LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 13 February 1986

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Anne Levy) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Augmentation of the EL137 and EL172 Water Supply Pressure Zone; Hallett Cove School (Construction);

Port Lincoln Community College of Technical and Further Education (Establishment).

QUESTIONS

DRUG AND ALCOHOL SERVICES COUNCIL

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health on the subject of the Drug and Alcohol Services Council.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: The medical/psychiatric functions of the unit have been managed by three specialist psychiatrists. I am told that all three psychiatrists have left the unit, one by virtue of his appointment not having been renewed and the other two by virtue of their no longer wishing to serve in the unit. The reasons given are that the direction in which the council is moving the functions of the unit is away from medical practice to the extent that it is now considered to be a unit in which no consultant psychiatrist could work in good conscience.

The people who are disillusioned have, I am informed, undertaken, first, a bachelors degree in the medical course; secondly, a specialised postgraduate course including further studies in general medicine at a specialist level; and, finally, intensive training in the psycho-social aspects of society in general and of drug users in particular. The unit has previously been an accredited postgraduate training unit and has trained some 42 psychiatrists in the management of drug and alcohol addiction. As a result of the recent changes, the unit is no longer accredited as a postgraduate training unit. The unit has previously enjoyed international status with collaboration between the Addiction Research Foundation of Canada.

I am told that, in the last three years, the unit has attracted six figure sums in research grants, approximately half of which has come from overseas. With the loss of academic and training status, it is unlikely that the unit will attract such research in the future.

It is considered that the shift away from emphasis on the medical management of what is a highly complex medical problem, which is filling one-fifth of our hospital beds, is a more recent move and stems from a lack of understanding of the role of highly trained State psychiatric specialists in this field. I am informed that it is likely that the South Australian Salaried Medical Officers Association would have difficulty in recommending employment in the unit to its members. I am not talking about junior doctors or people with GP qualifications who might attend the unit and perform routine daily medical tasks; I am talking about people who are specialists who form policy and who teach and plan research. They are the people that we appear to have lost, and they are the people I am informed the unit needs.

There are instances of medical officers who, being bonded to the Government as a consequence of undertaking paid 'in-service' postgraduate training, now object to, and seek to avoid, appointments with this unit because of poor morale, lack of confidence in the management and rapidly deteriorating academic standards. One of the people previously connected with the unit who is now disillusioned has stated that so much work has gone into bringing this unit into the 1980s but it is now suddenly set back to the 1950s. My questions are as follows:

1. Is the Minister aware of the problems at the Drug and Alcohol Services Council?
2. Is he aware that all consultant psychiatrists have now left the Drug and Alcohol Services Council?
3. Is he aware that, because of this, the unit is no longer accredited as a postgraduate training unit?
4. What steps is he taking to ensure that further consultant psychiatrists are attracted to the unit to ensure that it is returned to its previously world recognised position?
5. What steps will he take to investigate the events that have led to the present position?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I am able to tell the honourable member at some length what has led to the present position. The area of drug and alcohol treatment, prevention and early intervention has been of great moment to me from day one. I had the members of the original Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board come to my office within three weeks of my becoming Minister in November 1982.

Apropos of what steps have been taken (and just in case your are curious about the relevance, I assure you, Ms President, that it is entirely relevant), I determined that the model being used had been quite relevant in the 1960s. However, it was clear that it was by no means adequate for the 1980s. Consequently, the legislation under which the old Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board operated was repealed. The Drug and Alcohol Services Council was formed. It has its own constitution and is an incorporated unit under the Health Commission Act. It was in that way brought into the mainstream of health services and under the umbrella and into the family of the Health Commission.

The new Drug and Alcohol Services Council was constituted in the first instance as a task force chaired by Dr Brian Shea. Among other things, Dr Shea was the founding Chairman of the South Australian Health Commission, a former Director-General of Medical Services and a former President of the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists. Dr Shea is a psychiatrist of great renown in Australasia, so I repeat that that very much reformed council with a reformed 1980s-type constitution, which was constituted in the first place as a task force, was chaired by Dr Brian Shea.

It produced a blueprint for an enormously upgraded series of drug and alcohol services in South Australia. Fortuitously, at about the time that it presented that report—and it was based on a three-year strategy for implementation—the Prime Minister called a special Premiers Conference, which was to address the question of very much upgraded services, treatment, prevention and early intervention and, of course, the other law and order matters with which we had to grapple as Governments around the country. That was preceded by a Ministerial committee meeting on drug strategy. Arising out of that special Premiers Conference, the so-called 'drug summit', we were fortunate to obtain, as a result of joint State and federal funding, a massive boost of 50 per cent in the budget of the Drug and Alcohol Services Council.

