

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 8 August 1985

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

MOANA PRIMARY SCHOOL

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

Moana Primary School Redevelopment.

QUESTIONS

IDENTITY CARDS

The **Hon. M.B. CAMERON**: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Attorney-General a question about identity cards.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. M.B. CAMERON**: The matter of identity cards appears to be slowly building up in the community. It appears that some decision is to be made in the near future by the Federal Cabinet or Government—I am not sure which—about this subject. From my private conversations and from indications that I have received, this matter cuts right across Party lines and there is a wide variance of opinions in both major political Parties. I am not sure how this matter is seen by the Australian Democrats. Certainly, within the two major Parties there is a wide difference of opinion.

There are two sides to the issue. On the one hand it is said that we must have the cards because that is the only way in which we shall be able to catch the tax evaders and the people who are receiving benefits to which they are not entitled. On the other hand, it is said that the cards will lead to the deprivation of civil liberties—that people should not be forced to carry a card bearing a photograph identifying themselves, and that that will lead to information being held by the Government that citizens might not want it to hold.

I come down very firmly on the side of no identity card. I have always taken exception to mass identification of the population. I would take exception to any public servant being told that he shall have a photograph of me and I shall carry a card. I think that all citizens have the right to remain anonymous if they so wish and that their identity is their own business. I do not think that anyone should have to be identified by a number. I even have some objection to the Medicare card. However, it appears that to obtain benefits one must have a card. That was the start—

The **Hon. K.L. Milne**: The cards are all right, but it is the cost.

The **Hon. M.B. CAMERON**: The cost is the other end of it. I do not even like the card. Certainly, at least with that, one does not have to have a photograph on it, but that is only a small part of it. Over the years that I have been in Parliament I have observed the steps that have been taken to try to force members of Parliament to have identity cards to enter this building. Indeed I recall everybody lining up for their photographs to get an identity card.

Members interjecting:

The **Hon. M.B. CAMERON**: You are right there. I can assure honourable members opposite who are saying that that I did not line up either, and I had no intention of lining up. If it meant I could not get into the building and

come to Parliament because of the lack of an identity card, so be it. I have no intention of having any public servant ever getting a photograph of me on an Australia card so we might well have another problem.

I think that when it reaches a stage where a person's identity rests entirely on a number or a card, there is something wrong with our society. We are a free society and a citizen should have the right to say 'Yes' or 'No' to the carrying of such cards. The old saying that 'hard cases make bad laws' really comes to the fore in this one. Why should every citizen of the State have a card because some people are doing the wrong thing? The fault is in the original law that is being flouted and should not be cured by mass coverage of every citizen. However, those are my points of view. I now ask the Attorney-General the following questions:

1. Has the State Cabinet or the State Labor Party considered this question?

2. If so, what are the views of the Government on this issue?

3. If neither of those things has happened, as the Attorney-General is the person who is entrusted at the present time with the law of this State, I ask what are his views on the subject of identity cards?

The **Hon. C.J. SUMNER**: This matter is being considered by the Federal Government. The State Government has not considered the matter up to this point in time.

The **Hon. M.B. CAMERON**: Could I ask a supplementary question? I think it is important that a person in the position of Leader of the Government and the Attorney-General should answer the last question: what are his views on the subject of identity cards?

The **Hon. C.J. SUMNER**: I could do that, but it seems to me that I happen to be in this place as Leader of the Government and Attorney-General with a number of other portfolios and—

The **Hon. M.B. Cameron**: You don't have a point of view?

The **Hon. C.J. SUMNER**: At this point in time I am not prepared to express a point of view to the honourable member or to the Council, except to say that the State Government has not so far considered this matter.

CENTRAL LINEN SERVICE

The **Hon. J.C. BURDETT**: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking the Minister of Health a question concerning the Central Linen Service.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J.C. BURDETT**: Yesterday the Minister of Health issued a press release on the Central Linen Service. In it he expressed in glowing terms his support for the Central Linen Service and its performance over the last two years. The Central Linen Service has been operating for many years now and has been the subject of extended and ongoing criticism, both because of its role in competing with the private sector and because of its consumption of taxpayers' funds. The Central Linen Service competes against a number of private sector laundries on a most unfair basis. It is, for example, exempt from sales tax on all its purchases and consequently has an immediate commercial advantage.

The Central Linen Service now appears to be undertaking a plan to squeeze out many private operators. One of the major arguments in the operation of the Central Linen Service in the past has been the need to provide the proper provision of laundry and linen services to public sector hospitals. However, the situation has now developed where even very small private hospitals and nursing homes are being approached by the Central Linen Service.

I am aware of a case where the Central Linen Service has taken work from the private sector at a cost for standard flat linen of between 35 and 40 cents per kilogram. This undercutting of private sector charges is not the result of a healthy, free market. It is possible only because the Central Linen Service is able to use its contacts with the large public hospitals to subsidise its activities in the small hospitals and nursing homes.

This is evidenced by the fact that the Royal Adelaide Hospital pays some 90c per kilogram as against the 35c to 40c for the laundry of standard linen. I acknowledge that standard linen is flat linen plus some other linen, but it is 120c for theatre linen. The Royal Adelaide Hospital pays 90c per kilogram for standard linen, a variation of up to 55c on charges paid to the Central Linen Service by some small private hospitals and nursing homes. In addition, the Government is now committed by way of the South Australian Financing Authority to a further \$10.4 million to upgrade yet again the facilities of the Central Linen Service. There seems little doubt that the Minister of Health has embarked on a course of takeover of as large a section of the private sector laundry service as possible. Yet, there is no advantage for the South Australian public in such an expansion by the Central Linen Service. Indeed, an analysis of the output of the Central Linen Service and the private sector laundries shows that the economic performance of private laundries remains substantially better than that of the Central Linen Service. The output when related to the staff employed in the private sector is considerably higher, and the risk is taken by the private sector rather than by the Government (using taxpayers' funds).

I am aware that a number of private sector operators are confident that they could handle the business of the Central Linen Service at a much lower cost in both the short and the long terms and could do so without putting taxpayers' funds in jeopardy or requiring Government guarantees. I am aware, too, that a number of private sector organisations would be interested in purchasing the Central Linen Service.

The Minister's statement yesterday failed to address the long-term issues that I have raised. Accordingly, I ask:

1. Will the Government review its decision to pour additional resources into the Central Linen Service?
2. Does the Minister acknowledge that the Central Linen Service is not required to incorporate the same costs as is the private sector and that it therefore has an unfair competitive advantage?
3. On what basis does the Minister claim in his press release that South Australian public hospitals saved \$2.2 million as a result of using the Central Linen Service?
4. What freeze on charges is applied to public hospitals?
5. What is the economic value of the output per employee of the Central Linen Service?
6. What interest rate is charged on loans being extended to the Central Linen Service?
7. What steps are taken to guarantee that information contained in tenders by private enterprise is not disclosed to the Central Linen Service in order to give it unfair advantage when settling tenders?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I am delighted that the Hon. Mr Burdett has raised this matter. In fact, I was about to pass a note back to my friend and colleague the Hon. Ms Levy to ask whether she would mind in her usual well informed way asking me a question or two about the Central Linen Service so that we could say a word or two about it. While I am on my feet, I may also say a word or two about Mr Olsen's proposed sale of the century. He will sell all of the successful public enterprises in South Australia: that is Liberal Party policy.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: We will tell you about the success of the Central Linen Service in a moment. Not only does Mr Olsen propose to sell all of the successful State enterprises—all of those assets that belong to the people of South Australia—but he and his political colleagues propose to import for this purpose a couple of Mrs Thatcher's experts. Let us look at what privatisation has done for the United Kingdom.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Davis will come to order straightaway: otherwise it is the end of the sitting for him. I wanted to remind—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Honourable members had a fairly good run in the first couple of days. If honourable members carry on stupidly when they ask questions, I will have to take some action against them. I point out to the Minister that, although I have no jurisdiction over his method of answering questions, his reply should have some relevance to the question.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I thank you for that assistance, Mr President, because in fact I am in full flight in answering the first question whether we would review our decision. The simple answer is 'No'. We are very happy with our decision. We do not intend, as do our Liberal opponents, to bring hatchet men from the United Kingdom to tell us how to sell off successful State enterprises.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Is that what they are going to do?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: That is exactly what they are going to do. On numerous occasions they have pledged and re-pledged that, particularly in respect of the Central Linen Service and other successful State enterprises. It is apparently also Federal policy.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: They will have someone from Mrs Thatcher's Government?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Mr Olsen is fresh back from the United Kingdom, where he took advice from some Treasury official.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: So he thinks we are unable to run our own affairs?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Well, he wants to bring people from 20 000 kilometres away but, worse than that, he wants to introduce privatisation or Thatcherism into South Australia. Thatcherism in the United Kingdom, where it has been carried to its ultimate and logical end point, has brought the United Kingdom to its knees. That country currently has 3.5 million people unemployed. This is the policy espoused by the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues. When I became Minister of Health the Central Linen Service was a shambles. It had been allowed, as a matter of quite deliberate policy, to run down during the three years and two months of the Tonkin interregnum and it was a disgraceful mess. Not unnaturally, morale was at an all-time low.

