LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday 15 August 1984

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

PETITION: SIMS BEQUEST FARM

A petition signed by 504 residents of South Australia, praying that the Council will support the retention of the Sims Bequest Farm intact to fulfil the wishes of the late Mr Gordon Sims, to improve the existing Cleve Certificate in Agriculture course and to establish residential facilities that will cater for the present and future requirements of country students, was presented by the Hon. Peter Dunn.

Petition received and read.

QUESTIONS

PARLIAMENT HOUSE SECURITY

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking a question of you, Mr President, about the security arrangements at Parliament House.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Since I have been in this Parliament there have been numerous changes to the security arrangements at Parliament House, but the latest change in arrangements has to take the cake. First, I have found that cameras are now pointed towards us whenever we walk into the building, and I understand that a recording is taken of our presence in the building as we walk in, including any gesture that we might make towards the cameras which, from time to time, some people feel motivated to make. I take exception to that change in security arrangements.

The Hon. R.C. DeGaris: Do you know why it is necessary?

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I am not worried about that. The honourable member can go into that in a minute if he likes. I understand what the Hon. Mr DeGaris is saying. The second matter is that on Monday morning members arrived at the House with their little plastic cards, with which we were duly issued over the years to enter the building. I placed mine in the little slot provided and absolutely nothing happened. In fact, a voice came from inside echoing 'Who is it?' After I had described who I was, the door opened and we were was allowed in. It turns out that the whole system was changed over the weekend without notification to members and that no cards were available to open the doors of the offices that we enjoy.

The Hon. Anne Levy: There are still none.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: That is what I am coming to. I was assured by the person who allowed me into Parliament House (it was very decent of him) that later that day I would receive a card which would allow me entry to my office. I am still waiting for that card, which has not yet appeared. On top of that, when one enters the building now there are people thrust away in little boxes everywhere keeping an eye on every person who comes into the place. I would be rather interested to know the cost of all the alterations that have been made to ensure so-called 'security'. It appears to me that there is a bit of paranoia felt by people around this place and that perhaps we are becoming so security conscious that before long not only the public but we, too, will be restricted from entry and we will have to turn the whole place into a museum. My questions are as follows:

1. When are we to receive the cards that will allow us reasonable entry to this establishment, including the car park and the House?

2. What has been the cost of the latest alterations made to the security arrangements in Parliament House, including the cameras, changes in the entrances to the Parliament and changes to the card system?

3. Who authorised these changes?

4. What is the difference in cost between the cost of alterations on the House of Assembly side and that on the Legislative Council side?

5. Were you, Mr President, involved in the alterations that have been made to the security arrangements and, if so, in future could some discussion take place with the various Parties involved in order that we might have some input and be able to tell you and whoever else makes such decisions whether we consider such changes to be absolutely necessary?

The PRESIDENT: In reply to the first part of the honourable member's question, I am yet to see any politician who is camera shy, so I am not too worried about that matter. In reply to another part of the honourable member's question, yes, Black Rod and I have been involved in a number of discussions with officers from the House of Assembly regarding security generally. I was a little surprised that the old cards were withdrawn before the new ones were ready for issue. I think that this delay in issuing the new cards has caused some inconvenience to members. I did not even know that there were new cards to be issued until yesterday. I can assure members that the new cards are available and that Black Rod will no doubt issue them today.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: What about costs?

The PRESIDENT: I will get that information for the honourable member.

REHABILITATION OF INJURED WORKERS

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question about rehabilitation of injured workers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: The Government's policy is to establish clinics, which I understand will be under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labour, for the rehabilitation of injured workers. I understand that the only existing rehabilitation unit where a multi-disciplinary team of medical and paramedical staff operates is the Alfreda rehabilitation unit operating as part of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and therefore under the Health Commission system. With the advent of the intended system of rehabilitation, will the Alfreda unit be closed? If not, what will its future be and under whose jurisdiction will it be?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The Opposition seems to be trying to drum up some sort of a furphy and invent a story that Alfreda is going to be closed. It was interesting that the member for Mallee in another place the other day told a most extraordinary story during his Address in Reply speech in which he said that a decision had been taken to close the unit. No such decision has been taken at all. We are very proud of Alfreda; it plays a very important role in rehabilitation generally in the western suburbs.

Of course, it is conducted as an outreach activity by the administration and management of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Indeed, I am very happy to tell the Council that in this financial year (1984-85) a firm commitment has been made to supply and construct a hydrotherapy pool at a cost of something in excess of $250 000 for Alfreda. So, its role is not being diminished. Far from it—it is being

nurtured and expanded. I would like to put to rest for all time that scuttlebut that the Liberal Party seems to be perpetrating around the place. I repeat that Alfreda and its services will be augmented in 1984-85.

ROXBY DOWNS

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about Roxby Downs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Last Monday, 13 August, the *Advertiser* carried a report that the police policy at Roxby Downs this year during the blockade will be a no arrests policy. The report stated:

From the point of view of South Australian police and the Government, a 'no arrests' policy would, if successful:

- Protect workers' rights to go unimpeded about their lawful business.
- Greatly reduce the cost to the taxpayer of prolonged legal procedures if hundreds were charged.

Yesterday in the House of Assembly the Minister of Emergency Services indicated that he had had some discussions with the Police Commissioner about a no arrests policy and that only in the most dramatic of circumstances would arrests have to be made. Those dramatic circumstances were not defined, but I would have thought that the Attorney-General, as chief law officer for the State should, or at least ought to, have been involved in that sort of decision. Accordingly, I ask a series of questions of the Attorney-General:

1. Was the Attorney-General consulted or involved in any discussions as to the reported 'no arrests' policy?

2. Does the Attorney-General support that policy and condone the policy of not prosecuting for breaches of the law?

3. Does the Attorney-General support the argument that the cost of prosecuting for a breach of the law is the proper basis for determining whether or not a prosecution should be laid?

4. Is the Attorney-General able to give a definition of the dramatic circumstances referred to yesterday by the Minister of Emergency Services in the other place?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am surprised that the Hon. Mr Griffin does not know that the question of the policing policy at Roxby Downs, as elsewhere, is a matter for the Police Commissioner. I have explained in this Council previously that if there is a disagreement between the Police Commissioner and the Government over any aspect of police action, the Government is able, pursuant to the Police Regulation Act, to issue instructions to the Police Commissioner and table those instructions in the Parliament. That has not happened on this occasion. The matter for policing at Roxby Downs is a matter for the Police Commissioner. I am also interested to know that the Hon. Mr Griffin, the former Attorney-General, believes that the Attorney-General should interfere in police prosecution practice.

That is a new slant on events. The honourable member is apparently suggesting that the Attorney-General should ring up the Police Commissioner and instruct him on whether or not to prosecute. The honourable member knows that that is not the convention that operates in this State. Specific Acts of Parliament lay down where the Attorney-General has authority to authorise a prosecution. The Police Offences Act is one of those Acts.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: You know that there is a responsibility on the Attorney-General—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Attorney-General has authority to prosecute under section 33 of the Police Offences Act in relation to indecent and obscene material.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: You are copping out.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: No. Under that Act there is a specific provision that no prosecution shall proceed under that section without the approval of the Attorney-General. Apart from those specific examples, the question of the prosecution policy adopted by the police is a matter for the police at the committal proceeding stage and indeed at the stage of prosecution for summary offences.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: You know that that is not correct.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: It is correct.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: You know that the Crown Prosecutor is involved in many committal proceedings.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member may ask a supplementary question.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That is just not true. Once again, the Hon. Mr Griffin displays his ignorance after three years as the Attorney-General. The fact is that the Crown Prosecutor is not involved in every committal proceeding; he is involved in some committal proceedings.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: That is different to what you said.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Well, the policy at that level is still a matter for the police. The question who should be charged is not a question with which the Government or the Attorney-General interferes. If the Hon. Mr Griffin is suggesting that the Attorney-General should be able to ring up the Police Commissioner, say that Dr Ritson has been picked up for drunken driving and suggest to the Police Commissioner that that charge should be withdrawn—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am sorry. If the Hon. Dr Ritson or the Hon. Ms Levy—

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: Or the Hon. Dr Cornwall.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: —the Hon. Dr Cornwall or anyone else was picked up and, as the Hon. Mr Griffin knows, if I as the Attorney-General purported to instruct the Police Commissioner not to proceed against that individual for an alleged offence, he would be the first to come into this Parliament and ask a question about the matter. I am sure of that.

I reiterate that, basically, the question of the prosecution policy in the Police Force is left to the police. That is the convention in this State, and I assume that it was the convention when the honourable member was Attorney-General in this State. Of course, that does not mean that from time to time there are not consultations between the Police Commissioner and the Minister of Emergency Services (who is the Minister responsible for the police) or indeed between the Police Commissioner and the Attorney-General. It does not mean that there are not consultations between the Crown Prosecutor and the Attorney-General or between police prosecutors about particular matters. I merely point out that, in respect of those matters within the police authority (that is, those matters that do not go before the District Court or the Supreme Court, where clearly the Attorney-General takes over in conjunction with the Crown Prosecutor) the convention has been that decisions about those prosecutions are left to the police. Again, I repeat that that is the situation in relation to the policing policy at Roxby Downs. I understand that the Minister of Emergency Services discussed the matter with the Police Commissioner. I was not personally involved in those discussions, and, because of the policy that I have outlined, there was no need for me to be involved.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I desire to ask a supplementary question. Several of the questions that I asked have not been answered. Does the Attorney-General support the 'no

arrests' policy, that is, does he condone a policy of not prosecuting for breaches of the law? Also, does he support the argument that the cost of prosecuting for a breach of the law is the proper basis for determining whether or not a prosecution should be laid?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I answered those questions by saying that it was a matter for the Police Commissioner. I repeat—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I have no intention of commenting on the Police Commissioner's policy in this regard. The Police Commissioner has decided to adopt a certain attitude in relation to this situation. Of course, if there were threats to life, limb or property, or threats of violence and the like, the question of arrests would be acted on. I believe that the Police Commissioner's view relates to those matters of a non-violent kind of protest. That is the view of the Police Commissioner. In so far as that is his view on this occasion, I can only say that he has ultimate responsibility at the Roxby Downs site. The Commissioner will have a number of police officers at the site and under his charge, and he will be responsible for keeping the peace in the area. If (as he apparently has) the Police Commissioner has seen this as being the best policy to adopt in these circumstances, I certainly would not argue with it.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I desire to ask a further supplementary question. In the light of the Attorney's technical approach to this question, is the Council to presume that the absence of a direction to the Commissioner under the Police Regulation Act is an indication of Government support for the Police Commissioner's actions?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Hon. Mr Griffin does not seem to be able to understand. I repeat what I have said before: the Police Commissioner has the expertise and the responsibility on the ground at Roxby Downs for dealing with the situation. If the Police Commissioner, having assessed all the factors, believes that his approach is the appropriate policy to adopt, I would not disagree with his view.

NATIONAL ANTHEM

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Attorney-General a question about the National Anthem.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: The *A.M.* programme on the ABC brought to light the deplorable lack of familiarity of Australians with the words of our National Anthem. Apparently, 2 per cent is the fairly optimistic estimate of the number of Australians who know the words of the first verse of our National Anthem.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: A lot more know God Save the Queen.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: That may well be so.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: Other embarrassment was brought to light during the America's Cup celebration when of all the nations involved it was the Australians who were left very confused and red faced because as a group they were not able to sing their National Anthem. I believe that Australians are very reluctant singers. I do not think that that involves any sort of genetic or physical deficiency. Perhaps it is something that is being corrected by some of the groups of people who are joining us from European countries. I hope that we will improve in that respect. Later, the Hon. Mario Feleppa may be able to show the skills with which Italians can sing certain songs.

As today is also the 150th anniversary of the British Act of Parliament which authorised the settlement of South Australia, this is a significant day on which to raise this question. If we can ever be excused of being a bit jingoistic perhaps we can be today. Does the Attorney-General know the revised words of the first verse of our National Anthem? Mr President, I am quite content if you rule that the Attorney is able to consult or be prompted by his colleagues on the Government front or back benches. I would not mind, with your approval, Sir, if the Attorney replied in song, providing that *Hansard* was authorised to take down words that are sung.

It would be very exciting and quite an improvement. If, on the other hand, the Attorney-General does not know the words he may approve of my prompting him, in which case they would go into *Hansard* so that all honourable members of this place at least would have the words of the first verse of our National Anthem before them. I hope that he can answer the question for me first.

The PRESIDENT: I cannot permit you and the Attorney to render a song without having first heard your rehearsal, but the Attorney-General may like to quote the words.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I appreciate your ruling, Mr President, that I am not permitted to sing the Australian National Anthem, *Advance Australia Fair.* I am very appreciative of your indication of protection in that respect.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: So are we.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: And I am sure that the Council is also because I have absolutely no intention of singing the National Anthem this afternoon. Australians have a bit of a problem with their national anthem, which I readily admit. For some completely schizoid reason, in 1976 when a referendum was conducted on what would be an appropriate national anthem most Australians voted for *Advance Australia Fair.* I did not. I thought that that was probably the worst of the choices, because the words of *Advance Australia Fair,* as originally known—known, I should say, in the Eastern States and not in South Australia—comprised sentiments that were utterly unacceptable in the modern day. The second verse, in fact, referred to Brittania's ruling the waves, and that was completely inappropriate, but those were the words at the time.

