandoning last year.

In relation to touting in public hospitals, on several occasions this year I have raised the question of specialists touting in accident and emergency departments of public hospitals. Pressure was being put on insured patients admitted as public patients to transfer to private status for the personal gain of the attending consultant. The Minister of Health consistently denied that such practices occurred. On 3 June, after very careful research, I documented all the details of a spectacular case of touting at the Modbury Hospital. The story was reported around Australia. As a result, the practice has virtually disappeared from our public hospitals. Is this the sort of success which makes the Liberals believe I am their greatest asset in the forthcoming election?

In relation to the Medical Board of South Australia, I am sure all members will recall that towards the end of last year I raised a number of instances of incompetence or negligence by a small (and I stress 'small') but significant number of doctors in Adelaide hospitals. I was greatly assisted in this work by Dr David Crompton, a very senior member of the medical profession in South Australia. The first aim of the exercise was to ensure far better procedures for accreditation of doctors to hospitals and the delineation of their clinical privileges; in other words, to define what procedures they were competent to perform. The second aim was to reduce overservicing in the hospital situation. The third was to demonstrate the unsatisfactory nature of the legislation under which the South Australian Medical Board operated. This was a reflection not on the excellence and impeccable credentials of the board members but on their Act.

As a result of my campaign there has been an improvement in the first two areas. That is, accreditation and delineation of clinical privileges and the reduction of over-servicing. Regarding the Medical Board, we have been promised amended legislation in the present Parliamentary session, as a result of my campaign.

Acute shortages of nursing staff; the hospital computer fiasco; confusion on 'hospital only' health insurance; the Wallaroo Hospital debacle; the disgraceful closure of nursing home beds at the Magill Home for the Aged; unreasonable delays in the pensioner spectacle service. These are just some of the other matters which I have taken up on behalf of South Australians in the last year. In the first six months of this year, from 1 January to 30 June, I have been reported on 22 occasions in the *Advertiser*, 30 times in the *News*, and four times in the *Australian*, a total of 56 news items attributed to me.

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** Does that make you feel good?

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** I have just explained that I have had an enormous success rate across the board in South Australia. Even the normally mild mannered Minister of Transport froths at the mouth and gnashes his teeth when my name is mentioned. The rest of them go right off this planet. Because of my prodigious output and the controversial nature of many of the subjects which I raise I know that newspapers in particular carefully check my material before they run it. Presumably, Onlooker and the Liberals 'who talk freely about [me] being their best asset in the run up to the election' are implying that most journalists in Adelaide are either incompetents or fools.

For my part, I have assessed the record carefully. I am very happy to stand on it. Despite the constraints of Opposition, I have achieved substantial benefits for South Australians. Despite Onlooker's inferred criticism of his journalist colleagues, I would also like to say that I regard the standard of journalism in Adelaide as being equal to any in Australia, with one exception, that is, the performance of 'Onlooker', Mr Michael Quirke, during the disgraceful campaign in which he actively participated during the September 1979 election. I look forward to my work in the health portfolio immediately after the State election. I support the motion.

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT** (Minister of Community Welfare) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Licensing Act, 1967-1982. Read a first time.

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

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

The Licensing Act section 5 (6) provides that a person holding or qualified to hold judicial office under the Local and

District Criminal Courts Act may be appointed by the Governor to exercise the powers and functions conferred on the Licensing Court Judge. Minor difficulties have arisen relating to the manner in which a person appointed under this section should be addressed in court and the title which may be used in signing court documents.

This amendment is designed to make clear that a person appointed under this section is an Acting Judge of the Licensing Court. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 transfers the definition of membership of the court from section 5 (2) to

section 4. Clause 3 strikes out subsection (2) of section 5 and amends section 5 (6).

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 5.59 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 28 July at 2.15 p.m.