I talked to the laundry people about what its future ought to be, and I was assured that the situation could be turned around quite dramatically. That assurance was given to me not only by people within the health system but also via Touche Ross, which had been appointed by the Tonkin Government as consultant to review the operation of the laundry and to make recommendations on its future. Touche Ross recommended that a number of things be done to turn around the laundry and make it a successful and viable enterprise.

The first stage of that program has been implemented. As a result of increased and improved management, the laundry's performance is such that productivity has increased from 27 kilograms per operator hour to 35 kilograms per operator hour—an increase in productivity of 30 per cent. If any private corporation in this country was able to increase

its productivity by one-third of that amount in the same period, naturally there would be headlines in the financial pages—and so there should be. There was a 30 per cent increase in productivity.

However, the Hon. Mr Burdett makes disparaging remarks about efficiency *vis-a-vis* private sector laundries. Let me tell the Council and the people of South Australia (because they ought to know) in the context of this debate that that is the highest productivity for any large-scale laundry in Australia—that is incontrovertible fact.

It is also a fact that, since this Government came to office, and since it entered into a contract with the management and work force at the Central Linen Service, it has been able to impose a price freeze on laundry that is processed by that service. That has meant to this point in time a direct saving to the public hospital system in this State of \$2.2 million, and that sum has, in turn, been reinvested directly in the major teaching hospital system in South Australia.

I am sure honourable members recall that we inherited a public hospital system that was reeling from the assault that had been made on it during the unhappy three years of the Tonkin Government. That \$2.2 million was part of the \$10 million that we were able to reinject into the budgets of the major teaching hospitals. That is what has happened—the laundry is a remarkable success story! The fact is that at this stage it has expanded its clientele and currently services 108 hospitals, nursing homes and other institutions.

The latest plan for the service involves the consolidation of the existing debt structure plus further borrowings to purchase from overseas the very latest, state-of-the-art equipment. It will be the highest tech and most up-to-date equipment in Australia. For commercial reasons, I am unable and unwilling to divulge the fine details of that equipment, because the service operates competitively in the market place with private industry.

There was an accumulated debt over the Central Linen Service of \$4.9 million. That debt had accumulated over many years and particularly during the three years of neglect by the former Liberal Government. That entire debt (some of which was interest) will be repaid in full to Treasury; there will be no write-offs, and no commercial advantage given to the Central Linen Service. Using finance from the South Australian Financing Authority the service will pay in full \$4.9 million to the State Treasury, and we will use the other \$5.5 million to re-equip the laundry so that it will be the most modern in Australia, at which time we anticipate even further rises in productivity.

The laundry will be asked to further maintain that freeze on its charges for at least 12 months, at which time its prices will be reviewed. The \$2.2 million saved in two years is based on straight CPI figures. If, in fact, prices had risen simply in line with the cost price index, it would have resulted in an additional charge against the health system and directly against the public hospital system of \$2.2 million.

The laundry will have to do five things: firstly, it must compete on a commercial basis; secondly, it must service its loans at the current rate of interest being charged by the South Australian Financing Authority; thirdly, it must service its debts in full; fourthly, it must operate on a competitive, commercial basis; and, fifthly, for the next 12 months it must continue to peg its prices at 1982 levels. I submit that that, by any standards, is a remarkable success story of which the Government is entitled to be very proud. More importantly, it is a story of which the management and workers at the Central Linen Service are entitled to be very proud. I am happy to tell this story anywhere in the State at any time.

It seems to me in those circumstances that it is hardly surprising that the Leader of the Opposition is claiming this morning that he has a suitor—he has someone who is prepared to buy it. Well I have at least three different firms who would be prepared to buy it. That is hardly surprising, because it is a remarkably successful and viable commercial operation. The Government has no intention of allowing it, as a major asset of the South Australian public, to pass into private hands.

I am a very enthusiastic supporter of private enterprise, and of the mixed economy. However, it would be total folly for any Government to allow that very efficient and effective Central Linen Service—the most efficient in Australia—to pass into private hands because there would then be a direct charge against the health budget in order to sustain the profits of whatever private enterprise organisation was running it. To do that would be totally wrong. This Government has no intention of flogging off the assets of the people of South Australia, whether it be the State Bank, the Housing Trust or the Central Linen Service.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I have a supplementary question. If the public hospitals, including the Royal Adelaide Hospital, wish to use the services of a private sector laundry, would there be any impediment from the Health Commission?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: No, there certainly would not.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: It is a funny thing—the old business of capitalising the gains and socialising the losses, of which the conservative Party seems to be so fond. Not so long ago I was being urged to repurchase the Frozen Food Factory. The previous Government sold the Frozen Food Factory to Elders-IXL.

An honourable member: For a song.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: No, indeed, not for a song. I had a look at the figures and refused point blank to buy back the Frozen Food Factory. I fought tooth and claw in Cabinet and everywhere else to ensure that that decision was not forced on me, because I had no intention of subsidising—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: —the private or public operation of the Frozen Food Factory from my health budget. By contrast, Queensland—a great free enterprise place is Queensland, we are told—has a frozen food factory built by the State.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett: What about the Central Linen Service?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: We are talking about successful and unsuccessful public and private enterprise. Queensland was stuck with a frozen food factory, just like South Australia. However, Queensland decided to subsidise themselves out of trouble by using their health budget. It leased its white elephant frozen food factory to a private operator and then passed special legislation to force its 18 major hospitals to purchase frozen food from that operator at a rate—

The Hon. J.C. Burdett interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: It is not indeed. You are absolutely wrong. It has everything to do with it. If the honourable member cannot follow that, he is more dense than I thought he was. Queensland forced its 18 major hospitals to purchase—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I can follow what the Minister is trying to do, and I believe that honourable members can, too. Honourable members have a right to ask further questions on the matter. However, let us hear the answer.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Queensland forced its 18 major hospitals, by legislation, to buy from its frozen food factory at prices which would make it a viable operation. In other words, it subsidised the private operator directly from the health budget. I have no intention, while I am Minister of Health, and the Government has no intention in this term or any of its succeeding terms, of using the health budget money to subsidise private operators in laundries when we can do the job better and more cheaply ourselves.

WRONGFUL DISMISSAL CASES

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question in relation to the abuse of wrongful dismissal cases.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I have raised the case involving Murray River Developments Pty Ltd, which was sued by a former employee alleging wrongful dismissal. The case was brought by a person who was hired by Murray River Developments as an engineer. He held himself out to be an engineer but, in fact, he was not qualified. He was dismissed because he did not hold the qualifications that he said he held.

The claim by the former employee was heard by an industrial commissioner with no legal training at all—a system that was introduced by the present Government in the face of widespread objection. The hearing lasted 47 sitting days; there were 4 275 pages of transcript; the former employee was on legal aid funded by the taxpayer; and at the end the lay commissioner decided that he did not have jurisdiction to hear the case. The question of jurisdiction had been raised after the first few days, but the commissioner decided that he would not resolve that question and would let the case run on.

In the end, the costs of legal aid, the commissioner and his staff, the transcript, the lawyers fees and other costs of Murray River Developments exceeded \$100 000. Murray River Developments costs and losses alone exceeded \$45 000. In fact, it was the longest running wrongful dismissal case in South Australia, and it is an appalling case. Since this case other employers have drawn to my attention—

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Are you sure that this is not *sub judice*?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: It is not *sub judice*. Other employers have drawn to my attention cases where dismissed employees have instituted guerilla activity in the expectation of money settlements, rather than long and expensive hearings before lay commissioners who have no training in resolving claims judicially. False and vexatious claims are growing.