An honourable member: That was before the Falklands.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Brittania might have been ruling the waves about 80 years ago.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: It ruled the waves until 1975.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: When the Hon. Frank Blevins stopped going to sea apparently Brittania stopped ruling the waves. Certainly, by the time the referendum was conducted those sentiments were inappropriate. They were inappropriate anyhow in a song about Australia. So I always found the original words of *Advance Australia Fair* obnoxious. I did not vote for it, and I believe that another song would be more appropriate.

All that I am saying to the Council is that Australians apparently had somewhat of a schizoid attitude to the National Anthem when they voted at the referendum. They apparently voted for a song, the words of which very few of them know. If people had really searched their souls they probably would have voted for *Waltzing Matilda,* because that is one song that is known by all Australians. It is one song which is known and which identifies Australia overseas. It was the tune that was played at the Olympic Games and other international events when our National Anthem was *God Save the Queen* or *King.*

It is very unfortunate that apparently Australians felt that *Waltzing Matilda* was too much of a folk song, and did not have a grandness about it to be the National Anthem. I believe that it was an appropriate National Anthem and

should have been chosen by the people at that referendum. However, that was not to be.

So, we have a National Anthem, the words of which most Australians do not know. There are new words, apparently. The present Government apparently agree with me about the completely inappropriate nature of the original words of *Advance Australia Fair* and therefore changed them. I do not believe that many Australians would have known the original words, and I do not believe now that many Australians, including me, know the full words of *Advance Australia Fair*. I could give a reasonable rendition of *The Song of Australia* because, as everyone knows, in South Australia that was the song that was used in schools to accompany *God Save the Queen* on appropriate occasions. In the Eastern States it was *Advance Australia Fair*.

I suppose that in the absence of another referendum (which I personally would prefer) we should adopt as a National Anthem the song that everyone knows and identifies with this country—*Waltzing Matilda*. In the meantime we will have to learn the new, non-sexist words of *Advance Australia Fair*. I would be prepared to join the honourable member, who I am sure does not know them, either, without reference to a cheat sheet that he has in front of him, and for him to convene a song session for all Parliamentarians so that we could all get together and learn the new words. It is an unfortunate fact of life in Australia that not many people know the words. More people know the tune, but now that it has been adopted by Australians without their knowing the words, it is something that we cannot change and something that we obviously have to learn to live with.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: A supplementary question, Mr President. It would have been a lot quicker to let the Attorney sing: I wish that you had ruled otherwise. It is obvious that he does not know the words. I ask him: are the following the words of the first verse?

Australians, all let us rejoice
For we are young and free;
We've golden soil and wealth for toil;
Our home is girt by sea.
Our land abounds in nature's gifts
Of beauty rich and rare.
In history's page let every stage
Advance Australia Fair.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: As I said, I do not approve of *Advance Australia Fair*. I do not approve of the words and it is not my choice as a National Anthem, but I will, along with everyone else in this Council, have to at the appropriate time learn the words.

ETHNIC TELEVISION CHANNEL

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Ethnic Affairs a question about the ethnic television station channel 0/28.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I have raised this matter before and much uncertainty still remains amongst the migrant communities in this State as to when channel 0/28 will be extended to Adelaide. This concern is evidenced in copies of letters that I have with me. There are three letters, each dated 20 July 1984, one addressed to the Right Honourable the Prime Minister, another addressed to the Hon. M. Duffy, Minister of Telecommunications, and another to the Hon. Stewart West, Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs. These letters are from the Co-ordinating Italian Community Incorporated, which has been vitally interested, as the Minister knows, in this matter. I quote from one of the four paragraphs in these letters, as follows:

For the past four years it has been a constant source of frustration to read the channel 0/28 programme guides in the Italian newspapers, and to know that as taxpayers we have been denied the wealth of culture and information available to Sydney and Melbourne residents.

I have been seeking assurances from the Minister that the South Australian Government has been doing everything in its power to expedite this arrangement and to see that the present Federal Government in Canberra honours its promise to have this television service extended to Adelaide in the first half of the next calendar year, or in the latter half of this financial year. In view of this new concern that is obvious as a result of these letters, has the Minister any further information in regard to this matter? Secondly, can he give a clear assurance to the Council that he has done everything possible, as Minister of Ethnic Affairs, to assist the local ethnic communities in this serious problem?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I can give the latter assurance that the honourable member seeks, namely, that I have done everything possible to ensure that the representations of groups in South Australia are put to the Federal Government on the question of the extension of channel 0/28 to Adelaide. Members will recall that a resolution was passed by this Council that was transmitted to the Federal Government, and I have continually made my views and the views of the Government known to the Federal Government. In the last Budget the extension of channel 0/28 to Adelaide was announced to occur in 1985—

The Hon. C.M. Hill: The first half of 1985.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Yes, in the first half of 1985. I have not seen anything to indicate that that decision has been changed. I received correspondence a few weeks ago from the Federal Minister reiterating that transmitters had been bought or were in the process of being bought as a result of the 1983-84 Budget that would enable the extension of channel 0/28 to Adelaide. There was no indication in his correspondence to me that that decision had been changed. An inquiry headed by Mr Xavier Connor is looking at the question of multicultural broadcasting, and I appeared before that inquiry and gave evidence about the policy of the Labor Party and about the policy of the State Government on the question of the extension of channel 0/28 to Adelaide.

I made clear to that committee that in my view the extension was not a matter that was negotiable by this Government nor by the committee. It was not a matter that could be considered by the committee, because specific commitments had been made by the Federal Government. There is nothing that I have heard or seen that would indicate the situation has changed. I imagine that there will be more information on the progress in this matter in the Federal Budget, which is due to be handed down within the next 10 days.

ETHNIC SOCIAL WORKERS.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister of Health to ascertain why the Minister of Community Welfare is withholding Federal funds earmarked last financial year for women's shelters in South Australia to employ ethnic social workers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Last year the Federal Government established the Women's Emergency Services Programme to upgrade existing women's shelters and improve the salary of staff. As part of this programme, the Federal Government provided funding for the employment of four full-time ethnic or bi-lingual/bi-cultural social workers to be shared among the 11 centres in South Australia.

The Department of Community Welfare was given the responsibility for dispersing these funds to the shelter move-

ment before 30 June 1984. To date, the funds have not been disbursed despite countless pleas from a variety of sources for the Minister of Community Welfare to do so. Requests for the Minister to explain why he has not been willing to release the funds have gone unanswered. In the meantime, shelters in New South Wales and Victoria have received their Federal funding before 30 June, and have employed eight and five full-time ethnic social workers respectively. I am sure that the Minister of Community Welfare is well aware of the enormous pressures under which the shelters are operating in South Australia and of their need for ethnic social workers. Further, the need in South Australia is no less acute than in New South Wales and Victoria.

This afternoon I was advised that the staff of the women's shelters in South Australia are so mad about the inaction of the Minister of Community Welfare and his refusal to explain the reasons for his inaction that they have arranged for a delegation of shelter workers to sit in at his office all day tomorrow to highlight the degree of their anger. Also, I understand that the media has been advised of this course of action. Will the Minister release immediately the Federal funds due last financial year to the women's shelters in South Australia to employ four full-time ethnic social workers? If he will not, will he explain why he is not willing to release the funds?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I will refer that question to the Minister of Community Welfare and bring back a reply.

COURTS

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the cost of Mercedes Benz versus taxis.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: All honourable members will remember that the Attorney-General—

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Mr President, this matter is on notice, and I believe that Standing Orders do not permit a question to be asked without notice when a matter is on notice for an answer later in the day.

The PRESIDENT: It is a matter of whether it is the same question as the one on notice. If it is, I ask the honourable member not to proceed with that question.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am not already repeating the Question on Notice. That would be superfluous. I intend to ask a different question on the same subject.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: The same question in a different way?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No, a different question. As I said, the Council will remember that the Attorney-General last week was under some pressure in this Chamber arguing that the Regency Hire Car Company could provide a Mercedes Benz for less than the cost of a taxi, to use the words of the Attorney. I have today a copy of a letter sent to the Attorney-General on 13 August from Mr Ben Robinson, President, Taxi Cab Operators Association of South Australia, who states:

Dear Sir,

We refer to the article entitled 'Accused's Mercedes Cheaper than Taxis' which appeared in the *Advertiser* on 9 August 1984.

We are at a loss to understand the statement made by you in relation to the costs of taxis against hire cars for the comparisons stated below.

Mr Robinson then gives an estimate, as follows:

Taxis: Flagfall $1.20
Running time 56c per kilometre
Detention time $12.20 per hour.
Hire Cars: Generally accepted rate $22 per hour depot to depot.

Using the above figures for a round trip of, say, 20 kilometres and waiting time of a half an hour, the fare comparisons should be as follows:

The Hon. C.J. Sumner interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am going to ask the Minister to comment.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I rise on a point of order. This is the same question that the honourable member has on notice. I think that, in this case, the honourable member should put his question to enable us to know whether or not there is a breach of Standing Orders. It seems to me that, having placed a question on notice which deals with this particular topic and which I am in a position to answer—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Don't you want the letter read out?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I do not care. The honourable member can read it out.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Let me get on with it, then.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I think that the question to be asked by the honourable member should be stated at this stage. Clearly, the Standing Order states that the honourable member should not ask a question that is on notice. It would be clearly absurd if questions could be placed on notice in this Council, and Ministers could get answers to those questions, and if honourable members could then attempt to pre-empt the answers to those questions by asking the same question in a similar way.

The PRESIDENT: If it is the Attorney-General's desire to have the question asked, then it is a matter of withdrawing leave and asking for the question to be asked.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am not asking that. I think that you, Mr President, ought to know the question in order to rule on it.

The PRESIDENT: I have found the question and will have a look at it. Personally, I cannot see a great deal of difference. Perhaps the Hon. Mr Lucas is providing different evidence, but it will be necessary for him to ask a different question for it to be allowed.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: What is your ruling, Mr President? Am I allowed to continue with my explanation?

The PRESIDENT: I will rule the honourable member's question out of order if it is the same as the question on notice.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I can assure you, Mr President, that it is not the same, as I indicated at the start of my question. The letter continues:

Unless the State Government is in receipt of a very generous price by a hire car operator, we must strongly protest that the abovementioned article is not correct and consequently we object to its contents. As a result of the article, we are now in receipt of complaints from radio companies who have received requests from consumers wanting Mercedes hire cars instead of taxis, because they believe they are cheaper. We know this is not the case; consequently, would you advise how we now get out of this current predicament? Yours faithfully, Ben Robinson, President.

My questions, which are different from those on notice, are as follows:

1. Has the Attorney-General received that letter from the President of the Taxi-Cab Operators Association of South Australia?

2. Will the Attorney-General respond to the allegations made by the President of the Taxi-Cab Operators Association, and does he dispute the figures provided in that letter by the President of the Taxi-Cab Operators Association of South Australia?

The PRESIDENT: That is a fair enough question.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Mr President, the honourable member has blatantly abused the Standing Orders.

The PRESIDENT: I do not believe that that is so.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: He has blatantly abused the Standing Orders.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The question asked is not the one on notice.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member is asking for the same information as is asked for in the question on notice, but in a different way by asking, 'Does the Attorney-General agree with the figures outlined in that letter?' That, Mr President, is precisely the question asked by the honourable member and placed on notice last week. He has abused Standing Orders and abused his position in this Council.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: There is no question that that is what the honourable member has done.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will read to the Council the question as it appears on notice:

In particular, what is the evidence for the Attorney's statement in this House that 'this company can provide a vehicle with a driver for less than the cost of a taxi'?

Several questions were asked today.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: They ask for an answer to that question.

The PRESIDENT: They may deal with the same subject, but they are not the same question. If the Attorney does not want to answer the question he should say so—that is his prerogative.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: What I am putting to you is that the honourable member has asked for a comparison of hire cars and taxis; that is the question that the honourable member has now asked, and that is the question, in effect—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: I asked the Attorney to respond to the allegations.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Responding to the allegation is tantamount to answering the Question on Notice, which I intend to do this afternoon. If that is what the honourable member wants, I will now respond to the Question on Notice that he asked. I do not know whether or not the letter mentioned has been received in the office.

The PRESIDENT: That really was the question.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Then the honourable member asked whether I agreed with the figures in that letter. That question is clearly the same question, expressed in a different way, that the honourable member placed on notice last week. That is clearly the situation to anyone looking at the matter in any objective manner. That is why I took the point of order. However, I have no problem with answering the question. The fact is that the honourable member placed a question on notice and then decided that he had a bit more information and abused Standing Orders to get that information into the Council prior to my answering the question. That is why that Standing Order exists. The honourable member has got around it by asking the question at the conclusion of his statement. The fact is that the second question the honourable member asked is the same in substance as the question he placed on notice. Now, if the Council will bear with me, I will answer the question on notice as follows.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: We have other questions.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That is bad luck. The honourable member should have taken that up with the Hon. Mr Lucas.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Answer the questions I put.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I rise on a point of order. Somehow or other the Attorney seems to be reflecting on you, Mr President, and your ruling about the question. For him to now attempt to give answers to Questions on Notice under the guise of a separate question asked by the Hon. Mr Lucas is nothing more than blatant abuse of his position as Leader of the Council.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I rise on a point of order.

The PRESIDENT: Order! We have another point of order.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Was it not the purpose of the Standing Order to stop other members, on seeing a Question on Notice, asking a Dorothy Dixer of the Minister and getting an answer to that question before an answer was given to the member who put the question on notice? The purpose of the Standing Order was to protect the question of the honourable member who had asked it and put it on notice and to stop other members getting political kudos by ripping the question off and asking the Minister a Dorothy Dixer. However, if the Opposition wants a situation to prevail where anybody can ask the same question in similar words, then that is the rule.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will the Minister quote the Standing Order.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Standing Order is the general practice of this Council. Members can consult the Clerks or Erskine May. The fact is that the rules of the Council have been abused because the honourable member decided that he had some additional information, having placed the question on notice. The correct thing to do would have been to withdraw the question, if that is what the honourable member wished to do.