We are at this moment in the process of upgrading the services and adding many new services. With regard to what steps are being taken, very briefly we have purchased a

property at Ashbourne which will be used as a country living program for drug free therapeutic rehabilitation. That will accommodate about 24 people who are being rehabilitated at any time.

We are moving the present occupants out of the family living program at Joslin. They will go variously to Ashbourne (once we have planning approval to establish that facility) and also to halfway houses around the metropolitan area. Joslin—the old St Anthonys as it was—will be refurbished and used as a major alcohol treatment facility. The alcohol treatment and detox services currently located at Osmond Terrace will be relocated to Joslin for certain classes of alcoholics needing treatment and rehabilitation.

We will subcontract some of the services to the private sector, particularly I hope to the Salvation Army. Osmond Terrace itself will be a specific facility with both in-patient and out-patient facilities. The methadone program will be run from Osmond Terrace, but it will be very much an upgraded and revamped program all round.

They are just some of the things, of course. We have the Free to Choose program already going in secondary schools. There will be a life education program, details of which will be announced within the next few months. That will be based on the successful New South Wales program.

So, there is education and early intervention. In addition, a facility will be established at one of our major teaching hospitals to be headed by Dr Bob Hecker who, incidentally, is one of the distinguished specialists of this city and who also happens to be on the Drug and Alcohol Sevices Council. It is a complete nonsense to say that we have abandoned or moved away from medical practice in organising drug and alcohol services.

What has happened quite specifically and as a matter of policy is that we have moved away from the complete dominance in the organisation and delivery of programs that was occupied by the psychiatrists. That was done quite deliberately. A new Director of Treatment Services will be appointed. He or she will almost certainly be a medical practitioner, but not necessarily a psychiatrist. We can get the psychiatrist input that is necessary, but there is far more to tackling the major problems created by drugs and alcohol in our society than having a State service which is predominantly or even overwhelmingly organised by and run along the lines of psychiatry.

There are very many other branches of specialist medicine. Among our early intervention programs as I said, for example, we will have a facility I believe at the Royal Adelaide Hospital headed by Dr Bob Hecker, who is a gastroenterologist and a very appropriate—

The Hon. M.B. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The Hon. Mr Cameron who is still trying to learn something about at least the fundamental or rudimentary parts of his shadow portfolio chuckles that a gastroenterologist might be associated with an early intervention unit at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The fact is that one of the enormous problems with alcohol is that it causes liver damage. So, it is entirely appropriate that we ought to have a specialist in liver diseases—a gastroenterologist—to run that part of the program.

Let me say that we have quite deliberately moved away from a model that was dominated and virtually overwhelmed by psychiatrists. Let me give a clear example. I will demonstrate dramatically why. When I became Minister of Health there were about 40 people on the methadone program. Methadone keeps people out of gaol. Methadone keeps women who have narcotic problems out of prostitution. It keeps young men who have narcotic problems out of prostitution. It cuts down the number of armed offences. It cuts down the breaking and enterings. It has the potential to significantly lower the crime rate.

Now there are about 270 people on methadone maintenance programs. That has been done deliberately as a result of Federal and State Government policy. The guidelines were originally formulated by the old guard—by those who took a simple line that all drug problems were related in some way or another to head problems. They had been responsible when the methadone program was removed from Hillcrest to Osmond Terrace for taking about 80 people off that program.

By and large two things happened to the people with long-term narcotic addiction problems. With long-term narcotic addicts the recidivism rate is about 80 per cent or more: at least four out of five long-term narcotic addicts regrettably will slip back into their habits, so that something like 80 people were taken off that program and no-one bothered to follow them up.

Two things have happened to them. Either they have died, because of the decisions that were taken before I was Minister—they have died for one reason or another, whether it be hepatitis B, overdose or any one of the very nasty things that can happen to drug addicts—or they were out on the streets hustling for a fix. Those were into crime to get the money to feed their habit. Those survivors of that very sad period in our history are now back on methadone programs.

I do not suggest for one minute that young people with short-term histories of narcotic addiction are suitable for a methadone maintenance program but, where you have people who have well established levels of addiction that have continued over a period of eight or 10 years, then it is my view (and I will never apologise for it) that it verges on criminality not to admit them to a methadone program after reasonable assessment.