There are a number of issues in relation to this matter: the availability of legal aid and the lack of review of the progress of the case; the appalling waste of time and money by virtue of the lay commissioner's refusal to decide the threshold question of jurisdiction; the waste of money and time by Murray River Developments which is, in itself, a prominent tourism developer; and the hearing of wrongful dismissal cases by persons without any legal training but with the power to make large awards of damages. In the circumstances of this case, where extensive costs have been incurred as a result of action by a Crown agency, I ask the following questions:

1. Will the Government make any *ex gratia* payment to Murray River Developments to meet its extensive losses exceeding \$45 000 resulting from the actions of the Government's industrial commissioner?

2. What action has been taken to ensure that this sort of thing does not recur?

3. Will the Government return this jurisdiction to the court rather than leaving it with the lay Industrial Commission?

4. Will the Attorney-General seek to tighten up on the availability of legal aid in these sorts of cases and ensure that there is adequate review of long running cases by the Legal Services Commission in future?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member knows as well as I do (and I recall him indicating in this manner in the Council on numerous occasions when asked questions about legal aid) that the Legal Services Commission is independent of Government. Obviously the honourable member has forgotten the relevant legislation in which he no doubt participated when the Bill was before the Council. That legislation explicitly states that the Legal Services Commission is independent of Government. It is not, as such, an agency of the Crown. It is all very well for the honourable member to criticise the granting of legal aid. The fact is that the Legal Services Commission can review its decision to grant legal aid at any time.

I do not know what the circumstances of the grant in this particular case were, but I can assure the honourable member from what I know of the operations of the Legal Services Commission that grants of legal aid are not made lightly. I would therefore indicate to the honourable member that that is a decision for the Legal Services Commission. If the honourable member wishes to obtain further information about that, then I am sure that can be done. I have no doubt he could write to the Director of the Legal Services Commission and ascertain the relevant information, but, if he would like me to do that, I do not mind doing it for him.

With respect to the other questions, it is not just hearings before Commissioners that sometimes take long periods to resolve. Many other legal cases take considerable periods to resolve before judges and magistrates.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: As I understand what the honourable member is asking, the factual matters were determined. It was not for 40 odd days arguing just a jurisdictional question. It was dealt with by the Commissioner on its merits. I do not know the full details of the case. I am surprised that the honourable member is apparently suggesting that there should be some interference in the exercise of the functions that are carried out by Commissioners, but the full details of the case are not available to me. The honourable member has asked a number of questions, and all I can do is to get a report on the case from the Minister and bring back a reply in due course.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: What about an *ex gratia* payment?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I do not know sufficient about the case.

STOREMEN AND PACKERS BAN

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Deputy Premier, a question relating to The Wholesaler.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: The question follows on from an issue raised with the Minister of Labour yesterday. Unfortunately, he has flown to Melbourne and is therefore unavailable. I understand that the Deputy Premier has answered a question in the other place relating to this matter. Therefore, I presume, I ask the Attorney-General a question on this issue.

I would like to make it plain that I have just spoken to the manager of The Wholesaler, the new enterprise attempting to open up on Hardy's Road, Underdale, which is having to combat the combined vicissitudes of quite unacceptable union obstruction and other measures from competitors. It seems intolerable to me that South Australian consumers are being deprived of this alternative competitive wholesale outlet because of this quite unacceptable behaviour.

I have been assured by Mr McArdle that he has been unable to make contact with the Hon. Mr Blevins, Minister of Labour. He has tried constantly this morning. He has had no contact with him for the whole of the time that the Hon. Mr Blevins has held that portfolio and therefore has not been able to get any comment from him in his role as the Minister of Labour as to the Government's attitude towards or support for an illegal ban.

The question that has been raised is whether the injunction was imposed by a South Australian or Federal union. It is unclear at what point the actual obstruction is being put, but the injunction certainly applies to all branches of the Storemen and Packers Union. It seems to me that a responsible Government should be initiating action and concern in this matter and not leaving it, as it apparently is at this stage, for the beleaguered manager to try and make contact with the Minister. Therefore, I am asking through the Attorney-General:

1. Has the Government discovered the circumstances surrounding the illegal ban on Nestles' delivery of stock to The Wholesaler, which was the issue that I raised with the Minister yesterday?

2. Does the Government approve or disapprove of the ban as it is currently applied?

3. Does the Government have any intention of taking action to assist The Wholesaler to get what it is fully entitled to by law and justice: a reasonable and uninterrupted supply of stock so that it can open on its intended opening day next week?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: This matter was dealt with by the Minister of Labour yesterday. I understand the honourable member's concern about the matter and will ensure that it is taken up and referred to the Minister of Labour as a matter of urgency.

SOCIAL WELFARE PROGRAMS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Community Welfare, a question concerning social welfare programs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I am sure it is not news to anyone in this Chamber that the new Federal President of the Liberal Party, John Valder, has made a number of statements regarding the Liberal Party's policy on social welfare programs. As I am sure everyone is aware, he made certain remarks on a video tape which was distributed by Westpac to about 300 people in Australia and was subsequently shown on national television, so presumably it has been seen by many millions of people. Among other things, Mr Valder said:

If you are really going to make any big reductions on Government spending, I have got to say there is only one way it is going to be done—it would have to be done in—that's social welfare. He later said:

I think our Party is very conscious of the need to do that. The introduction of the assets test was a small step in that direction. This is the first time that we have had the Liberal Party come clean on just what its attitude is on cutting Govern-

ment spending. It is quite obvious that Government spending is to be reduced, as the Liberal Party keeps saying, by cutting social welfare programs. This is a statement from the Federal President of the Liberal Party with all the authority that such a position holds. Social welfare, of course, is not only the province of a Federal Government. We have our own Department of Community Welfare and Minister of Community Welfare who is very involved in social welfare programs at State level.

We now have the question of which social welfare programs in this State the Liberal Party would expect to cut. One can think of items like the pensioners' concessions on electricity bills, on water rates, on public transport, emergency financial relief, and so on.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member is straying away from the question.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I was about to ask the question, Mr President. Has the Minister of Community Welfare made any evaluation, financial or otherwise, of the effects on the social welfare programs in this State of the implementation of Mr Valder's Liberal Party policies on social welfare cuts?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I must say that I am hardly surprised that the Hon. Miss Levy's very good explanation upset the Opposition as much as it did. I would hardly be surprised that Liberal Party members in this State squirm every time someone mentions Mr Valder's name. Mr Valder may have many qualities—I cannot comment on them, and it would be inappropriate—but one is that he has a distinct tendency to tell the truth. He is a gross and grave embarrassment to the Liberal Party, because he frequently says, 'There may be a leadership challenge; I would not rule out that possibility. We will certainly have to make cuts in social security spending if we are to get into small government and privatisation'—all the things that his Liberal Party colleagues talk about in this State. Then he says with great truth that there will have to be very severe cuts in a whole range of areas in which human services are delivered.

I am not at all surprised that in the circumstances the Opposition should have squirmed very loudly when the Hon. Miss Levy made her explanation. I have not got those details immediately available, but I will be delighted to refer what I think is a very good and timely question to my colleague the Minister of Community Welfare in another place and bring back a reply.

DA VINCI EXHIBITION

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for the Arts, a question on the arts.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: The Co-ordinating Italian Committee, a well and favourably known organisation within the Italian-Australian community, has been negotiating with the Department of the Arts and the State's Art Gallery for the opportunity to display an overseas cultural exhibition in the Art Gallery. This committee, which has wide representation from Italian-Australians who reside here, deals with Italian festival planning, welfare matters, and cultural and educational activity generally.

The exhibition comprises drawings, pictures and models by Leonardo Da Vinci and relates to his scientific and engineering works. It is coming to Australia from the National Museum of Science and Technology, Milan, and the arrangements for it to come to Australia have been made, I understand, by the Italian Consulate in Adelaide.

The Hon. Anne Levy: It has not been here yet.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: No, this one has not been here. The committee considers that the Art Gallery is the only suitable venue for such an important exhibition. It requires about four to six weeks to erect the display and exhibit it to the public. It has sought this period in the latter half of 1986, after which the exhibition will go to Melbourne and Sydney. It realises and accepts that the first half of 1986 will involve special Festival of Arts and sesquicentennial exhibitions at the Art Gallery. It feels that, because of its large numbers within the South Australian community, it would be a credit to the Italians in this State and to South Australia generally if the exhibition's Australian program started in Adelaide and then moved interstate.