The PRESIDENT: Does the Hon. Mr Hill have a point of order?

The Hon. C.M. HILL: No, I want to ask a question and get on with something worth while.

The PRESIDENT: You will have to be smart, as we are having some consultations about whether or not the question was out of order. I do not believe that it was out of order. I will quote the rule so that we do not have any bother with this. It uses the following words: 'repeating in substance questions already answered or to which an answer has been refused'. Neither of those things has happened. I have taken the view that, because the question, to my mind, seeks different information from that placed on notice, the Hon. Mr Lucas has the right to an answer. Whether the Attorney-General wishes to answer the question or not is entirely up to him.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: It is the same question.

The PRESIDENT: Do not answer it then.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

PAROLE

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS (on notice) asked the Minister of Correctional Services:

1. How many prisoners became eligible for parole immediately following the recent amendments to the Prisons Act?
2. How many have been released?
3. How many of those who have been released—
   (a) Are under investigation for offences?
   (b) Have committed offences and have been returned to gaol?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have this information. I point out that it could have been given in Question Time to some other member. The question has been asked in a slightly different way. Do you get the point?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. The number of prisoners who became eligible for parole immediately following the recent amendments to the Prisons Act (that is, 20 December 1983) was 112.

2. The number of prisoners who have been released since 20 December 1983 is 422 (to 10 August 1984).

3. *(a)* The number of those prisoners who have been released since 20 December 1983 and have been reported to the Parole Board of South Australia as being under investigation for offences is 14.

(b) The number of those prisoners who have been released since 20 December 1983 and have been reported to the Parole Board of South Australia as having committed offences and have been returned to gaol for those offences is 27.

It could be noted further that the rate of recidivism is not considered high. Of the 422 prisoners approved for release since 20 December 1983, only 27 (that is, 6.4 per cent) have been returned to prison following the committing of further offences.

COURTS

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (on notice) asked the Attorney-General:

1. To provide such information as will demonstrate that the Courts Department's contract with Regency Hire Cars is the cheapest form of available transportation for prisoners being taken to the scene of an alleged crime.

2. In particular, what is the evidence for the Attorney's statement in this Council that 'this company can provide a vehicle with a driver for less than the cost of a taxi'?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Jury views are held by direction of the presiding judge, pursuant to section 88 of the Juries Act. The Sheriff as an officer of the court is responsible for the arrangements necessary for the conduct of the view. The use of Regency Hire Cars for this purpose is nothing new. The present Sheriff, Mr Carr, inherited the arrangements when he assumed his office in 1978. Mr Carr has advised me that he continued the practice after his appointment and after he had satisfied himself that the practice provided the required service and was cost efficient.

I am informed that in the period September 1979 to November 1982, a period spanning some three years during which time a member of the Liberal Party in this Council, the Hon. K.T. Griffin was Attorney, there were 42 vehicle bookings made through Regency Hire Cars. The type of vehicle used on each occasion is not recorded but it should be noted that the company uses only Mercedes cars plus one Holden Statesman. I assume that the Hon. Mr Lucas will now address a similar question to his colleague, the Hon. K.T. Griffin. The fact is that in the three years of the Hon. Mr Griffin's tenure as Attorney-General he used Regency Hire Cars on 42 occasions and probably on many of those occasions Mercedes Benz cars were used. The cost per vehicle from Regency Hire Cars is $20 per hour flat rate. This contradicts the statement in the letter that the Hon. Mr Lucas read out in this Council. The flat rate, by the way, is $20 from pick up to drop off.

The vehicles are unmarked and supplied with drivers experienced in the requirements of jury views, particularly as to not engaging in conversations with persons being transported. On the other hand, the current rate for taxi hire is $12.30 per hour waiting time, flag fall is $1.20 and a day rate of 56.18c per kilometre and evening rate of 64.10c per kilometre. The distance jury views travel and the time occupied on a view varies greatly. Areas range from Berri in the Riverland to the inner city. If required to estimate an average, the Sheriff suggests a distance of 60 kilometres travelled and a time lapse of 2.25 hours. Respective costs based on this average would be as follows:

	$	$
Regency Hire		45.00
Taxi flag fall	1.20	
Kilometreage (day rate)	33.70	
Waiting time 1¼ hours	15.38	
Total taxi hire		50.28

Furthermore, not all views are taken during daylight. Night views have been held where the alleged offence has taken place at night and the lighting or visibility of the area is critical to the Crown or defence case. Using the average estimated distance and time frame, Regency Hire is marginally cheaper than taxi hire. Moreover, that margin would increase for views incurring greater kilometres. If a view has to go further into the country then, obviously, a flat rate of $20 per hour would be cheaper than the taxis.

However, the real benefit of using Regency Hire is the provision of an on-going service of supplying unmarked vehicles and drivers experienced in jury view requirements at a rate that is competitive with taxi hire. The cost of providing a mini bus for use by jurors is $50, which covers the first two hours, after which the rate is $25 per hour. Although Regency Hire have no mini buses, this service is arranged through that organisation at no additional cost to the Courts Department.

The honourable member referred specifically to the scene of an alleged offence at Royston Park, where the distance travelled was 34 kilometres and the time lapse was 1¾ hours. Officers from the Courts Department have provided me with some alternatives for conducting this jury view, with appropriate costing. For the benefit of Opposition members, they are as follows:

		$	$
(1)	Current practice:		
	Two hire vehicles @ $20 per hour	70.00	
	One mini bus @ $50 (company supplying vehicles charges on a depot-to-depot basis)	82.00	
			152.00
(2)	Taxi hire without mini bus		
	Six taxis @ $35.68 each	214.08	
	Two additional Sheriff's Officers for jury escort (wages)	31.38	
			245.46
(3)	Taxi hire with mini bus		
	Two taxis @ $35.68 each	71.36	
	Mini bus	82.00	
			153.36
(4)	Hire car for judge/mini bus for jury/taxi for accused		
	One hire car	35.00	
	One taxi	35.68	
	Mini bus	82.00	
			152.68
(5)	Hire car for judge/mini bus for jury/departmental car for accused		
	One hire car	35.00	
	One mini bus	82.00	
	One departmental car and Sheriff's Officer (wages)	15.69	
			132.69
(6)	Departmental car for judge/mini bus for jury/departmental car for accused		
	One Mini bus	82.00	
	Departmental cars and Sheriff's Officers (wages)	31.38	
			113.38

I must add that departmental cars have been used from time to time, although this has not happened often. Further, Courts Department vehicles do not display the South Australian Government number plates following representations from the Judiciary that vehicles used for court purposes should be unmarked. Judges will not travel in vehicles that are marked with South Australian Government number plates. This limits the number of cars that are available at short notice.

I am also advised by the Sheriff that prior to this practice being introduced taxis were used. However, judges were

concerned about travelling in vehicles which displayed the name of the company; that is, they preferred to drive in unmarked cars. Finally, there is no formal contract with Regency Hire Cars. This company simply provides the required service at very short notice and at a competitive rate. The conclusions, therefore, are that in comparison with taxis the Regency Hire Cars option is cost competitive, is of advantage in having an experienced driver and is acceptable to the Judiciary. While it may be possible to achieve some small savings by use of departmental vehicles, these are not always available and would be more inconvenient as cars would have to be organised from three different sources. The mini bus would have to be organised from the hire car firm, if one went by hire car, or one would need more departmental cars.

The judge's car would have to be organised possibly from the Courts Department, because judges will not travel in cars that are marked with a Government number plate, and the third car might have to be organised from some other departmental source. The advantage of Regency Hire Cars is that they make all the arrangements. Finally, as I pointed out in my previous answer, the question of hiring cars for views is one for the presiding judge—and I ask the honourable member to note that. The Sheriff makes the arrangements on the instructions of the judge. Both the prisoner and the jury are under the control of the court during a trial.

However, should the honourable member after discussing the matter with his colleague Mr Griffin still be unhappy, I am prepared to advise Regency Hire Cars that, as a result of questions raised in Parliament by the Opposition, its services are no longer required and I will approach the Judiciary to see what alternatives might be acceptable to them.

SHOP TRADING HOURS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second reading.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is identical in intention to the Bill that I introduced in May 1983. I will briefly refer to its contents and its intention. As I said last week, the Australian Democrats support the intention of the Hon. Martin Cameron's Bill, but I believe that this Bill goes further and in fact attempts to remove completely discrimination against fresh red meat. The obligation is not on those who are promoting Bills to lift restrictions on fresh red meat sales to put forward arguments but rather it is on the opponents of the proposal to justify and give reasons for the constant discrimination against the sale of fresh red meat.

I intend briefly to pick out the discrimination under the Act in relation to the prescription of fresh red meat, and I hope by doing that to underline to the Council and to the people of South Australia who are interested in the issue how petty and ridiculous the current restrictions in the Act are. There are distinct advantages in removing any mention of fresh red meat from the Act, because in my opinion there can be no justification for such reference, which requires certain conditions which do not apply to other products in the same category but which apply to fresh red meat.

There is another reason why this Bill should be considered favourably in comparison with the Bill introduced by the Hon. Mr Cameron, and that is that, if this Bill is passed, any amendment to the shop trading hours would automatically apply to the trading hours for fresh red meat. That would overcome the bothersome necessity of readjusting the hours prescribed for the sale of fresh red meat, and we would have to do that if the Hon. Martin Cameron's Bill came into effect. Therefore, this Bill will achieve two important things: first, it will completely erase the absolutely unjustified discrimination against fresh red meat; and, secondly, it will make the process of alteration of the hours of sale of fresh red meat much simpler when the shop trading hours are altered. I repeat that the responsibility of argument is firmly with those who oppose either of the two Bills; they must give grounds for justification as to why we continue to discriminate against fresh red meat. Personally, I feel that nothing substantial or significant can be brought up to back that opposing point of view.

Of course, one other aspect might not have been emphasised enough in regard to the sale of fresh red meat, and that is that, if the hours are extended, outlets, particularly smaller outlets, will be very severely stretched in their resources if they must open for those extra hours. However, I emphasise clearly that there is no compulsion on any meat trading outlet to remain open during the hours that we hope will become available to them because of the passing of this Bill. They can choose what hours will be most profitable and convenient for them, and obviously that will involve the hours that suit the consumer. No outlet will deliberately cut itself off from its life blood—the demand and convenience of the consumer.

However, those who operate butcher shops in shopping centres as lessees have a valid fear in that I understand that quite often conditions are imposed so that they must remain open for all the hours during which they are legally entitled to open. That is a quite unreasonable and cruel imposition, and such a legal restriction would certainly be an awkward disadvantage for lessees. However, I was reassured in reading in the *Advertiser* earlier this year an article which stated that legislation had been prepared by the Attorney-General's Department (this information was provided by Mr Terry Groom, who was apparently making a statement on behalf of that Department) and that the Bill rendered 'void any provision compelling a business tenant to have the premises open for business at particular hours'. When that legislation is brought forward and passed, as I believe it should be, any remaining fears or suspicions of pressure being placed on the leasing butcher shops in shopping centres would be removed.

My Bill will delete section 4 of the Act, which contains a definition of 'meat', as follows:

> . . . the flesh of a slaughtered animal intended for human consumption but does not include bacon, cooked meat, frozen meat, fish, poultry, rabbits, sausages and other small goods or any other prescribed meat or prescribed product derived from meat:

I feel with some confidence that the Minister of Agriculture is sympathetic to the people whom he represents so adequately and conscientiously. It is quite unreasonable that a definition of that nature should remain in any Act in 1984 resulting in such specific discrimination against fresh red meat and particularly against a host of competitive products. The definition should be deleted. Clause 6 of the Bill deletes the provision dealing with butcher shops outside shopping districts.

Although all other shops outside shopping districts enjoy freedom and tolerance in relation to their trading hours, section 6 (1) *(a)* of the parent Act specifically and quite oppressively selects the sale of fresh red meat as having to be tightly confined. That is illogical, irrational and unfair. My present Bill seeks to delete certain subsections from section 13 of the parent Act. My earlier Bill effected some amendments and, if this Bill is passed, those changes will

become redundant. I refer to that part of the legislation which currently allows for a butcher shop or meat trading outlet to be open on a late shopping night or on a Saturday morning. My current Bill will delete that provision from the legislation because that will become redundant.

Clause 5 of my Bill provides that meat be deleted as a prescribed good. Section 16 of the principal Act defines 'prescribed good', as follows:

(a) Meat.
(b) Motor vehicles and boats.
(c) Motor spirit, lubricants, spare parts and accessories for motor vehicles.

Surely, anyone with a logical mind can see that there is no connection between meat and the other products. Why meat retains its place in the prescribed goods provision I am completely at a loss to understand. Meat is further discriminated against in section 17, which generously allows shop keepers licensed to sell and deliver motor spirit and lubricants, spare parts and accessories for motor vehicles on any day after closing time and on Sundays and public holidays, but it still denies people who are selling fresh red meat that same freedom.