The committee is extremely disappointed, because its plans seem to have failed in that it has been refused the gallery as its venue, despite the fact that at one stage during the negotiations it was given some hope that the gallery would be available. It has been told to try the Centennial Hall, the State Design Centre or the Institute of Technology hall. It feels somewhat insulted by these suggestions, because such venues are not in keeping with the extremely prestigious exhibition from Italy.

Will the Minister take an immediate initiative in this matter, intervene, and make every endeavour to provide space in the Art Gallery, when required, for these most important overseas works to be shown here during the latter part of the State's sesquicentennial year.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will refer the question to the Minister for the Arts and bring back a reply.

MEAT INDUSTRY DISPUTE

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about section 45D of the Trade Practices Act.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I had intended to ask this question of the Minister of Agriculture, and I am sorry that he is not here. Therefore, I will now direct it to the Attorney-General. Yesterday, the Hon. Mr Blevins, wearing his hat as the Minister of Labour, in response to a question from the Hon. Mr Gilfillan made the following comment in relation to section 45D:

I point out that the use of legislation such as section 45D of the Trade Practices Act, which this Government and the Federal Government oppose, will only exacerbate industrial disputes.

The section is central to a dispute between the AMIEU and the National Farmers Association in relation to the Mudgeinberri Abattoir in the Northern Territory, which dispute has now flowed to South Australia due to a national strike by several unions. The farmers, as the Attorney-General will be aware, are outraged by the blatant abuse by the AMIEU of the legal processes and the inconvenience and costs that are associated with this unwarranted national strike.

Does the Attorney-General agree that the National Farmers Association and the farmers in this State are justified in their grievances with the AMIEU in relation to the national strike? In view of the Minister of Labour's comments yesterday in relation to section 45D, does he agree that the Minister of Agriculture, as he also wears the hat of the Minister of Labour, has a conflict of interest in this dispute?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: No, there is no conflict of interest. As I understand it, the Minister of Agriculture is not involved in the dispute. I am sure that if the matter develops here the Minister of Labour will take an interest in it, but he is not involved in the dispute. Therefore, there would not be any conflict of interest.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: There is a strike—yesterday and today.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member is interjecting. All that I can say is that there is no conflict of interest. The Minister of Agriculture is not involved in the dispute. If he does need to get involved, I am sure that he will conduct himself appropriately. I do not think that there is anything further on which to comment. The honourable member has said that she raised this matter yesterday with the Minister of Labour, who provided an answer.

AIDS SCREENING TESTS

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question about AIDS screening tests.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: On 14 May this year during the debate on the Transplantation and Anatomy Act Amendment Bill, 1985, I sought advice from the Minister and his advisers regarding AIDS screening tests used by blood banks; I asked about research information on the percentage of false positives and false negatives arising from the screening tests in South Australia. I did not develop the argument on that occasion, heeding the advice of the Minister about not being alarmist in any way. At that time the Minister gave the following undertaking:

... I will provide that information and other relevant material to the honourable member by mail during the recess... I certainly undertake to have an appropriate roundup of the literature to bring the Hon. Mr Lucas up to date. I will mail it to him during the break and, if there is anything there of particular interest to other members, between the two of us and the marvellous invention of the photocopier I am sure that we can disseminate that information.

I do not want to pursue the subject of false positives and false negatives from the tests at this stage, but I ask the Minister whether he will give a further undertaking similar to that of 14 May (but hopefully there will be some action this time) to provide the information which I requested and which he has promised to deliver to me.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The honourable member will be aware that shortly after I gave that undertaking I flew to Brisbane for the Health Ministers conference and collapsed; I was out of the system for 5½ weeks.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I did not quite catch that half-smart remark, so I will not respond to it. If that has not occurred, I will certainly get someone to look into it as a matter of urgency. It is important not only that the Hon. Mr Lucas be brought up to date but also that there is an ongoing educational campaign in regard to every citizen of Australia, so I will attend to the matter with the urgency that I know it warrants.

YOUTH WAGES

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General as Leader of the Government in this Council a question about youth wages.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: The Attorney would be aware that the unemployment rate in South Australia relating to young people in the age range 15 to 19 years is in excess of 20 per cent; that is, more than one in five in that age group who want to work cannot find work. Last month the State Industrial Commission in Western Australia made a landmark decision in relation to youth wages which provided

that in certain circumstances employers could offer young people work at below award wages, provided that the young people were happy with the arrangement and that additional jobs were genuinely being created.

The Industrial Commission of Western Australia will examine applications on an industry to industry basis. Apparently, most industries in Western Australia covered by State awards will be able to pay lower than award wages to juniors if the commission's conditions are met. I understand that the Western Australian Trades and Labor Council and the ACTU are opposed to this decision and are seeking to prevent its application in other States. Does the State Government view the Western Australian Industrial Commission's decision (which appears to introduce some welcome flexibility into youth wage structures) favourably?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Government's position on this matter has been made clear on previous occasions. Notwithstanding that the honourable member's question is to some extent hypothetical as there is no application before the industrial tribunals in this State with respect to youth wages, the general arguments are well known. If they were to be put to the arbitration authorities here, the authorities would, as they did in Western Australia, have to make their own assessment of those arguments. The Government is not convinced that reduction of youth wages is automatically the solution to youth unemployment.

members and that Standing Order No. 389 be so far suspended as to enable the Chairman of the Select Committee to have a deliberative vote only;

3. That this Council permit the Select Committee to authorise the disclosure or publication as it thinks fit of any evidence presented to the committee prior to such evidence being reported to the Council.

(Continued from 7 August. Page 83.)

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: I thank the Attorney for bringing this matter before the Parliament. It involves a mixture of medical, administrative and emotional matters. Reading through the report rather quickly for the first time I noted that there are a number of issues that could well have been the subject of vigorous complaint had they simply been introduced via various pieces of legislation. However, in view of the fact that the Government proposes a Select Committee, the Opposition sees no point in canvassing these matters in addressing the motion. Members on this side support the Attorney's motion for the appointment of a Select Committee.

Motion carried.

The Council appointed a Select Committee consisting of the Hons R.J. Ritson, R.I. Lucas, Anne Levy, and G.L. Bruce; the Committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the Committee to report on Tuesday 8 October.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 7 August. Page 96.)

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. As many honourable members will know, I recently travelled to Nairobi to attend the United Nations conference to celebrate the end of the decade for women. Unfortunately, I was recalled to Adelaide and so I was not able to attend any of the conference. I certainly very much wanted to attend many of the sessions. I had previously put my name down to present a paper at this conference but, because of my recall, I was not able to do so. It was a paper on the political progress of women in Australia in the last decade. I made arrangements for notification of my absence to be conveyed to the organisers of the conference and, although I was assured that that was done, I gather that my paper was not struck off the conference list. A friend of mine went along at the specified time and found that a large number of people had turned up to hear my report.

I very much regret the inconvenience to those people and I thought that, rather than waste the effort I had put into preparing that paper, I would recount some of my findings to the Parliament. The United Nations Decade of Women ran from 1975 to 1985. The Nairobi conference was an opportunity to determine what changes had occurred for women throughout the world during that 10 year period. I decided to look at the involvement of women in politics in Australia during that period. I collected data on the number and proportion of women in the eight different Australian Parliaments for 1975 and 1985. The data is presented in two tables, one for 1975 and one for 1985, which are purely statistical and I seek leave to have them incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ARTIFICIAL INSEMINATION BY DONOR, *IN VITRO* FERTILISATION AND EMBRYO TRANSFER PROCEDURES IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL (Minister of Health): I move:

That the Hon. Barbara Wiese be discharged from attending the Select Committee and that the Hon. B.A. Chatterton be substituted in her place.

Motion carried.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I move:

That Orders of the Day: Government Business No. 1 be discharged.

There are still some minor issues that have to be tidied up. A similar motion will be moved at an appropriate time in the not too distant future.

Motion carried.