Of all the products mentioned in the shop trading hours legislation, meat stands alone as though it had some peculiar quality—as though its marketing is such a dangerous and reckless procedure that it must be so controlled and circumscribed. I feel that I must have convinced the Minister, because he appears to be moving off to persuade his colleagues of the worthiness of my Bill, the effect of which will completely remove for all time the discrimination against the sale of fresh red meat. I believe that the intention of my Bill has massive support amongst members of this Parliament both here and in another place.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I believe that that is probably true: members given freedom to vote would give the Bill a majority. I remind the Council of what I said previously: I think the Government is unduly influenced at this stage at least by an opinion from the Australian Meat Industry Employees Union. I beseech the Government to consider the effect of my Bill and to regard it as a just and proper reform both in the marketing of a product and in the consideration of a very important sector of South Australian society, that is, the meat producing farmer and primary producer. I commend the Bill to the Council. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 by paragraph *(a)*, amends the definition of 'exempt shop' by removing paragraph *(g)* of the definition. The effect of that paragraph is that a shop the business of which is solely or predominantly the sale of red meat cannot be an exempt shop under the principal Act. The removal of paragraph *(g)* will reverse this situation. Paragraph *(b)* of this clause removes from the principal Act the definition of 'meat'.

Clause 3 amends section 6 of the principal Act. Subsection (1) *(a)* of section 6 provides that the principal Act shall apply to butcher shops and subsection (1) *(b)* provides that the Act shall apply to other shops only if they are situated in a shopping district. Because the application of the Act to butcher shops is unrestricted, it applies to those shops wherever situated in the State. The clause removes paragraph (1) *(a)* from the Act with the result that the Act will in the future apply only to those butcher shops situated in a shopping district.

Clause 4 removes from section 13 those subsections dealing specifically with red meat. Clause 5 removes meat from the operation of section 16 of the principal Act. This section is designed to ensure that certain goods prescribed by subsection (1) are not sold as a sideline out of the hours that would apply if the trade of the shop concerned was solely or predominantly in those goods. This is the section that, in the past, has required supermarkets to close their red meat section earlier than other parts of the shop.

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 14 August. Page 222.)

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I support the motion. I thank His Excellency for his Speech with which he opened Parliament. I take the opportunity to reaffirm my allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen, and join His Excellency in expressing sympathy for the families of deceased members.

I wish to refer to Medicare. The responsibility of overseeing the provision of health benefits is clearly a Federal one. However, the effects of any such scheme, and in particular Medicare, on the standard of health care delivery in any State and the State health budget are enormous, and I consider it quite appropriate to refer to it in this Address in Reply speech.

The first and most important point to make about Medicare, even though it has been made before, is that it does absolutely nothing to improve the standard of health care. It provides no more doctors; in fact it may inhibit some of them from practising. It will provide no more nurses. It will provide no more equipment. It will provide no more hospitals, and in fact it will almost certainly destroy some of the private hospitals. Medicare is not a scheme to improve the standard of health care. It is a scheme to socialise the provision of medical, hospital and other health care and bring it under the control and direction of the Government. The South Australian Minister of Health is always sounding off about his major interest being the standard of patient care. Well, let me make it clear that the Medicare system which he espouses and supports does absolutely nothing for the standard of patient care and, on the contrary, as I shall demonstrate later, considerably reduces the standard of patient care. Let me first point to the areas where Medicare seriously reduces a patient's right of choice and civil liberties through Government intervention.

Medicare takes away the right of the individual to insure himself against what is at common law an insurable risk. It prohibits gap insurance. The citizen ought to have the right to say, 'I will carry the cost myself' or 'I will provide for it by way of insurance.' To take this right away is gross intervention against a citizen's rights to arrange his own affairs. It is a gross intervention against a citizen's rights to enter into a contract. It is really 1984 and Big Brother stuff. It was an attempt by a socialist Government to spell the end of the private funds which have served the Australian community so well for such a long time. The Commonwealth Government has done a grave disservice to Australians by legislating against a free enterprise system which has served the Australian public well. Medicare also delivers a serious blow to the private hospital system which has been a significant part of the provision of care to sick people in the past.

The categorisation of private hospitals as originally announced was quite iniquitous and discriminatory. It gave

category I hospitals a licence to print money, enabled category II hospitals to survive (just), and sent category III hospitals to the wall. This last aspect of the Medicare package in regard to private hospitals was disgraceful. If some smaller private hospitals needed to be phased out (and I believe that this is not the case), the Government should have had the guts to do this directly instead of surreptitiously slipping it into the so-called categorisation scheme. The Commonwealth Government has acted most dishonestly in destroying private hospitals in this underhand way. The categorisation scheme is being reviewed, but I do not think that it will finish up much better.

A Federal Liberal Government and a South Australian Liberal Government would acknowledge the private hospital system as being a full partner in providing hospital care and would encourage it and certainly not discriminate against it in such a crassly socialistic way as the Commonwealth Hawke Government has done. If the object of the exercise really is to provide the best standard of patient care to the community (and I doubt whether that is the case in regard to the Labor Governments), surely a working partnership between the public and private sectors ought to be aimed at.

A particular aspect of the discrimination in regard to private hospitals which applies in South Australia relates to community hospitals in the country which declined to enter into the deficit funded scheme for recognised hospitals when it was adopted some time ago. These are Keith, Kadina, Moonta, Ardrossan, Mallala and Hamley Bridge. These hospitals had every right to accept the scheme which was offered or to reject it and to elect not to be a burden on the South Australian taxpayer, but to pay their own way. Most of them have been most successful in doing this, so far, paying their way, setting aside reserves and being in a position to fund substantial capital improvements without any cost to the taxpayer.

The iniquitous Medicare system categorises them as Category 3 private hospitals and condemns them to the wall. Of course, they are not private hospitals at all. They are community hospitals. Some of these hospitals have sought some sort of consideration from the State Government, such as supporting some Medicare beds in their hospitals. This has been refused. To at least two hospitals the suggestion has been made that the hospital might like to apply at this stage to become a recognised hospital and receive deficit funding. In another area, an area health board plus incorporation of the non-recognised hospitals has been suggested, but this is not good enough. If these hospitals have been able to supply a good service to their patients for so long without being a burden to the South Australian taxpayer, why should they now be forced, in order to survive, to join the deficit funded hospital system just because a Commonwealth socialist Government says so?

I am convinced that many members of the public struggling under the burdens of high State and Commonwealth taxation will yield to the temptation to drop their hospital insurance. This will be a further blow to the private hospitals and will place a heavy burden on the public hospital system. In Victoria it is clear that waiting lists for what is said to be elective surgery, but what can be important surgery to the patient, have got out of hand. The same has been suggested in South Australia. The Minister has denied that this is so, but I get frequent complaints on this issue. The answer to the question on waiting lists placed on notice by the Hon. Dr Ritson should enable an assessment of this to be made when the answer is given.

Also, the Federal Government's 35-day rule turns sick patients out of private hospitals without providing a single additional nursing home bed for them to go to. A number of elderly patients have become very anxious about this rule. The general situation in regard to private hospitals was referred to by Barry Hailstone in an article in the *Advertiser* on Monday 13 August. I quote from the article, headed 'Big shift from private treatment in hospitals':

> The Secretary of the South Australian Private Hospitals' Association, Mr J. Bailey, said that the Commonwealth's system of classifying hospitals into three categories, each with different levels of payment, although costs might be the same, was compounding the problems of private hospitals. The public mistakenly believed that 'the top hospitals were in category 1 and the bottom hospitals were in category 3'. The classification system was based on the kind of work done at the hospital.
>
> There were several hospitals in the lower categories of funding which faced closure, Mr Bailey said. 'Unfortunately, the better hospitals will go first because they are the ones that are committed to high standards of patient care and they are less willing to adopt cost-cutting measures at the expense of patient care,' he said. While there had been reductions in private hospital funds' membership, some families had also downgraded their cover to the basic level, a move which denied them access to some private hospital accommodation.
>
> Mr Bailey said there were indications that waiting lists were growing at the State's major public hospitals—the only light on the horizon for private hospitals. The State President of the AHA, Mr Trevor Cumpston, said that there had been a major drop in the number of private patients seeking outpatient treatment in public hospitals, and a growth in the number of public patients.
>
> Outpatients: The number of South Australian people seeking outpatient treatment at public hospitals for the four months from 1 February, when Medicare was introduced, to May had been 505 514 compared with 487 108 for the first four months of 1983. The number of private outpatients seen in public hospitals in the same time had dropped from 433 108 to 74 663 although the number of patients presenting themselves for treatment had remained steady.
>
> Mr Cumpston said the AHA was now doing a comprehensive national survey. Mr Bailey said that before Medicare public hospitals had been seeing 60 per cent private patients and 40 per cent public patients.
>
> He now believed that this trend had reversed and public hospitals were attending 30 per cent private patients and 70 per cent public patients.
>
> Pensioner patients and those with free health-care cards were further disadvantaged as more people dropped out of private health care into the public sector. 'Those who were well served by the public sector now have to compete with people who have dropped private hospital insurance,' Mr Bailey said. He said that under the category system there were three levels of payment.
>
> Patients who attend private hospitals in category 1 get a fund benefit of $120 a day plus $40 Government benefit, making a total of $160 a day for basic cover. For the top table it is $150 plus $40, a total of $190. Patients in category 2 get $130 ($100 plus $30) for basic cover and $160 for the top table ($130 plus $30). Patients in category 3 get $100 ($80 plus $20) for the basic cover and $130 for the top table ($110 plus $20).

The medical profession in South Australia has been commendably restrained in regard to Medicare. It has properly taken the attitude that it is not for a professional body to attack a Government on its particular method of funding health care. But any medical professional body, including the New South Wales branch of the AMA, has the right to speak out when it feels that the policy of the Government is seriously impinging on the standard of patient care. The South Australian branch of the AMA was acting reasonably in conducting a rally on the steps of Parliament House on the Medicare issue. I believe that Medicare goes a long way to destroying the close doctor patient relationship which has been the lynchpin of good medical care for some time past. In particular, a patient in hospital in order to gain full Medicare benefits has no choice of doctor.

In fact, the taking away of choice—no choice of insurance, no choice of public or private hospital if one is to receive full Medicare benefits—is the hallmark of the Medicare system. It is a destruction of choice.

Patients in country areas in South Australia are particularly adversely affected by Medicare. Medical practitioners will be constrained to work in hospitals for a sessional fee where their patients are in hospital. It really is the fact that many country medical practices are quite marginal and Medicare

will force country practitioners out of country practices. This may well have been part of the intention of the Commonwealth Government in introducing the system, but if that was the case they should have said so. The Medicare system also inhibits specialists from going to country areas, and that deals a further blow to providing medical services to patients in those areas.

The current situation in regard to Medicare was summarised by the Federal shadow Minister of Health (Hon. Jim Carlton) in Adelaide last week. His comments were reported in the *Advertiser* of 7 August 1984, and I quote from the article, headed 'Most of system would change. We would revise Medicare: Libs':

A Liberal Government would keep the Medicare concept of universal health care but would change 'three-quarters' of the present system, the Opposition Health spokesman, Mr Carlton, said in Adelaide yesterday. He said that six months after the introduction of Medicare, Australians had a more complicated system which cost most people more. Its defects included:

- People who could least afford it—the elderly and pensioners—queuing for beds in public hospitals.
- Empty beds in private hospitals and some being forced to close.
- Sick and elderly people being threatened with expulsion from hospital under the '35-day rule'. (A limit of 35 days free care in hospital applies to people who are not certified in need of 'acute care'. After that a minimum daily fee of $12.40 is charged.)
- A lack of Medicare offices.

One of the places where there is a severe lack of a Medicare office is Murray Bridge. There is ever so much need for an office there, as the member for Mallee has pointed out, but he is not going to get one. The report continues:

- The 1 per cent Medicare levy was a 'political figure' designed to make health cover look 'cheap', but it did not cover the cost of providing services.

Mr Carlton said he knew of two private hospitals in Victoria and one in New South Wales which had been forced to close since Medicare had begun in February. In Victoria, 8 000 patients were on public hospital waiting lists and elderly people were waiting up to two years for orthopaedic operations.

There was some evidence of increased waiting lists in South Australian hospitals but health authorities were not being 'entirely honest' in providing figures to prove this. Although his Party's health policy might not be announced until September, Mr Carlton said a Liberal Government would make major, nondisruptive changes to the system within a year of taking office.

A very positive statement. The report continues:

It would allow people to insure for the gap between the 85 per cent Medicare reimbursement and the full cost of services. This would encourage people to insure privately, leading to a bigger role for private health funds. Allowing private fund offices to be agencies for Medicare also would be considered, as would standard 'fair competition' rules for all companies—general insurance and health funds—providing health insurance.

I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. C.W. CREEDON: I support the Address in Reply and join with other honourable members in expressing sympathy to the families of former members who have died during the past 12 months.

I take this opportunity again to raise matters that are of great interest to me, especially the treatment of handicapped persons and, in particular, the deaf. Handicapped persons comprise a group in our society who, to all general appearances, have no visible sign of handicap, but they are a group in society who are a cause of embarrassment to ordinary people in the community simply because the society has no knowledge, or very little knowledge, of their complaint.

Some people in the community panic when confronted with the unknown. I have known people to forbid their children from even playing with a deaf child, and I have known deaf people to be harassed in many other ways. I know foremen and supervisors who would make no attempt to talk with deaf apprentices and who would prefer to call in parents and expect them to communicate the foreman's point of view. Indeed, I have known deaf people to be excluded from all 'hearing' football and cricket teams, usually with the excuse that, as the person concerned cannot hear, they might get hurt. Ability was never considered.

I am not sure whether coaches or captains were afraid to try and communicate or whether they were just lazy. I refer to senior classes in further education courses where teachers continually face the blackboard when talking and indicate their inability to think or remember that they might have just one learning-impaired student in their class. I know that TAFE colleges are restricted financially in respect of the employment of counsellors to aid the deaf in understanding what the teacher is communicating.

I gather that hearing students have no restrictions placed on them, and I fail to understand why handicapped students should be discriminated against. I received yesterday a most timely letter which is a copy of a letter sent to several members of Parliament. The original letter was sent to the Minister of Education and states:

Our eldest son, Gary, profoundly deaf from birth, is studying for his Matriculation in an integrated setting at Strathmont High School Speech and Hearing Centre. Ever since he began his formal schooling the Education Department has provided specialist teachers of the deaf to instruct and support him in all his educational settings. Because he is currently receiving special one-to-one tutoring, note taking and support with the use of both oral and aural total communication, the school feels sure that he will be successful in gaining his Matriculation. We are most grateful to all the people who have made this possible. However, we are most concerned that there is unsuitable provision for this kind of help and support in the tertiary education of our son.

Flinders University, which has a suitable and challenging course in economics, has indicated a willingness to accept the challenge of continuing our son's education. If Gary does not receive special help in the form of tutor note takers, we are certain that his opportunities will not come to fruition. We are appealing to you and your office to urgently consider providing funds for such a person or persons to assist our son. Gary will be the first ever profoundly deaf person from birth to matriculate from a speech and hearing centre in South Australia.

Speech and hearing centres have been around for 30 or 40 years. The letter continues:

Surely it is the Government's responsibility to provide the equal opportunity for a successful career for our son. We will continue to do our utmost in supporting him morally.

I refer to a report from last month's *News* headed 'Deaf "cheated" in education'. The report states:

Deaf children are being 'cheated' through totally inadequate education, says a specialist. Unless parents demand better services children will be 'defrauded' of their true potential, he claims.

Brother McGrath, head of a New South Wales school for the deaf, Castlehill, said children's deafness is being diagnosed too late and then they were not taught language skills comparable with the rest of the world.

When visiting a deaf school in Sweden, I noticed that children in primary grades were being taught two languages, their own and English. The report continues:

Speaking at Mount Barker Catholic School after attending a Canadian conference on speech and hearing, Brother McGrath said bad Australian education was directly responsible for the poor performance of deaf children. Children with high intelligence left Australian schools with the language skills of a seven-year-old. 'They become multi-handicapped after going through our schools,' he said. 'If realistic lessons were given early they would not end up without adequate language which leads to social and emotional handicaps. These children deserve the right to reach the intellectual potential and educators are defrauding them.'

When I spoke to Brother McGrath on the telephone about the matter he raised in the paper, he said that Australian education of the deaf had often been of poor standard, and I can certainly agree with his comments. The born deaf and those deaf at a very young age go into a school situation at about the age of three years, and most come out at age 16 or 17 greatly lacking in mathematics, reading and writing skills, the essential ingredients required to master further skills.

In Australia there are about one million deaf or hearing impaired people. I do not want honourable members to think that they are all born deaf or get meningitis or something like that early in life. People, as they go through life, working in factories and those sorts of places where noise is very high, contract deafness. About 80 000 of those people are in South Australia. One per cent of them were born deaf and have never heard the spoken word.

With so many deaf and hearing impaired people within the community, some decisive action needs to be taken to improve the lot of this large minority group, and there is no doubt in my mind that we should right the wrongs of the young deaf and look to a better and more satisfying education for them. I could see as a first step an independant inquiry into education of the deaf, and we would, no doubt, come up with some recommendations that would commence to remove some of the discrimination and improve the lifestyle of a generally depressed, but very intelligent, group of people.

Until recently, the deaf have been rather badly treated by the medical benefit funds. The Federal Department of Health does an excellent job with testing, evaluating and the supply of hearing aids and spares until a person reaches the age of 21. I believe that after a person reaches 21 years of age some spare replacements are supplied but no new aids or medical advice is available.

I have made inquiries and believe that hearing aids cost between $400 and $750 each. There are various kinds of hearing aids and that is probably why the price varies. There are, for instance, the aids that fit in the ear; there are other aids that are attached to spectacles; and bigger models. Their life span, generally, is about eight years. I made inquiries of medical benefit funds and found that Medibank does have a refund system.

It will pay $300 towards the cost of hearing aids if one has invested in super-cover after a three-year wait, and I believe that some of the other smaller funds also will come to the aid of their contributors, but the fund that claims to be the biggest of all (Mutual-N.H.S.A.) has not yet seen fit to help its deaf contributors.

In other areas there have been successful attempts to help the deaf. For instance, the deaf are now able to use the telephone—a devise called a tele-printer, its common name being porter-printer, has been designed which is about as big as a small typewriter to which the hearing/speaking piece of the telephone is connected, and, provided the person on the other end has the same gadget, it is possible to type out messages to each other.

These machines are battery operated and are rechargeable by plugging into a power socket, depending on whether one wants a printout or not. The headset is much like a cash register in a supermarket. The words run across the top of the machine. In any case, there are some machines that do a printout. These machines cost between $400 and $600. I know that that price is hard on low income earners. It could be worse, because I am told that the Federal Government has just removed a sales tax impost on machines sold to people who are deaf.

I received further information today that the most expensive machine is now down to $500. In the beginning, when Telecom handled the distribution of these machines, the price was about $800 to the deaf and about $1 000 to hearing people. Naturally, if one's children are deaf and one wants to communicate with them a hearing person has to have one of these machines, also. Probably the one handicap with the telephone is that the question might be asked how does one know when the phone rings and when the other person answers. That is the problem I see. I can imagine a phone conspicuously placed with some kind of lighting signal to overcome this problem. This is not my field, and I can only hope that some capable person will come up with an answer to this problem in the near future.

Another important breakthrough has been the development of the bionic ear implant more properly called the multichannel implantable hearing prosthesis. The idea has been around since the war years and there have been about eight cochlear implants, too. The one I wish to talk about comes from Melbourne and is made by Nucleus Limited in Sydney. Professor Graham Clark and his team at the University of Melbourne have been engaged in the research and development of a multichannel implantable hearing prosthesis since the early 1970s. In 1979 three profoundly deaf people were implanted with a prototype 10-channel device. Intensive psycho-physical testing of the patients was necessary. The results were encouraging, and with support from the Australian Government further development was undertaken.

The University of Melbourne and Nucleus Limited have collaborated in the development of a 22-channel cochlear implant. Over 25 implants have been completed internationally and in Australia with the approval of Government authorities, and 20 of those have been completed in Melbourne and Sydney. I am talking about the 22-channel ones, but there have been ones with less channels implanted in people in other places in the world. At the moment the device seems like a fairly simple arrangement, and consists of an electrode with 22 electrical contacts which is put into the cochlear, and a small control unit is placed in the mastoid bone under the skin behind the ear. This is connected to the electrodes, which electrically stimulate the hearing nerve.

The multichannel cochlear implant allows more information to be sent to the hearing nerves than does a simpler, single electrode implant. The cost of these is fairly fantastic—the single electrode type is $3 000 and the multichannel type is $10 000. Dr Cornwall has indicated that he has every intention of implementing a cochlear implant programme in South Australia. Of course, at present he is uncertain about which hospital this will operate from. Also, there are other costs involved such as doctors; hospitals; people skilled in pre-implant evaluation and counselling preparation for a possible failure; concentrated follow-up work post-operatively; and long-term assistance with the recipients and their families to ease their adjustment.

I turn now to local government matters and to my recent overseas trips where I had the good fortune to have long and interesting talks about local government matters, some aspects of tourism and, in Italy, the official attitude to drinking and driving. During the past session we saw a section of the refurbished Local Government Act passed by the Parliament, but certainly not totally to the Government's satisfaction, as I am sure it was not to the Opposition's total satisfaction. I am positive that local government would have liked a different end result. I believe it is called consensus, where all parties involved are expected to give a little, what is generally accepted to be for the common good. We are yet to see how it all works, but hopefully there will be considerable benefits to local government from the changes to the Act.

The next section of the Act to be considered encompasses the revenue raising responsibilities of councils—rates and taxes. Many ratepayers become irritated when rating is mentioned. Once again this year some people in some council areas believe that they have been unduly penalised. Property revaluation strikes at the very heart of some communities, some sections of which find the valuation increases have been massive. Their exasperation with such a system grows at about the same pace as those who reside in the less influential parts of town and are expected to pay a minimum rate.

Now I would like to turn my attention to the trips I have taken over the past 12 months or so. In June and July last year I visited councils in England, Ireland, Denmark and Germany. These councils were not only involved in the minor matters that are tackled by our South Australian councils, but also the matters that are the preserve of our State Government and the Government authorities that are responsible for our highways, sewerage and water supply, and are the suppliers of electricity and housing.

My first visit was made to the District Council of West Wiltshire, situated at Trowbridge in the County of Wiltshire, with a population of 100 000 people. Elections for councillors are four yearly and district councils are the revenue collectors for the county council and the parish councils. (I found it very interesting to note that farmland was not rated, although the residential premises on the land was rated.) County and parish councils prepare their budgets and their requirements are incorporated in the rate notice sent out by the district council.

A council has only those powers which have been conferred on it expressly by an Act of Parliament and no more. There are two separate systems—one for England and Wales (which differ slightly) and the other for Scotland. Both systems are financed by rates on property levied locally and Government grants. The parish councils of England become the community councils of Wales and Scotland.

Local government functions may be classified into county and district, and parish or community functions. Whereas county and district functions are distinct, the parish functions are mostly concurrent with those of district. However, arrangements may be made so that any council may discharge functions of any other council as its agent. The functions of the parish councils include allotments, burials, cremation, halls, meeting places and entertainment, exercise and recreation facilities, public lavatories, street lighting, off-street parking, footpaths, support of local arts and crafts, encouragement of tourism and the right to be consulted by the district council on planning applications and certain by-laws. District council functions, in addition to parish functions, include aerodromes, civic restaurants, housing, markets, refuse, administration of planning control, formulation of local plans, sewerage on behalf of the water authority, museums, licence of places of entertainment and refreshment, and the constitutional oversight of parishes. County functions include the formulation of structure plans, traffic, transportation and roads, education, public library, museums, youth employment and local services.

I also visited the parish council of Westbury in West Wiltshire and its rate requirement was one new pence in the pound. In both councils I had the opportunity of speaking to the Chairman, Mayor, some councillors, executive officers of the district council and the Town Clerk of Westbury. Councillors usually have political Party affiliation, are not paid for their services but receive an expense allowance.

I next travelled to Ireland and visited Ennis, the administrative centre of County Clare on the west coast of Ireland. Ennis has a population of 11 000 people and County Clare 100 000 people. The elected local authorities of Ireland comprise 27 county councils, four county borough corporations, seven borough corporations, 49 urban district councils, and 23 boards of town commissioners—as can be seen, less councils for a population of 3½ million people than we in South Australia have for about one million people. All council members are elected under a system of proportional representation every five years. Elected members usually have political Party affiliation and are not paid but, as in England, provision is made for the payment of expenses.

The range of services for which local authorities are responsible is broken down into eight main programme groups as follows: housing and building, road transportation and safety, water supply and sewerage, development incentives and controls, environmental protection, recreation and amenity, agriculture, education, health and welfare and miscellaneous services. Because of the small size of their administrative areas, the functions carried out by town commissioners and some of the small urban district councils have tended to become increasingly limited, and the more important tasks of local government have tended to become the responsibility of the county councils.

The local authorities have a system of government which combines an elected council and a whole-time manager. The elected members have specific functions which include the striking of rates (local tax such as levies on street lighting, garbage collection and some forms of buildings), the borrowing of money, the adoption of development plans, the making, amending or revoking of by-laws and the nomination of persons to other bodies. The managers, who are paid officers of their authorities, are responsible for the performance of all functions that are not reserved for the elected members, including the employment of staff, making of contracts, management of local authority property, collection of rates and rents and the day-to-day administration of local authority affairs.

The manager for a county council is also a manager for every borough corporation, urban district council and board of town commissioners whose functional area is wholly within the county. A central body called the Local Appointments Commission is charged with the duty of selecting suitable persons to be appointed by local authorities to chief executive offices, professional offices and other prescribed offices.

The revenue expenditure of local authorities is financed by a local tax, called rates, on the occupation of immovable property, grants and subsidies from the central government and payments for certain services which they provide. Since 1978 full rates relief has applied to houses, the domestic element of mixed property (that is property embodying a domestic as well as a non-domestic use) secondary schools, community halls and farm buildings not previously derated.

Rate relief also applies to land subject to certain criteria. The central government recoups to local authorities in full the amount of rates foregone as a result of this rate relief. Local authorities use a scheme of combined purchasing to obtain commodities of standard quality at the lowest possible price. Official supply contractors are appointed biannually by the Minister for the Environment on the recommendation of an advisory committee. The electoral roll voting register is compiled annually for central government by the local authorities, and an interesting point, but not very commendable, is that postal voting for the State is confined to full-time members of the police and defence forces.

At a later stage in the trip I visited Naestved in Denmark, 90 miles south of Copenhagen. Radical reforms were imposed on local government in Denmark in the early 1970s, and the county councils were reduced from 25 to 14 and the parishes from 1 400 to 277. Naestved is governed by a county council. Council member numbers on county councils can be anywhere between 13 and 31. All members have political affiliation, the mayor is paid full-time and elected from within the council.