DISPOSAL OF HUMAN REMAINS

Adjourned debate on motion of the Attorney-General:

1. That a Select Committee of the Legislative Council be appointed to inquire into and report upon the disposal of human remains in South Australia and in particular to consider the recommendations of a report entitled 'Disposal of Human Remains in South Australia';

2. That, in the event of a Select Committee being appointed, it consist of four members and the quorum of members necessary to be present at all meetings of the committee be fixed at three

WOMEN IN PARLIAMENT IN 1975 AND 1985

Table 1 1975

Parliament	Lower House		Upper House		Party Affiliation of Women	
	Women	Total	Women	Total	ALP	Other
Australian	1	127	4	60	3	2
New South Wales	1	99	7	60	4	4
Victoria	1	73	0	36	0	1
Queensland	2	82			0	2
South Australia	1	47	2	22	2	1
Western Australia	1	51	3	30	2	2
Tasmania	0	35	1	19	1	0
Northern Territory	2	19			0	2
	9	533	17	227	12	14

Table 2 1985

Parliament	Lower House		Upper House		Party Affiliation of Women	
	Women	Total	Women	Total	ALP	Other
Australian	8	148	15	76	14	9
New South Wales	2	99	10	45	7	5
Victoria	9	88	6	44	14	1
Queensland	3	82			1	2
South Australia	3	47	3	22	4	2
Western Australia	4	57	3	34	6	1
Tasmania	1	35	0	19	1	0
Northern Territory	1	25			0	1
	31	581	37	240	47	21

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: For the information of those who do not have copies of the tables before them, I will speak briefly about the figures contained in them. I will look first at the Lower Houses in the Australian Parliaments. In 1975 the Australian Parliament had 127 members, one of whom was a woman; New South Wales, 99 members, one of whom was a woman; Victoria, 73 members, one of whom was a woman; Queensland, 82 members, two of whom were women; South Australia, 47 members, one of whom was a woman; Western Australia, 51 members, one of whom was a woman; Tasmania, 35 members, none of whom was a woman; and the Northern Territory, 19 members, two of whom were women. Therefore, in total the eight Lower Houses of Parliament throughout the country had 533 members, nine of whom were women—a proportion of only 1.7 per cent.

In 1975 the figures for the Upper Houses were: Australian Parliament, 60 members, four of whom were women; New South Wales, 60 members, seven of whom were women; Victoria, 36 members, none of whom were women; South Australia, 22 members, two of whom were women; Western Australia, 30 members, three of whom were women; and Tasmania, 19 members, one of whom was a woman. That is a total for the six Upper Houses (as Queensland and the Northern Territory do not have Upper Houses) of 227 members, 17 of whom were women—a proportion of 7.5 per cent.

I turn now to the figures for 1985. The situation has certainly changed. If one looks now at the Lower Houses of Parliament one sees the following figures: Australian Parliament, 148 members, eight of whom are women; New South Wales, 99 members, two of whom are women; Victoria, 88 members, nine of whom are women; Queensland, 82 members, three of whom are women; South Australia, 47 members, 3 of whom are women; Western Australia, 57 members, four of whom are women; Tasmania, 35 members, one of whom is a woman; and Northern Territory, 25 members, one of whom is a woman. This is a total of 581 members, 31 of whom are women—a proportion of 5.3 per cent.

If one looks at the Upper Houses throughout Australia in 1985 one sees the following figures: Australian Parliament, 76 members, 15 of whom are women; New South

Wales, 45 members, 10 of whom are women; Victoria, 44 members, six of whom are women; South Australia, 22 members, three of whom are women; Western Australia, 34 members, three of whom are women; and Tasmania, 19 members, none of whom are women. This is a total in the six Upper Houses of 240 members of Parliament, 37 of whom are women—a proportion of 15.4 per cent.

If one combines the figures for the Upper and Lower Houses one finds that in 1975 there were 26 women members of Parliament constituting 3.4 per cent of all members of Parliament, but that in 1985 there were 68 women members of Parliament constituting 8.3 per cent of all members of Parliament. I think that two things must be noted about these figures: firstly, that it is a source of rejoicing that the involvement of women in Parliaments has risen by 240 per cent during that decade. This I am sure is something about which we can be very pleased. However, the rise has been from a very small figure to another very small figure and the fact that 8.3 per cent of the members of all Australian Parliaments are now women is not a cause for great satisfaction and is certainly not an indication that women have achieved equal opportunity to be members of Parliament. We have a long way to go yet before we can say that our Parliaments are representative of our communities in terms of the proportion of women they have as members.

Another aspect that members may be interested in is the number of female Ministers in the various Governments around the country. In 1975 there were no women Ministers in any of the eight Governments around Australia—not one! In 1985 a different situation exists—there are now five women Ministers throughout Australia: Senator Ryan in the Federal Parliament—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I am comparing 1975 and 1985.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: If the honourable member cares to wait I will continue with my speech and give her some further information. In 1975 there were no women Ministers in any Government in Australia. In 1985 there are five women Ministers: Senator Ryan in the Federal Government; Barbara Wiese in South Australia; Janice Crosio in New South Wales; and Joan Kerner and Carolyn Hogg in Victoria. Therefore, there are now five women Ministers in

this country, all of them belonging to the ALP.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: In the intervening years—it is in my notes, if the honourable member cares to check later.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Then let me continue without interjection, please. In the intervening 10 years five other women have been Ministers in Governments throughout Australia—Jillian James in Tasmania, Jennifer Adamson in South Australia, Margaret Guilfoyle in the Federal Parliament, Pauline Toner in Victoria and June Craig in Western Australia. Of these five women, two belong to the ALP and three belong to the Liberal Party. So, during the 10 years there have been 10 women Ministers, seven belonging to the ALP and three to the Liberal Party. Various other comments can be made on these results.

It is certainly noticeable that the proportion of women in Upper Houses was in 1975, and continues until 1985, to be very much higher than in Lower Houses. As I indicated earlier, in 1975 women made up 1.7 per cent of members of Lower Houses but 7.5 per cent of members of Upper Houses; in 1985 women make up 5.3 per cent of members of Lower Houses but 15.4 per cent of members of Upper Houses, giving an overall average of 8.3 per cent. This greater representation of women in Upper Houses has continued. I have no doubt that there are many reasons for it, not the least of which would be—as we all know—that Upper Houses have fewer responsibilities and less importance in all Australian Parliaments.

It is a well known observation that the more prestigious the position anywhere in society the fewer women are found there. It is also instructive to look at the Party affiliations of women in Australian Parliaments. In 1975, when there were 26 women members of Parliament throughout the country, 12 belonged to the Labor Party and 14 to other Parties. If members are interested in the breakdown, 11 were Liberal women, one a National Party woman, one a Country Liberal Party woman and one an Independent. Therefore, there was little difference between the left and right side of politics. A Labor/Liberal comparison was 12 to 11 and a Labor versus the rest comparison was 12 to 14. These figures do not differ significantly from equality if one applies a statistical test.

In relation to Party affiliations around the country for 1985, there are 68 women members of Parliament. Of those, 47 belong to the Labor Party and 21 to all the other Parties put together. Those 21 women belonging to other Parties are made up of 13 members of the Liberal Party, four members of the National Party, one member of the Country Liberal Party, two Australian Democrats and one member of the Nuclear Disarmament Party. However, the comparison of Labor versus non-Labor or of Labor versus Liberal in both cases shows a highly significant superiority of Labor over non-Labor or Liberal women.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You have to do a percentage. You have more members than we have.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I was about to do that. The Hon. Mr Lucas's interjection was the point that I was about to raise: it is not so much a question of the absolute numbers but of the proportion of members, seeing that the different Parties do not necessarily have equality of numbers in total. Looking again at the figures for 1985, if one subdivides them by Party membership, for Lower Houses there are 24 ALP women around the country out of a total of 294 ALP members around the country—8.2 per cent of Lower House members. All other Parties put together can muster seven women as members of Lower Houses of Parliament out of a total of 287 members of Lower Houses of Parliament, which is only 2.4 per cent of Lower House members.

It is surprising that while we have four States and the Federal Government which are Labor—in other words, five Labor Governments out of eight Governments in Aus-

tralia—the number of Labor members to non-Labor members around the country is 294 to 287. Certainly, it does not differ significantly from equality. However, Labor women make up 8.2 per cent of Lower House Labor members, and the other women make up only 2.4 per cent of Lower House members of Parliament. If the Hon. Mr Lucas is interested in looking just at the Liberal Party, throughout the country there are 163 Lower House Liberal members of Parliament, of whom four are women, making 2.5 per cent. If the honourable member does not want the comparison between Labor and non-Labor, but prefers the comparison of Labor to Liberal, for Lower Houses Labor have 8.2 per cent women and the Liberals have 2.5 per cent—both abysmally low. This is a highly significant difference between the Parties. I have carried out statistical tests and it is not just an apparent difference but a highly significant statistical difference in proportion.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: They are both too low.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I have already said that. However, there is no doubt that the Liberals are significantly lower than Labor as a proportion. The same situation applies if one looks at Upper House members of Parliament around the country. Throughout the country there are 102 Labor members of Upper Houses, of whom 23 are women. This means that 22.5 per cent of ALP members of Upper Houses are women. Throughout the country there are 138 non-Labor Party members of Upper Houses, of whom 14, or 10.1 per cent, are women. Again, we have this large difference—22.5 per cent of Labor Upper House members compared to 10.1 per cent of non-Labor Upper House members.