Councillors are elected for a four-year term by proportional representation, handling such matters as major roads, hospitals and health services, general education, all matters of social security, and employment; they appoint four of their number to a five-man board to supervise all primary local governments or parishes in the area on behalf of the central Government. The primary municipalities are responsible for water, gas, electricity, community welfare, primary schools, libraries, local roads and other matters for which

our style of council would be responsible. All residents pay a levy for the maintenance of cemeteries and committed church adherents contribute towards the upkeep of the State church, as in Norway. The county councils are the chief tax gatherers on behalf of central Government after central Government has determined the rate.

I next visited the city of Elmshorn in Schleswig Holstein, the most northern State in Germany. Elmshorn has a population of about 40 000 and members of the county council are elected for six years. The Mayor and Deputy Mayor are paid officers of the council, with the Mayor being the chief administrator and the Deputy being the chief of works; one was a Social Democrat and the other a Christian Democrat. Local government provides short distance public transport, local road building, electricity, water, gas, housing, sports facilities, primary and secondary schools, adult education, and youth welfare.

Councils levy their own local taxes and receive in full all land tax, 60 per cent of a manufacturing tax, and 14 per cent of wage and income tax. Even that amount of money is insufficient to complete their tasks. Consequently, Government gives large grants to local authorities, and with grants come directives. Since local administration, have to carry out many Federal and State laws according to exact directives anyway, they believe that they are in danger of becoming mere executive organs of the Government as a whole. In Germany one finds fourtiers of government—municipalities, counties, State Government (which appear to be little more than administrators of Federal directives) and the Federal Government.

In June of this year I spent five weeks in Rome, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Poland, the Berlins, Czechoslovakia, and Vienna in Austria. Whilst in Rome, I kept an appointment with the Government statistical department where I spoke with three officers of the road accident branch. My purpose was to inquire into drink driving accidents and to see whether there was any specific legislation to control drink driving activity and the kind of penalty that a driver might expect to suffer if found guilty.

Italy has no random breath testing legislation and drinking and driving is not considered a problem. I was led to believe that their citizens would not appreciate having to blow into the bag. That is how it was said to me. If a person was visibly drunk, he could be stopped and taken to a cell to sleep it off and then he would go through the same court procedures and penalties that we endure.

It is interesting that a first vehicle drivers licence is issued at the age of 18 years but a licence to drive a small motor bike is issued at 16 years. There are no 'L' or 'P' plates, the speed limit is 50 km/h in built up areas and, although there is no maximum speed limit, 120 km/h seems to be the acceptable limit.

I had an appointment to speak with people in the same field in Belgrade on the morning of the day we were due to leave Belgrade for Australia, but unfortunately I was unable to keep that appointment. The previous day on a flight from Dubrovnik my luggage was lost and I was left wearing the most casual of tourist clothing.

Tourism in these countries was in some ways encouraged, but at times one wondered whether it was a serious consideration. Border crossings of two hours, and at one crossing 3½ hours just to examine passports, are not very encouraging to tourists, and certainly will not bring forth recommendations to others. The guides were mostly very good, but they concentrated on showing tourists the old churches and castles, and talked about the saintly kings of the ninth and tenth centuries who were responsible for building the walled towns and cities. Considering where I was, I thought this approach rather odd. I would rather have seen the present day version of what those places have to offer. In fact, East Berlin was a good example of clean, modern, spacious and beautiful environments, much preferred to the commercial shabbiness of West Berlin. I support the motion.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I support the motion. In doing so, I take the opportunity to comment on several subjects, the first of which is energy. I choose that subject because I believe that inevitably any progress of our society in South Australia and Australia generally and indeed in the world will largely be linked with the source of energy, the consumption of energy, and its end product.

The Stewart Report, which has been very significant in relation to South Australia's immediate energy options, has not had my confidence. I believe that the report is misleading in its interpretation of the position regarding the Wintinna coalfield. Implied judgments made about the Kingston coalmine were very hard to justify on the evidence before the committee, and indeed it was shown that the evidence was certainly not conclusive in that Western Mining has now put forward a different procedure as an option for extracting coal from the Kingston mine.

The Democrats generally and I believe that the extraction of a fuel source and the production of energy are together only one part of energy responsibility. We were very disappointed that the Stewart Report did not contain more specific and significant ingredients for alternatives. The so-called alternatives are energy producing technologies based on renewable energy sources. One of the misnomers and one of the ways in which the Government, the Stewart Report and many people in Australia distort the philosophical background in regard to energy is the reference to those who are extracting coal, gas or oil as 'producers'. I would like to remind the Council that in fact those people produce nothing; they extract the base material from a limited or finite resource. We are blind and foolish if we do not realise that these resources are non-replaceable and that at the current rate of usage they will dry up quite quickly.

Nuclear energy has been put forward quite significantly by other speakers in this debate, and I do not have to remind the Council that Roxby Downs, the suggestion that South Australia should have a nuclear power reactor, and the argument that many countries are beginning to depend on nuclear energy emphasise and underline over and over again the need for our society to confront the issues and challenges of nuclear fuel as a source of energy.

I think that in some ways it is unfortunate that the debate has become what I will describe as attitudinal and that those who take part have been somewhat predictable in that the signals have been pointing in one direction. Apart from the ALP, which moved its signal fairly dramatically from one direction to another, there has been a consistent anticipation from the Liberals and from the Country Party that there would be support for nuclear energy and the mining of uranium. I point out to members in this place and to anyone who reads *Hansard* or hears of the input into this debate that as best as we can we are all obliged to view the evidence objectively detached from a prejudice either for or against nuclear energy. I am not able to exhaustively debate that issue or to give an adequate argument in favour of my position in the time that I intend to take to discuss the matter this afternoon.

Anyone who is reading the newspapers and listening to current news bulletins will be conscious that there is, for example, a dilemma about what to do with fuel rods at Lucas Heights. There was a leakage of uranium hexafluoride from Lucas Heights, and there was a problem in the transport of iridium which, although it is not directly linked to uranium or nuclear energy, highlights yet again the extraordinary dangers that exist when handling and transporting dangerous radioactive material. The significance of this can be seen in

countries that have been practising quite sophisticated technologies for many years. The United Kingdom is an example where at Windscale (now known as Cellafield) there have been quite unacceptable consequences as a result of nuclear energy and nuclear reactors. These may be overcome and there may be ways in which the incidence of accidents and mishaps can be reduced. However, it seems to me to be inevitable that if we continue to proliferate nuclear power reactors—and many are appearing in countries which do not have anything like the back-up technology or the reliability to conform to certain standards—we will be plagued with a profusion of accidents and problems, some of which may reach catastrophic proportions.

I am very reluctant to give any encouragement to the extension of nuclear energy. Where nuclear energy is currently being used I believe that it should be reduced, where possible, and replaced by alternatives, and it is to that which I will now refer. We have been convinced, I think wrongly, that the only way forward for society is through the production and consumption of more energy. Quite obviously, that ignores the remarkable achievements that are available to us through a much wider use of conservation and the efficient use of the energy that we already produce. To support that, I refer to something that I found very significant, namely, a book published by the Productivity Promotion Council of South Australia. The Council is a national non-political, non-profitmaking organisation and its objectives are to enhance productivity improvement in industries and enterprises throughout the nation and to promote understanding throughout the community of the meaning of productivity in its role in improving the standard of living and quality of life of Australians.

The book outlines nearly 70 examples of the successful application of the principles that I have mentioned. In other words, it outlines a more efficient use of the energy produced. The book describes such things as the redirection of heated ambient air; heat exchanges to recover heat from flue gasses; using recovered steam condensate to pre-heat boiler-feed water; insulating process vats; increased stream condensate recovery; and increased recovery from cooling water. There is nothing very exciting about this material, it does not really turn one on, and one does not see banner headlines anywhere proclaiming this book as a breakthrough or a remarkable achievement. Its significance was brought home to me when I added up the actual financial benefits to be gained from the measures described in the book. I emphasise that they are not just suggestions or theories; they are measures recommended and then put into effect and accurately costed. The installation cost of the 70 measures in Australia is $566 573, which is about half a million dollars. The total saving of power cost in the first year would be $1 206 307, or more than twice the amount of the total installation costs. I believe that that is a very significant achievement.

The actual power saved in one year is estimated to be 240 000 gigajoules. That does not mean that there is any less production or fewer jobs; in fact, it means that there are more. It means that there is a very significant and high priority for Australia when we consider our energy needs and the way in which it should be provided. I believe that it is quite ridiculous for us to worry ourselves about how we will supply electricity for an anticipated demand when these measures, if widely used and encouraged, would shrink the required increase away and probably leave us with the luxury of being able to conserve even the energy that we are currently producing and also further extend our current fuel supplies of both coal and gas.

As usual, the Democrats will be urging and promoting the introduction and encouragement of these measures. I do not think that it is too bizarre to consider that there should be legislation for compulsory insulation for housing and industry. I do not apologise for saying that because, unless we take measures which reduce the amount of power consumed, the cost to all consumers will rise. If effective measures can be applied to industry and housing that will reduce the amount of power required, thereby keeping down the cost of power consumed, everyone will have a significant advantage.

The South Australian Government has been very dilatory in following its expressed enthusiasm for solar and alternative energy development in South Australia. In several places there have been expressions of firm intention and enthusiasm in relation to developing prototypes and encouraging research and alternative energy sources. I have not yet found any significant evidence of that being put into practice. I take this opportunity to point out to the Government (perhaps later I will have a chance to reinforce it to the Minister of Mines and Energy) that the Victorian Government has a unit known as the Victorian Solar Energy Council.

I telephoned the Council and was told that it is a statutory authority which has been in existence since January 1981. It is a separate entity from the Mines and Energy Department and reports directly to the Minister. Prior to January 1981, the Victorian Solar Energy Research Committee operated, and it, too, reported directly to the Minister. Funding is 99 per cent from the Victorian Government with occasional Federal grants via the National Energy Research Division for special research and development projects. The current level of funding is $1.5 million per year, of which $500 000 goes in administrative costs, and the Council has 12 permanent employees.

Western Australia has a similar enterprise. It well behoves South Australia to get into this field significantly and positively as soon as possible, even if it is only from a competitive point of view, because I can see enormous advantages to a State that really pioneers and leads the way in solar and other alternative energy sources.

In passing, I would like also to stimulate some enthusiasm from the Government to establish the Arid Zone Botanic Park north of Port Augusta. Although it does not necessarily link into the same issue as solar energy, it is in an area which is very close to the same sort of basic principle. We ought and must, if we are to develop as a society, use the unique advantages that South Australia has. South Australia has an abundance of solar power and energy. It also has unique flora, which could, if properly developed, cause South Australia to become a unique worldwide centre for the study, analysis and propagation of arid zone plants. If there is not reasonably firm and positive action soon to establish the Arid Zone Botanic Park north of Port Augusta we will miss the bus, because I understand that Western Australia certainly has some ideas to put something like this into effect. The indications that I have seen of support for an Arid Zone Botanic Park in correspondence from overseas, interstate and the CSIRO have convinced me that it would be a real bonus to South Australia as a money earner as well as a unique display for tourists and others who may be particularly interested in studying the arid zone flora.

Both of these lead me to comment next on a book that I have just finished reading, which I believe is remarkably significant for us to consider in the latter half of the 20th century. It is by the author of *Future Shock,* Alvin Toffler. It is the latest book that he has published and is called *Previews and Premises.* I believe that he has a very high stature in credibility after his previous books: much of the prophecy and the anticipated development has already taken place, and he is held in high regard as an analyst of the trends and developments that will take place in our society. He has recognised what he sees as a demassifying or a decentralising of the work force.

Some chapter headings will give some clues to it. He is anticipating that a considerable amount of work and employment will revert back into the home or into a domestic situation, and that this may be to the extent of 15 million jobs in the United States of America in the early 1990s. If this trend takes place it will have dramatic consequences for the way in which we plan cities and for energy consumption. There will be a significantly reduced demand on massive transport systems and the communications and electronics industry, and their energy use will be more significantly a factor in our energy consumption. However, as those technologies are relatively very low energy users, it is reasonable to expect that we may move quite quickly to being a much lower energy consuming society, yet at the same time still enjoying equally as good, if not higher, living standards.

I give credit to the Hon. Brian Chatterton, who may be listening somewhere in the building; otherwise, he may not read *Hansard* closely enough to pick this up. His contribution in this debate was significant and showed a vision that Parliaments may not normally be very adept at showing. I hope that his encouragement to us to use the modern technology and adapt it to our needs is heeded by the relevant committees, but, wider than that, he has indicated the way in which our society, for its productivity and its workload, will move. It behoves all of us who are elected to represent the people of South Australia to be aware of the projected developments and to anticipate what consequences they may have on our society.

Alvin Toffler has mentioned in previous books the first wave, which was agricultural; the second wave, which was industrial; and the third wave, which is the electronic development of productivity. He points out that we are notoriously bad at adaptation from one to the other. He believes that the second wave, which was the heavy energy-consuming industrial society, is being wound down and replaced. He sees the smokestack as a relic, which is the sort of analogy that he sees of the trend in which we are moving.

The third wave that he believes that we are moving into has industries that range from electronics, lasers, optics, communications, information, to genetics, alternative energy, ocean science, space manufacture, ecological engineering, and ecosystem agriculture—all reflecting the qualitative leap in human knowledge, which is now being translated into the everyday human economy.

He goes on further to identify that this back-to-the-home movement, as he calls it, will have an enormous impact on the structure of the economy. One of the criticisms of this has been that it would be back to exploited cottage industry situations. He makes the point, and I quote him again:

> Remember—and this point is usually overlooked—these aren't illiterate workers just off some feudal manor. They are sophisticated workers, and they may, in fact, be able to use their home computers, video and telecommunications links to organise new networks, 'electronic guilds,' new professional associations, and other forms of self-managed or self-protective groups. New forms of collective action will be possible, too. Someday we may see 'electronic strikes'. I'd worry more about the conditions of workers left behind in the offices and factories.

That may all sound very bizarre stuff, but I am sure that there are members in this place who are fully conscious of and alert to the messages that Alvin Toffler is giving us in this book. He has made several other quite significant remarks in it. Picking at random a couple of them (because I realise that they have relevance to some of the matters that have been brought up in other speeches in this place), I point out that apparently there was some criticism in America of the close links between the United States and Japan and there was some concern about the further development of a closer alliance between these two countries.

The response in the book is that he does not want to see the world break up into racial blocs. He believes that the close link between Japan and the United States crosses these race lines, and that is good for us all. I intend in a minute briefly to refer to racism and, in particular, to the speech made by the Hon. Mario Feleppa. But while I am dealing with this book, I point out that Toffler infers that the decision-making processes will change because of what he sees as demassifying; the whole process of our society will become more individualistic. More individuals will take part in decision making. I quote him again:

> If I am right that we are demassifying the whole society, from energy and production to family life and values, then even more information is going to pulse through the society, and that means more information and workers and more decisions. It also means that present ruling elites and subelites will not be able to handle the decision load by themselves, any more than the feudal elites at the time of the industrial revolution.

One quote that I am about to give reflects some of the pressure that is on us as Parliamentarians. Toffler has recognised rightly that the profusion of decision making is very high now and likely to increase, and he observes it in this way:

> In fact, if I look around I see highly intelligent men and women making stupider and stupider decisions—in politics, in industry, in investment, in education, in every field. The quality of our decision making is deteriorating across the board. Not because the people in charge are stupid. But because they are all running too fast, making too many decisions too fast about too many things they know too little about.

I find that a very significant and accurate assessment of the situation that we are in; if we are not already in it, then we are on the brink of falling into it. I encourage honourable members to avail themselves of the opportunity to read this book from cover to cover. There is much more in it of great significance to us as Parliamentarians, and I offer to lend copies of the book. I have some extra copies available for any honourable member who may wish to do so, through my rather deficient encouragement to read it, and I will be pleased to make the book available to anyone who asks me for a copy.

I turn now to the question of racism and I congratulate the Hon. Mr Feleppa on what I believe was a very valuable and worthwhile speech. It was a very timely speech to which was added a very timely article to the *Advertiser* of 14 August. Headed 'Immigration debate garbled', I hope that honourable members read it, but I would like to quote some paragraphs, as follows:

> The debate on immigration has degenerated into 'discredited and garbled arguments based on prejudice', according to the New South Wales Ethnic Affairs Commission.
>
> In a report, *The 1984 Immigration Debate—The Myths and the Facts*, the commission says the question of Asian immigration threatens to polarise the Australian community. However, the debate consisted often of unjustifiable attacks on an ethnic minority, and had given credibility to extremist groups. In the 32-page report, the Commission disputes claims that Australia's immigration policies favour South-East Asian migrants over British and European migrants. It argues that immigration procedures actually favour British applicants for visas. It says that in 1983-84, 26 per cent of all resident visas for immigrants were granted to British applicants, even though they were less than 11 per cent of all applicants.

The article further states:

> 'Any move to resurrect race as a criterion for settlement in Australia would have a far-reaching effect on our foreign relations,' it says. 'It would also mean Australia wants to embrace racist policies. Any return to racist policies would have a disastrous effect on the relationships with our trade partners and on Australia's development.'

It is most unfortunate that that is always a vulnerable part of any society—the fear that living standards and security will be threatened by some identifiable group has been played on by those who wish to use the racist reaction by

people as an election issue or as a basis of pressure within society.

I believe that the actual groups who are identified here, the extremist groups, are entitled to have their opinions and, provided they act within the law, one cannot have any serious objections to their activities. I am disappointed that political Parties, and I include some expressions from the Liberal Party and National Party in this, in my opinion have abused the situation by playing on the fears of people who may be tempted to vote for them along lines which I frankly do not believe in their heart of hearts they hold—certainly not the Liberal Party.

It seems to me that as a society we came somewhat staggering out of a white Australia policy into a new era of recognising that all people were equal and would be welcome in Australia regardless of their country of origin. To have a return, even if it be briefly for the time of an election, to a state of mind where human beings are to be identified and treated in a particular way as far as entry and acceptance into Australia is concerned, on the basis of their race or country of origin, is completely abhorrent to me.

I believe that Australia has an exciting future with the blend of all groups, ethnic and racial, who join us. I believe that in so much of the life in Australia today we are working harmoniously and productively with the mix and I, for one, welcome unreservedly the addition of Asian groups into our society, the same as I have in regard to those from European sources. It is most unfortunate if anyone plays on the gullibility and ignorance of Australians in this matter just to whip up some temporary electoral support.

The last two matters that I will address include one which is important and which was referred to by the Hon. Mr Bruce—unemployment. Without spending time analysing unemployment statistics, we believe that there will be from now on a significant number of Australians who are unable to get traditional jobs as we have known them in the past. A considerable number of Australians will be experiencing unemployment. The indications given to me are that, although there may be 10 per cent of Australians who are unemployed at a particular time, because of the rotating nature and sharing of the actual work available by people who are unemployed and who then get a job and then return to being unemployed, about 30 per cent of the Australian work force have direct experience of unemployment.

One of the most deleterious effects of that will be the mental deterioration, mental torpor or bruising that people suffer from being exposed to unemployment. The Democrats have become particularly aware of this because of an initiative that the Hon. Mr Milne took 18 months ago when we were somewhat bemused about what we could do to help the situation for the unemployed. We thought we would ask the unemployed to come and speak to us and it was on his suggestion that we invited representatives from organisations of unemployed people and the unemployed themselves to come to Parliament House to meet us. They did so with some degree of suspicion and concern as to why they were asked to come. Over the ensuing 18 months their confidence in the exercise was assured. The Democrats, as an organisation, as a political Party, gradually slipped into the background and eventually off the actual organisation that grew around this meeting. It is known as South Australian Unemployed Group in Action Incorporated (SAUGA), and it has just been granted funds through the CEP to employ four staff and set up an office.

The most outstanding feature of this whole exercise has been the sense of self-respect, dignity and achievement that so many unemployed people are feeling because of the very high regard Government departments and several politicians, both Federal and State, have for this organisation. The press has recognised it and will continue to recognise it. I believe that this body we have set up in South Australia is a first for Australia. It is a body that deserves the support of all political Parties in this State. We have had inquiries from Western Australia and Victoria about SAUGA, which is an umbrella organisation that nurtures the formation of support groups and gives a visible identity to those who are unemployed, many of whom until now have felt ashamed of being publically recognised as being unemployed. This enterprise is doing a lot to overcome that.

The final subject that I will discuss is the status of the Legislative Council. We have received indications that legislation will be introduced to make changes to the terms of office of Legislative Counsellors and to the ability of the Legislative Council to block Supply. A question was asked today by the Leader of the Opposition about security in this building. Quite obviously during the next few months we will be dealing with the character, status and management of the Legislative Council. I believe that it is irrefutable that the Legislative Council is a significant House of Parliament in South Australia and on an equal footing with the House of Assembly.

Whatever distinction or arrangement of operation is arrived at must in no way reflect or impose an inferior role on the Legislative Council. The only way in which I could be persuaded to even consider a change would be if proportional representation was accepted as the means of electing members to the House of Assembly. If that was the case, I believe that the House of Assembly would share with the Legislative Council the same degree of democratic participation in the election of its members and that jointly both Houses could agree on certain procedures and restrictions that could apply, not to reduce the power of this place but to facilitate the proper working of the Parliament.

I can see no justification for denigrating Legislative Councillors to the position of second class politicians where they would not have the same influence and control over the affairs of the State as members elected to the House of Assembly.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: That interjection is very valid and accurate—we are more democratically elected than are House of Assembly members.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall interjecting:

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: That might well come; one never knows what might happen. We are limited to only three Ministers in this Council and I am not sure whether that is a precedent or a restriction under the Constitution Act.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: A precedent.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: It is a precedent. It seems sad that it has deprived the people of South Australia of the services of some excellent people serving in the Ministry. If one was to accept that there were not to be Ministers appointed from the Legislative Council, one must acknowledge that South Australia would loose a lot in the quality of its Government.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: That would be unthinkable.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: Yes, it would certainly be unthinkable.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: At this time.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I am glad to hear that interjection—I hope it is being recorded. As this is such an important House, it is also obvious that it must work properly and efficiently, and that means that members of the Legislative Council must be able to work properly and efficiently. The workload has increased and it will increase even more.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: You are not suggesting personal assistants, are you?

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: A suggestion has come forward from the Opposition back bench that personal assistants

may be the subject of discussion. I believe that personal assistants may well be justified for Legislative Councillors. One has only to compare the staff allocated to Senators, who have little more work than Legislative Councillors—and I am not even prepared to concede that they have a greater workload than certain Legislative Councillors. Senators have three full-time staff members, a fully equipped office and various other facilities, which means that they can do their job properly. If they are entitled to, and need, those sorts of facilities to do their job, that must mean, *ipso facto* (and I hope that that is the correct phrase in the circumstances), that Legislative Councillors cannot do their job properly, because they do not have three full-time staff members, an independent suite of offices or the other facilities that Senators have. In fact, I get the impression that in many cases we are being treated rather like errant school pupils and that we almost have to be apologetic for being Legislative Councillors.

I, for one, find that a very uncomfortable situation in which to try to do my work. I think that it is appropriate to point out to the people of South Australia that they will not get the best value for their dollar unless Legislative Councillors can do their work adequately and with the proper and necessary assistance that they require. I do not intend to go through the small detail of what I believe should be altered for the better running of the Legislative Council. However, I would like to make two or three significant points. Security has got to the point where I for one question whether it is necessary. What price do we pay for the ultimate in security? What has happened to the character of Parliament House, which I believe should be available to the people—and people should feel comfortable about coming here. I think that we have lost at least a part of that feeling through current procedures. It will depend on how humanely people exercise their power. I think that paranoia is the word for the implementation of the security system in this building.

I wish to make one remark regarding staff. Some of us have employed staff independent of the staff supplied by the Government. In my opinion that is a proper choice for a Legislative Councillor to make. I believe that the way in which this building and the offices are run should facilitate members getting the full value from assistants. Whether Legislative Councillors choose to employ individuals to help in their tasks or accept voluntary help is a matter for each member. I, for one, spend some thousands of dollars employing an assistant who is employed for 99 per cent of the time directly helping me with my political duties and Parliamentary responsibilities; a small percentage of time is directed at anything that could be described as Party political. I know from conversations with other Legislative Councillors and members in the House of Assembly that several other members employ assistants. It is my opinion that the management of Parliament must be arranged so that we get the best benefit with the least restriction and with some humane understanding of the circumstances. I do not believe that that would in any way detract from the acceptable standards of security in this place. The last point I make (and I do not for a moment pretend that this is a comprehensive assessment) relates to how we work in this place. I would like to mention offices as such.

Traditionally, the Legislative Council has had its offices in this building, and that might have been quite adequate and justified in the early days but, if the situation of offices and the working of the Legislative Council in this building restricts the ability of members to do their job, the matter must be reviewed. However, I do not see any reason why we cannot operate quite satisfactorily in these offices in this building if we as members of the Council confront the problem, accepting that different individuals have different requirements because of their constituent loads and their areas of responsibility. There must be some flexibility and understanding—that is the key.

There seems to be no justification for hard and fast, concrete, or petty rules for the conduct of this place, given that we are all here (we must assume) with the same intention—to serve the people of South Australia to the best of our ability. We are not here to sabotage the happy workings of this place, its efficiency or its security. The time has come to review the matter, because the workload of the Legislative Council will continue to increase so that all Legislative Councillors will have more work both in regard to legislation and from direct constituent approach. I support the motion.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and in doing so I, too, express my sympathies to the families of the late Claude Allen and Charlie Wells, both former members of this Parliament who have died since we last met. Unlike some of my more fortunate colleagues who have preceded me in this debate, I was not able to broaden my horizons by way of an overseas study tour in the Parliamentary recess this year.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: You had a right to, though.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Yes. I took the opportunity, however, to expand my knowledge in other ways, and I would like to talk about some of the things I learnt during the recess. For example, soon after Parliament prorogued in May I attended the week long 54th ANZAAS Congress in Canberra which was attended by about 3 000 people and ranged over some 45 different disciplines from the physical, natural and social sciences. During the week, dozens of papers were presented on a huge range of topics. I registered for the women's studies section which, incidentally, had the highest registration of all sections of the congress. I heard many stimulating presentations on a range of topics, one of which I will refer to later.

During the week I also attended the congress symposia, that is, the cross-disciplinary sessions dealing with the nuclear arms race and related issues. I had the opportunity to listen to two or three speeches delivered by Petra Kelly, who is the controversial co-founder of the Green Party in West Germany. Although on occasions her presentation was slightly over zealous and her attention to detail and fact was sometimes lacking, nevertheless I believe that she is a truly dynamic and charismatic political figure. People with Miss Kelly's dedication, energy and ability to awaken interest and passion will play a critical role in increasing awareness about the likelihood of nuclear conflict unless we take action to prevent it.