Non-Labor members cover a wide range of political Parties. In relation to Upper House members throughout the country, 86 are Liberal members, 18 are National Party members, one is a National Country Party member, one is a National Party of Australia member, 10 are Australian Democrats, one belongs to the Nuclear Disarmament Party, and 21 are Independents.

If one cares to make the comparison purely between Labor and Liberal, ignoring the other Parties, one sees that amongst the 86 Liberal Upper House members throughout the country, 12 are women (which is 14 per cent), very much higher of course than the 2.5 per cent for Lower Houses. However, 14 per cent is still significantly less than Labor's 22.5 per cent for women members of Upper Houses.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Why is it easier to get into the Upper House?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I discussed that a minute ago.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You reckon that it is less prestigious?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Yes. Were you not listening?

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: I heard that, but is that your only reason?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I said that that was one of the reasons.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: What are the other reasons?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I am sure there are many and varied reasons. If the Hon. Mr Lucas would care to read books which have been written on this topic, he would find large chapters devoted to possible reasons which I will not canvass here, why women are more strongly represented in Upper Houses than in Lower Houses.

It should perhaps be noted that a very large number of the women who are currently members of Parliament in all types of Houses are in fact in marginal seats. This applies both to Labor and non-Labor members of Parliament. I am not saying that they are all in marginal seats, but a very large number of them are. They are thus very vulnerable to losing their seats if there is a swing against their Party at the next election, and this applies to women of all Parties: they are more likely to be in a marginal seat than are their male colleagues.

We all know that there are marginal seats and very safe seats, and of course someone has to have the marginal seats. But, without wishing to categorise every woman member of Parliament as to whether she has a safe or marginal seat and do the same for all her male colleagues, I think it is fairly generally agreed that a higher proportion of women members of Parliament have marginal seats than do their male colleagues.

This was very evident in the elections in the United Kingdom which saw the Conservative Government brought to power with Mrs Thatcher as Prime Minister. Despite the prominence of one woman member of Parliament in the House of Commons, namely, Mrs Thatcher herself, the election which brought her to power reduced the number of women in the House of Commons to the lowest figure it had been since 1945. This of course is a reflection of the fact that women tend to have marginal seats and that women are much more likely to be representing Labor Parties than Conservative Parties. So, if there is a swing against the Labor Party and it is particularly marginal seats that are lost, this means that women disproportionately lose their seats, and the advent of Conservative Governments results in a decline in the proportion of women in Parliament.

This is certainly the case in Australia today. If we look at the State and Federal Governments which are Labor Governments, we see that there are 45 ALP women compared to 18 other women—a highly significant difference. However, if we look at the States and Territory where there are Conservative Governments we see that there are only two ALP women and three women of other Parties. In other words, where there are Conservative Governments there are very low numbers of women, and, where one has progressive Labor Governments, there is a higher proportion of women in Parliament.

This phenomenon is certainly not unique to Australia. It has been observed and commented on in many other countries, in particular in the United Kingdom and in the United States. So, it is not surprising that an examination of the Australian situation reveals exactly the same thing. All around the world, it appears that the more progressive and left wing Parties are much more likely to give women a guernsey to enable them to be members of Parliament. They obviously are the Parties which take equal opportunity more seriously.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Only 8 per cent?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Not for Labor women. It is higher than that for Labor women.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: That is the figure you gave me—8 per cent and 2 per cent.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: That was for Lower Houses.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: That is the prestigious positions you are talking about.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Agreed. I was going to go on and say that, while it is obvious that progressive Parties do take equal opportunity more seriously, they do give women a much fairer go in terms of positions in Parliament. Nevertheless, we cannot pretend that the situation is satisfactory or that the changes which have occurred in the last decade are sufficient to have achieved equal opportunity. All Parties must change a good deal more than they have in the last 10 years if true equal opportunity for women as members of Parliament is to be achieved in this country.

I gather that there were many reports at the Nairobi conference on the changes which had occurred for women in many different areas of life in many different countries of the world. The common theme which seemed to have emerged on many different aspects of women's position in the world seems to be that, while great changes have occurred in many fields and in many countries during the decade for women, there is still a great deal further to go. No-one can

be satisfied that the achievements which have been made are sufficient. It is a beginning, but a beginning only.

I have also heard a suggestion that at the United Nations level there may well be a further look at the situation regarding women in the year 2000, that is, 15 years from now. The program drawn up in Nairobi not only evaluates what has occurred during the decade but also puts forward proposals for achievement by the year 2000.

I very much hope that by the year 2000 there will have been continued change in many areas, not least of which is women's representation in Parliament, and that a report of the nature that I have given here in the year 2000 will show much greater improvement in the situation. I am sure that all the women—and, indeed, many of the men—in this Parliament would endorse the remarks that I have made. I support the motion.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I, too, support the motion. I will refer briefly to the contribution from the Hon. Anne Levy. I will read it with interest later and look at the table. I certainly agree with her last comment that certainly all women—and, I imagine, virtually all men as well—would support the increased penetration of the Parliament by numbers of women in South Australia and throughout the other Parliaments of Australia.

I really do not think that the figures that the Hon. Anne Levy has quoted really give cause for much backslapping, whether it be from the left or the right—a penetration of 8 per cent from the Labor Party in the Lower Houses in Australia and 2 per cent from the conservative Parties throughout Australia. Neither of those figures is much cause for backslapping at all, and they certainly would give cause for concern in both the major Parties.

I also refer briefly to the comments made by the Hon. Cecil Creedon in what I suppose should be described as his valedictory address to Parliament yesterday. To be frank, I was most disappointed in some aspects of the Hon. Mr Creedon's speech, in particular his argument towards the abolition of the Legislative Council as it exists today. I suppose that one could refer to yesterday's contribution from the Hon. Mr Creedon as 'The big sleeper awakes'. I am referring not to the honourable member's sleeping habits in the Chamber in that description, but to the fact that after about 12 years of service in this Council—12 years of inaction and silence on this matter—the Hon. Mr Creedon chooses his valedictory address to reveal his true position.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: One would think that he would have done it much earlier if he felt so strongly about it.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: As the Hon. Miss Laidlaw points out, if this is such a passionate commitment that the Hon. Mr Creedon has had over 12 years for the abolition of the Council as it exists now, why have we not heard him speaking in this Council and in public forums on either the abolition of the Legislative Council as it exists now or championing reform of the Legislative Council into a form that would be acceptable to him. No! What we have heard from the Hon. Mr Creedon has, in effect, been 12 years of virtual silence on this matter and on many other matters, and he has quietly collected a not insubstantial pension.

Having done that, he now chooses to say, 'Now that I am leaving the place, a pox on all your houses. I think that the place ought to be abolished.' That is a fine state of affairs! He has been here and collected his 40 pieces of silver, but, now that he is leaving, he has decided that we can get rid of the place. The Legislative Council has looked after him for 12 years, but now he says, 'Let's get rid of the place.' I would be interested in the views of the Attorney-General, who certainly on occasions has demonstrated an understanding of the worth of the work of the Legislative Council, and certainly I will look forward to the contribution

of the Government Whip, the Hon. Mr Bruce, with respect to the future role of the Legislative Council.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: They would argue that one only gets out of this place what one puts into it.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: A very timely interjection from the Hon. Miss Laidlaw, which needs no expansion from me. It was very disappointing also that the Hon. Mr Creedon chose his valedictory address not only to call for the abolition of the Legislative Council, but to denigrate the work of other members of this Legislative Council with respect to the passage and review of Government Bills in the Council. Virtually all members of this Council, other than the Hon. Mr Creedon, would agree that many Bills leave this Council in a better condition than they were when they first entered.

I instance only the Electoral Bill, which entered this Council and, after many hours of Committee debate—not filibustering during the second reading debate—a number of improvements were made and accepted on behalf of the Government by the Attorney-General. During all that debate, where was the Hon. Mr Creedon? He was conspicuous by his absence!

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: When?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: On the Electoral Bill. It could have been any Bill. I have had a quick look back through the three years in which I have been in this Council and I cannot find a contribution from the Hon. Mr Creedon during the Committee stage of any Bill in this Council—and that is only three years. If I were to go back over the 12 years—but I will not waste my time—we would not find too many Bills at all in those 12 years to which the Hon. Mr Creedon has devoted too much time with respect to the most important Committee stages.

It is not very fair of the Hon. Mr Creedon to denigrate the work of other members in this Council, both on his own side—for example, the Hon. Mr Chatterton has moved a number of amendments in Committee to improve Bills, as have other members—and members on this side with respect to the most important work that this Council has done and can continue to do.

One other aspect on which I comment briefly is the Hon. Mr Creedon's unfortunate reference to the length of speeches. He said:

For the purposes of debate any capable speaker can say all that needs to be said on a subject in less than half an hour.

He then proceeded to speak for 50 minutes in this Chamber. I would have thought that the Hon. Mr Creedon, after 12 years in this Council and after making a statement like that, would at the very least have pulled up in 29½ minutes and perhaps devoted the other 20 minutes to another debate, but the Hon. Mr Creedon soldiered on for 50 minutes in this debate.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: He has upset you!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: He has, yes, and I am happy to admit that. He has denigrated all members of this Council, most unfortunately. He has denigrated the Council. That is something that ought to be raised in this Council, and I hope that other members will refer to it as well.

With respect to the length of speeches, I refer to the longest speech that has been given in the three years that I have been here. That was by the Hon. Trevor Griffin on the controversial and very complex Electoral Bill. That speech went for some 78 minutes, for the Attorney-General's interest, and it was a most important contribution to the debate on the Electoral Bill, because it laid down with a surgeon's precision—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Lawyer's.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Surgeon's precision. I would never say 'a lawyer's precision'—the majority view of the Liberal Party with respect to the Electoral Bill. There were many provisions in that Bill. There have been many other occasions

on which the Hon. Mr Griffin and others have set out their position on most important parts and clauses of Bills before us and, as a result of that, have had to take some time.

It is all right for the Hon. Mr Creedon, because he is a member of a Party that relies on the block Caucus vote and therefore a member of the Labor Party in Parliament cannot move away from what is decided in the Caucus. However, that is not the case with the Liberal Party in this Chamber.

The Hon. C.M. Hill interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I thank the Hon. Mr Hill. The voice of experience of the Hon. Mr Hill backs up what I said.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will refer to that later.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: What about—

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. G.L. Bruce): Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: We will see. When members on this side take a different position on Bills, they must give reasons. On a number of occasions in my years in this Parliament Liberal members have taken different positions on Bills or clauses and they have had to set out cogent reasons why they have taken a position different from the expressed Party position. That is not a strength of the Labor Party that needs to be explained; it is a strength of the Liberal Party that needs to be explained with respect to certain Bills that come before this Council. Having vented my spleen for eight minutes on the speech made by the Hon. Mr Creedon (and I must say that I take to heart his 30 minute restriction) I will not continue in that vein, but I would like to say a lot more about the honourable member's speech yesterday and his contributions to this Parliament during the 12 years that he has been in this place. However, I will not do that on this occasion.

The major subject of my contribution is the progress towards reform of the practice and procedures of the Parliament. I know this to be a subject near and dear to the Attorney-General's heart. Some two years ago a Joint Committee on the Law, Practice and Procedures of the Parliament was established. In effect, the Committee was to look into the more efficient operation of the State Parliament. I am not sure whether you, Mr Acting President, were a member of that august body, but certainly the Attorney-General was. I believe that that Committee has been a complete disaster.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: I agree.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I intend to offer suggestions, and I certainly hope that the Attorney-General will respond in detail.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: We couldn't get the Liberals to take any interest in it. They have done nothing.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Let us not get Party political over this matter. The Attorney-General is attempting to inject a bit of Party politics and vitriol into the debate. I hope that we can debate this matter rationally this afternoon. I will make a contribution on a bipartisan basis without attempting to apportion blame to the Attorney-General, his Party or my Party. I hope that the Attorney-General will control himself and let me make that contribution.

The committee was established more than two years ago to improve the procedures and practice of the Parliament. It was to look at a range of things, such as the possibility of a new committee system to handle the mushrooming of QUANGOS (or statutory authorities), law reform proposals and the handling of Budget Bills. In addition, it was to consider the minimisation of the number of times we have to sit here into the early hours of the morning; the provision of more time for private members' business in another place; the setting of a minimum number of sitting days for the Parliament in any one year; and, finally, the possible rostering of Ministers for Question Time in both Chambers.

The Attorney-General has some strengths; I certainly acknowledge that. If one hears a criticism of the Attorney-General, it is that he is not widely known as a reforming Attorney-General. Certainly, his colleague, the member for Mawson (Sue Lenehan) was reported in the *Advertiser* to the effect, 'The problem with Sumner is that he is not a reformer.' I paraphrase, because I do not have the quote in front of me. Basically, it was said that he does not get too much reforming done.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: That is rubbish. More legislation passed through here in the past three years—

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am paraphrasing Sue Lenehan.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: You are not quoting her accurately.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: She said that the Attorney-General is not a reformer when one considers past reforming Attorneys-General in the Labor Party. That is the view of Sue Lenehan. It is a criticism. However, I do not want to pursue that matter. All I say is that in this case one must remember that the Attorney-General has attempted to set in train genuine reforms for the operations of State Parliament. I do not criticise the Attorney-General at all in this respect. I believe (as I said previously) that one of his strengths is that he set in train what we hoped would be measures to reform the procedures of the State Parliament.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: It took three years—

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am not being critical.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: We have not finished the Joint Committee on the Administration of Parliament, and it has been going for three years.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I know. It is tragic that this most important Committee has not met at all for 16 months. The last meeting was in April 1984. That is outrageous.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Hear, hear!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I agree with the Attorney-General. It is outrageous that the members of the Committee could not find two hours in 16 months to hold at least one meeting of the body that was meant to reform the practice and procedures of the Parliament. It will not wash for any member of the Committee to say 'I was on holiday, the Attorney was on holiday and the shadow Attorney was on holiday,' because a Select Committee meeting can take only a couple of hours. I do not believe that in 16 months there was not one occasion on which a quorum was not possible.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: We are still waiting for a quorum of the Liberal Party in the Lower House.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I do not want to apportion blame.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: It is true.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I respond by saying that we cannot blame the Liberal Party solely. That may be the Attorney's response, but he knows full well that his own Caucus (particularly members in marginal seats in the Lower House) is partially responsible. If the Attorney wants names, I will tell him later, but certainly one member in the western suburbs is most vociferous about his opposition to the Trainer proposals, if I can call them that. Some members of the Attorney's Party strongly oppose the reforms that the Attorney has tried to introduce through the Joint Committee. If the Attorney wants to get into an argument about whose fault it is—as I have said, I do not want to do that—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: The Trainer proposals are supported by the Parliament.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No, they are not. If the Attorney wants to get into an argument about where the fault lies, I am willing to oblige on another occasion. I hope that we can debate the merit of the proposals without apportioning blame between the Liberal Party and the Labor Party. Let us get into Party politics on another occasion. We should talk about the merits of these proposals and what we can do about them from now on.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Hear, hear!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Yes.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: You sort out your own Party; I will look after mine. You are not having very much luck, I know that.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. G.L. Bruce): Order! The honourable member would be better advised to address the Chair than the Attorney.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am happy to concede that I do not have much influence within my Party.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: I heard Goldsworthy sat on you.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It is not much of a secret that I do not have much influence within my Party. However, that is not the subject of debate here this afternoon. I will refer briefly now to what I have called the 'Trainer proposals'. By 'Trainer proposals' I mean the proposals that went out under the name of John Trainer, the member for Ascot Park, who was Chairman of a House of Assembly subcommittee of the Joint Select Committee. I forget who the other members were, but I know that the member for Light (Hon. B.C. Eastick), was a member. It came forward with a set of proposals, which I have now misplaced and cannot refer to in detail, but about which I remember the import.