This leads me to a related matter, which should be of concern to all South Australians, namely, the role of the joint defence facilities or bases in Australia, in particular Nurrungar in the North of South Australia. I refer also to recent comments by our Foreign Minister, Bill Hayden, in relation to the bases. Recently I read some of the research work of Dr Des Ball and Mr Andrew Mack, both of the Strategic Studies and Defence Centre at the Australian National University. They both argue strongly and cogently that the three key installations in Australia, at Pine Gap, North West Cape and Nurrungar, are certain to be Soviet targets in the event of a nuclear war between the superpowers.

Since Nurrungar is so close to population centres in South Australia, particularly the Iron Triangle, we have a very real reason for taking an interest in the functions of this ground station so that we can decide whether or not the benefits of hosting such a ground station outweigh the risk of our being a nuclear target. Let there be no doubt that Nurrungar would be a target in the event of a nuclear war between the

superpowers. This is a view not only of academics such as Dr Ball and Mr Mack: the Australian Government too has acknowledged that this would be so.

The probable loss of life and damage caused could be quite devastating. For example, it has been estimated that, if there was a ground burst nuclear strike on Nurrungar, which is the most likely scenario, and if sufficiently high winds carried fallout from Nurrungar to the Iron Triangle, up to 10 000 people could be killed if no action was taken to evacuate them. Clearly, this is an important issue for all South Australians. Some people argue that, if Nurrungar is a nuclear target, we should just close it down and rid ourselves of the problem, but unfortunately it is not that simple. In addition to the potential costs of allowing Nurrungar to continue, there are also benefits to Australia and to the cause of world peace by having such ground stations situated in this country. Nurrungar is a vitally important ground station to the United States early warning system. There are three satellites in the early warning network which provide warning of Soviet missile launches. Nurrungar processes the warning data transmitted to it from the eastern hemisphere satellite which hangs in stationary orbit some 23 000 miles above the Indian Ocean. This satellite detects launches of Soviet land-based missiles with its infra-red and visible light sensors.

The satellite gives some 25 to 30 minutes warning of a Soviet land-based missile attack, and provides independent confirmation of attack warnings. This is extremely important as a safety check on false alerts, which have been alarmingly numerous in recent years. Therefore, this system may not only give early warning of a real nuclear attack but may also prevent an accidental war. In this sense Nurrungar plays an important stabilising role—that is, reducing the probability of nuclear war.

On the other hand, it also plays a destabilising role. The intelligence which is collected via the satellite contributes to United States nuclear war-fighting strategies. For example, such information would be used by United States war planners for re-targetting United States nuclear weapons in the event of protracted nuclear war, which the Reagan Administration talks about. In other words, the satellites, and hence Nurrungar, contribute both to strategic stability, via the early warning functions, and to strategic instability, via their contribution to the war-fighting capabilities.

This brings me to the recent statements made by Australia's Foreign Minister, Bill Hayden. Since taking office, Bill Hayden has argued correctly that the warning functions of ground stations such as Nurrungar should be supported. However, last week in Geneva he said something more. He said that, if it appeared to be the case that the superpowers—and it was quite clear he was talking about the United States—continued to fail to make progress towards genuine arms control and disarmament (and he specifically mentioned a complete test ban treaty), a freeze on new nuclear weapons systems and deep cuts in existing inventories, Australia would have to reconsider its position on the bases.

The reality at present is that the United States broke off negotiations on a complete test ban treaty with the Soviets and that the Reagan Administration has no interest at all in negotiating such a treaty. A complete test ban treaty would interfere with the Administration's so-called strategic modernisation programme, which includes the following new weapons systems: the MX and the Trident II missiles; the nuclear-armed sea launched cross missile; the B1B bomber and the stealth bomber; and all the space weapons systems in the so-called star wars programme.

The complete test ban treaty would hamper developments of these systems. The freeze on new nuclear weapons would prevent their deployment completely, which is why the Reagan Administration bitterly opposes the idea of a nuclear freeze, which the Australian Government supports. I think that Bill Hayden is quite right to draw attention to the fact that it is the United States, quite as much as the Soviet Union, which is dragging its feet on arms control. Indeed, the Reagan Administration rejects the idea of meaningful arms control except on terms it knows the Russians will refuse.

Many arms controllers in the United States today believe that the United States has given up on arms control altogether. Individuals appointed to the top arms control positions in the Reagan Administration have been, without exception, noted in the past for their bitter opposition to such arms control measures as SALT II. Only by third parties, such as Australia, standing up and saying publicly what many people in this country have believed privately for some time will there be any chance of any progress being made.

Until now our Department of Foreign Affairs disarmament experts, backed by the Minister, have believed that the best way to deal with the United States was via quiet diplomacy. There is now increasing recognition that on the central arms control issues of the day the Reagan Administration is simply unpersuadable. This is why it is necessary to raise the issue publicly as Mr Hayden did so eloquently in Geneva and, in view of the fact that Nurrungar is located in this State and therefore jeopardises the lives of thousands of South Australians unless there is arms control, we should give our full support to Bill Hayden's efforts.

I now turn to a new topic. I will discuss the paper to which I referred earlier and which was presented in the women's studies section at the recent ANZAAS Congress. The paper was delivered by Elizabeth Savage, an economist from the University of Sydney, and she presented some very important and interesting ideas about our system of taxation in Australia.

In the paper entitled 'Discrimination and Public Policy: The role of traditional economic theory', Ms Savage asserts that traditional tax theories which form the main stream thinking of public policy making economists in Australia have the effect of discriminating against women and the poor. They do this, she says, for two reasons: first, traditional public finance uses income as a means of making welfare comparisons between individuals and the joint income of husband and wife when comparing welfare levels of families; and secondly, that goods and services produced in the household sector are assumed not to contribute to welfare. Ms Savage says that as modern tax theory as espoused by economists in the United States and the United Kingdom does not make either of these mistakes and many of the gender inequities of the existing tax benefit system could be removed by a consistent application of what is the current state of the art of tax theory.

The concern of Governments that the collection and distribution of taxes and benefits among individuals should be according to their ability to pay or their need is not at issue between the old and the new approach. What is at issue is that modern theorists say that the traditional idea of excluding from the measure some factor or commodity which cannot be taxed (such as leisure) is not satisfactory. Modern theorists say that such items should be explicitly taken account of by altering the rules for what should be taxed and the rates at which they should be taxed. If there are exclusions from the tax base because certain items cannot be taxed, either because they cannot be observed (for example, leisure) or for political reasons (for example, capital gains) then the ideal structure of rates on what can be taxed should reflect these constraints for both equity and efficiency reasons.

Coming back to the discrimination that exists in the current system, Ms Savage says that the Australian tax/

benefit system discriminates between individuals on sex and marital status. The discrimination takes the form of higher effective rates of tax on the earned incomes of married women and sole parents. The most disadvantaged are women with low-earning capacities.

High effective marginal tax rates arise from the interaction of the tax system and income tested and taxed benefits which institutionally reside in the social security system, and also from other income tested benefits and rebates such as housing grants, rent rebates, the Medicare levy, rebates for child care, and secondary and tertiary allowances. The cumulative effects on women are frequently ignored, partly because they are administered by different departments and even different levels of Government, but primarily, Ms Savage asserts, because of an incorrect use of economic theory.

The tax system disadvantages couples where both earn, because taxable income substantially overstates the relative ability to pay of two-earner households which, because of their time commitments to paid work, are unable to benefit from the levels of untaxed activity to which single-earner couples have access. The two-earner couple is not able to deduct or obtain a rebate for items which the stay-at-home spouses provide during working hours (such as child care), even though the single-earner couple is not being taxed on the value of these services provided in the home. So the value of goods and services produced by market sector earners is taxed; the value contributed by the spouse at home cannot be taxed.

It is sometimes argued that the tax system advantages the two-earner couple by giving them access to two tax free zones (currently $4 595, totalling $9 190). Ms Savage points out that two-earner couples in fact have only one tax free zone of $4 595 and one of $282, the second being the separate net income of the spouse allowed before the dependent spouse rebate begins to be withdrawn. Therefore, if the two-income couple is portrayed as having two tax free zones, it should be recognised that the dependent spouse rebate substantially offsets the second tax free zone. The dependent spouse rebate, because it is withdrawn at a rate of 25c in the dollar, is equivalent to an additional tax free zone of either $4 402 (when there are dependent children) or $3 602. This implies that the single-earner couple in effect has a tax free threshold of either $8 997 or $8 197. Therefore, there is discrimination against two-earner couples who, for a given income level, pay approximately the same tax as a single-earner couple, despite working twice as long to earn the taxed income.

This illustrates the error in using joint income as the indicator of household welfare. And since low wage husbands tend to marry low wage wives and they tend to predominate among two-earner households, this discrimination against two-earner couples simultaneously discriminates against the poor. But this discrimination has a differential impact by sex, because the high effective marginal tax rates are conditional on wives earning income and so the disincentive to work is borne largely by women.

Married women earning over $282 effectively pay tax at the rate of 25 per cent because of the withdrawal of the dependent spouse rebate. This is significantly less than the $4 595 that single individuals and primary earners (usually husbands) can earn before paying tax.

The position of women is even worse when we consider the interaction of the tax and benefit system. It is not unusual for working married women to lose 80 cents out of each dollar earned due to taxation and the loss of income-tested benefits and rebates, such as the dependent spouse rebate, family income supplement, unemployment benefits, supporting parents benefit, secondary allowances, TEAS, first home scheme grant, rent rebates, child care rebates, and so on.

Because all these payments are income-tested on joint income and because it is the wife who leaves and re-enters the workforce, the effective tax rates on the earnings of married women (and sole parents) can be extreme. The term 'poverty trap' has been coined to describe the severity of these disencentive effects, and where effective marginal tax rates approach or exceed 100 per cent they have been termed 'unemployment traps'.

As an example of this, if we look at the case of a wife of an unemployed husband, we see that there is an effective marginal tax rate in excess of 100 per cent for substantial portions of the wife's earning range. If she is in the lower earning range, this results from the interaction of the dependent spouse rebate and unemployment benefit withdrawal; if she is in the higher earning range, it results from the interaction of taxation and unemployment benefit withdrawal. Over these income ranges, the wife's earnings actually result in a reduction in net family income; for example, net family income is reduced by $350 per annum if the wife works 23 rather than nine hours weekly.

For the wife of a husband on unemployment benefits and for the supporting parent there is a no net return even from working full-time, and if additional costs of earning, such as child care and transport costs, were taken into account the net income from the wife's full-time employment is likely to be significantly negative. Therefore, for people in these circumstances there is no way out of poverty, because of the combined effects of taxation and social security.

The withdrawal of other benefits and rebates, as I mentioned before—such as rent rebates, allowances for children in education, health levies, and so on—all combine with the tax system to reduce the net incomes of married women, particularly low wage married women, and sole parents who work. It is accurate to say that many women have been taxed out of the workforce.

Ms Savage further makes the point that, although the tax rates faced by women are frequently much higher than those faced by the highest income earners, it is only the disincentive effects on high wage earners that are given prominence, despite empirical studies which indicate that high wage males are unresponsive to taxation in contrast to women.

Ms Savage claims that this discrimination in the existing tax/benefit system is ignored in Australian discussions of policy reform, because the vast majority of contributors to the debate remains firmly wedded to the public finance tradition; so they keep advocating more of the same. The sort of proposals which are currently popular are such ideas as explicity joint taxation, either of the aggregation or averaging type, or increments to the existing joint nature of the tax system, such as by increasing the dependent spouse rebate; further means testing on the basis of joint income for such items as family allowances; the replacement of social security payments by a guaranteed minimum income on a household basis, or increased reliance on constant rate indirect taxation. Of course, Ms Savage makes the point that such proposals are expounded by people across the political spectrum.

She says that the policies recommended in Australia contrast sharply to the academic advice in the United Kingdom and United States which advocates departing from the public finance rules of thumb on which these policies rely. For example, in the United Kingdom it has been found that increasing reliance on a constant rate Value Added Tax has worsened the welfare position of the poor; and in the United States it has been found that eliminating joint taxation, introducing child care tax exemptions for working wives and exempting part of wives' earned income all increased social welfare. Another study has suggested that, because

wives' labour supplies are very responsive to taxation, an optimum tax structure would tax them at approximately half the marginal rate of men at the same income level. So what these new theorists are saying is that selective taxes that differ according to sex or marital status may be desirable, but that they would discriminate in the reverse direction to the discrimination in the existing tax systems.

As a lay person, I find these ideas very interesting. They clearly challenge the theories of traditional economists of the right and the left who are the people currently advising Australian Governments and they challenge many of the ideas being pursued by political Parties of all persuasions in this country.

Although we at the State level have no direct control over taxation policy, we have a very real interest in the effects of such policy in relation to our role in redistributing tax moneys collected by way of provision of services and so on, and also in terms of our interests as a State Parliament in diminishing inequalities between individuals in our society.

We also have a responsibility to listen to new or different ideas and to encourage debate among public policy analysts so that we can be sure that we have access to the best possible advice for, as John Maynard Keynes once said (as quoted by Ms Savage):

> 'Practical men' . . . are usually the slaves of some defunct economists. Madmen in authority, who hear voices in the air, are distilling their frenzy from some academic scribbler of a few years back . . . The ideas that civil servants and politicians and even agitators apply to current events are not likely to be the newest. But soon or late it is ideas, not vested interests, which are dangerous, for good or evil.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.45 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday 16 August at 2.15 p.m.