The proposals basically refer to the operations of the House of Assembly. I think that some of its proposals could well have been supported, in particular the one in relation to a cut-off time of midnight for the sittings of the Parliament so that we do not have this ludicrous situation of sitting into the early hours of the morning as we have through this and many other Parliaments. I think that there were also suggestions made for there to be a cut-off point for the introduction of new legislation of 10 days before the end of the session to prevent Governments of both persuasions continuing to introduce new legislation into the Parliament during that time. Whether or not 10 days is an appropriate cut-off period is debatable, but it is a proposal worthy of consideration, because with every Parliament and every Government of whatever political persuasion we have seen at the end of a session this queue up of Bills in the last week with everyone desperate to get home and shunting them through both Houses as quickly as possible.

There was certainly room for reform and compromise in the House of Assembly propositions circulated in November of last year. However, in the almost 10 months since then we have heard nothing from the Joint Select Committee about this matter. As that Committee has not met for 16 months it obviously has not considered the report of its own subcommittee.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: There is no need for the Liberal Party to respond to a subcommittee of the Joint Select Committee which had Liberal members on it (the Hon. Bruce Eastick being one; it had Labor and Liberal input) and which was to report back to the Joint Select Committee. There was no need for anyone else to vet them. The subcommittee ought to have reported to the Joint Select Committee.

The report was circulated in November 1984 and the Joint Select Committee has not met to consider the report of the House of Assembly subcommittee of that Joint Select Committee. It is clear, in my view, that vested interests in the Parliament are trying to scuttle the hopes of much needed reforms in the antiquated procedures of the Parliament. It appears that the intention is to let the Joint Select Committee quietly disappear without a murmur—go down the gurgler at the end of this parliamentary session—so that we will come in with a fresh new Olsen Liberal Government (and perhaps less likely another Bannon Government) and will have a clear book.

This Joint Select Committee, the Sumner Committee, will have disappeared without trace. If agreement on reform cannot be reached by the Joint Select Committee, and that appears to be obvious as it has not met for 16 months, then the Attorney should scrap it immediately. I have taken advice and found that there are many ways that the Attorney would be aware of in which he could scrap that Committee. I was surprised that he moved a motion on Thursday last or Tuesday of this week allowing members of that Committee to meet.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: I did not move it, I was not here.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Well, it was moved anyway and, if the Attorney-General did not know that, then I am surprised. The Attorney-General should move a motion to withdraw leave for members of this Council to sit on that Committee. I hope that the Assembly would do the same. Let us not let it go down quietly but shoot it right off the horizon in one fell swoop with a motion by the Attorney-General. Then let us see what we can do in place of it. I hope that we could then leave it to each House to attempt limited reforms of their own operations.

That is not the ideal situation, and I supported the attempt at genuine reform made by the Attorney-General, but it is not working, so let us concede that that is so and see what can be done in the remaining three months of the Bannon Government.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: We'll fix it up after.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: That is why I want to discuss with the Attorney this matter because I do not think that he will have an opportunity to do much fixing up after the next election. My view (and I hope during this debate we might get other views) is that the Attorney-General, after scrapping the Committee, could introduce legislation on behalf of the Government to establish two new Standing Committees in the Legislative Council along the lines of the successful Senate Committee system. The first, I would hope, could be called 'The Legislative Council Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs'.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: That is the one that the Hon. Mr Griffin is opposed to.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Hon. Mr Griffin and I have taken different views on a number of subjects, but that is another matter.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Such a Standing Committee would be able, amongst other things, to assist in the consideration of the law reform proposals that come before this Chamber. The second Committee I have called 'The Legislative Council Standing Committee on Finance and Government Operations' and it is modelled on similar lines to the Senate Committee known as the 'Rae Committee', which did much good work in overseeing the procedures of QUANGOS and statutory authorities in the Commonwealth arena.

I believe that such a Standing Committee of the Legislative Council could also oversee the ever-expanding number of QUANGOS we have in South Australia. It would not, of course, be limited to that oversight role and I do not believe that we ought to just have a Standing Committee on statutory authorities. I believe that we are limited in number and that, therefore, we are limited in the number of Standing Committees that we can have. I believe that we ought to have the widest possible scope in whatever number of Standing Committees we seek to establish in this Chamber.

In my view, that requires two Committees, one on constitutional and legal affairs and the other on finance and Government operations. I believe that there is a possibility, with the present makeup of this Parliament, of majority support in the Legislative Council for limited reform along

the lines that I have suggested. I believe that it is up to the Attorney-General to bite the bullet now if he wants to achieve any reform at all. I believe that, if the Attorney wants to risk being re-elected (and on current opinion polls there is a very high risk that he will not be re-elected)—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: The latest poll is 50 per cent.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Attorney-General's lack of understanding of opinion polls is evident in that remark. The Age poll is not a State poll but looks at Peacock versus Hawke throughout the nation. It certainly does not look at the comparison of Bannon versus Olsen or State Labor versus State Liberal. The last public poll has the Labor Party trailing abysmally—some 47 per cent to 41 per cent. I would not be surprised if we start seeing increased facilities flowing through to Opposition members from the Attorney-General, in the light of those opinion polls. That is the first risk that the Attorney takes if he leaves it to the next Parliament. The second risk he takes, even if he manages to scrape back, is that he may not, looking at the composition of the Parliament—Labor, Liberal, and Australian Democrats who might be present in the Chamber after the next election—have—

The Hon. Peter Dunn: One.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: That is right. There may well be only one Australian Democrat. Even if there are two, they may have a different view from the new Australian Democrat Councillor. I believe that the Attorney's chances of achieving the majority he would need for such a limited reform will be reduced.

It is for those reasons that I suggest to the Attorney that he should bite the bullet and take up a proposition similar to the one I suggested—that he introduce legislation in the Council to establish some standing committees of the Legislative Council along the lines of the Senate Committee system. I think that I have been talking for some 28 or 29 minutes and am coming to the time to which capable speakers are restricted in the Chamber, according to the Creedon rule of length of speech in the Legislative Council—one that the honourable member did not observe by some 20 minutes. There were many other matters I had intended referring to, one being the independence of members of the Legislative Council, particularly the Liberal Party members. I have conducted research on this matter and over the past three years I have found that virtually all Liberal Party members in the Council have, on one occasion or another, expressed a contrary view either through crossing the floor or speaking out publicly in the Chamber against Party decisions.

Virtually all members of the Liberal Party have taken an independent stance on a particular matter in the Legislative Council. I think that that is to be supported and applauded. At a future stage I intend bringing back some useful research on that matter that will indicate that virtually all members on this side of the Chamber have indicated the independence that is allowed in the Liberal Party on particular matters. The other matter I wanted to refer to was workers compensation, but the Minister of Labour is not here and I will save that for another day. With those few words, I support the motion.

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

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

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

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

In view of the lateness of the hour I seek leave to have the second reading explanation incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

It provides \$485 million to enable the Public Service to carry out its normal functions until assent is received to the Appropriation Bill. Honourable members will recall that it is usual for the Government to introduce two Supply Bills each year. The earlier Bill was for \$440 million and was designed to cover expenditure for about the first two months of the year. The Bill now before the Council is for \$485 million, which is expected to be sufficient to cover expenditure until early November, by which time debate on the Appropriation Bill is expected to be complete and assent received.

Honourable members will notice that this Bill provides for an amount significantly greater than the \$390 million provided by the second Supply Act last year. However, approximately \$65 million of the increase is explained by the effect of three accounting changes:

First, as from 1 July 1985, the Government has decided to change the basis upon which departments are charged for superannuation costs. Under present arrangements, departmental accounts show the Government's portion of pensions paid during that year in respect of staff previously employed. The new system will involve departmental accounts showing each year an estimate of the superannuation liability incurred as a consequence of

employing staff in that year.

Further, it has been decided that departments should be charged for these costs by requiring them to make regular superannuation payments to Treasury. To achieve this, additional appropriation will need to be provided to each department. This approach has only minimal net effect upon the Consolidated Account, for the Government still pays pensions only when they fall due.

Secondly, certain Commonwealth Government health grants which previously were handled outside Consolidated Account are now channelled through that account to the South Australian Health Commission.

Thirdly, additional interest payments (offset by equivalent receipts) have resulted from debt rearrangements with Government financial institutions which took place at the end of 1983-84. These rearrangements, which have no net effect on the interest commitments of the public sector, were referred to in the second report of the South Australian Government Financing Authority.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of up to \$485 million. Clause 3 imposes limitations on the issue and application of this amount.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.26 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 13 August at 2.15 p.m.