That is one of the many reasons why the directions have changed and why the policies of both the State and Federal Governments have changed. They have changed after consultation with people like Dr Bob Newman, whom we brought here from New York. It was Dr Newman who established the methadone program in Hong Kong as a special consultant. He halved the crime rate in Hong Kong within 12 months.

They are just some of the reasons why the policy changes have been made within Drug and Alcohol Services, which of course is in a very exciting period of expansion of its activities in treatment, rehabilitation, early intervention and, most importantly of all, prevention. I do not believe that I need apologise for having Drug and Alcohol Services in a situation where we are poised to lead the rest of the country with regard to our programs.

KEVIN BARLOW

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Attorney-General a question about Kevin Barlow.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: On 10 February 1986 it was reported that the Federal Government was to make a grant of between $10 000 and $20 000 to the Barlow family to assist with the expenses incurred with legal representation in Malaysia in December 1985.

According to the report, the Federal Government decision to make up to $20 000 available came after strong representations by the South Australian Government. The report also indicated that former South Australian Premier, Don Dunstan, was also involved in the review of the Malaysian case. Some opposition has been expressed publicly, particularly by anti-drug groups, to any public funds being made available for Barlow.

When the report appeared on 10 February I thought at that time that the South Australian Government's involvement was somewhat curious. Today, the morning newspaper carries a story that Mr Derryn Hinch of Sydney has a source claiming that Barlow confessed his guilt to that source at the gaol since the appeal was dismissed in December 1985. That raises questions about the basis upon which the South Australian Government made its strong representations to the Federal Government on the Barlow case. My questions to the Attorney-General are as follows:

1. Why did the South Australian Government become involved in the Barlow case? Was it in any way the result of a request by former Premier Dunstan?

2. On what material did the South Australian Government rely to base its strong representations?

3. Will the Government now check out the claims by Mr Hinch which bring into question the Government's basis for its strong representations to the Commonwealth?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: This matter first came to my attention as a result of representations to my office by Mr and Mrs Barlow, who are residents of South Australia and the parents of Kevin Barlow, who has been convicted of heroin trafficking in Malaysia and sentenced to death. The Barlows are pensioners with, I understand, a weekly income of some $160. To my knowledge they have no great financial means. They made representations to me that some form of assistance by way of legal aid should be available to them to assist in the defence of their son on this charge. Because I did not believe it was appropriate for the South Australian Government to become involved in the provision of that legal aid, I wrote to the Federal Government drawing these representations to the attention of the Federal Attorney-General.

The Federal Attorney-General has indicated that some funds will be made available to assist with the legal and associated costs of, I believe, Mr Galbally's appearance in Malaysia—Mr Galbally having been instructed by the parents of Kevin Barlow. Further, representations were made to me by Mr Galbally through former Premier Don Dunstan about the original trial in this case, expressing concern about the conduct of that trial. I then had the material sent to me by Mr Galbally and had it examined by a legal officer in the Attorney-General's Department. I did that on the basis that I believe the South Australian Government would have an interest if it felt that one of its citizens had been convicted in accordance with procedures that were not satisfactory.

The end result of all that was that there were a number of queries raised about the trial that led to the conviction of Barlow. Mr Galbally came to a basic conclusion, which was supported by Mr Dunstan (who is also a qualified lawyer and, indeed, a Queen's Counsel) who also examined the transcript of the proceedings from Malaysia). Therefore, Mr Galbally, Mr Dunstan, a legal officer in my department and I all examined the transcript.

Mr Galbally's firm view was that Barlow (he was not making any case for the other individual involved, Chambers) had been denied natural justice, for a number of reasons. First, Chambers's counsel had originally acted for both of them and had, according to Mr Galbally, used privileged information obtained when acting for both Chambers and Barlow against Barlow.

I am sure the honourable member would agree that that situation—if it were correct—would not be a situation that would be entertained in our judicial system, and would clearly give rise on appeal to accusations of a denial of natural justice. Furthermore, there were queries about the medical evidence that had been produced by the prosecution, and, I understand, a denial by the court of some medical evidence that was available. That placed a different interpretation on Barlow's actions than that which was alleged by the prosecution in terms of whether the actions of Barlow at the time of apprehension indicated guilt, or whether there was medical evidence that there was some other condition that led to his behaviour—shivering—at that particular time.

There were, therefore, a number of matters, and those were the two principal ones that Mr Galbally asserted led to the conclusion that Barlow had been denied natural justice. As a result of that, the Government determined that it should make representations to the Federal Government to draw these concerns to the attention of the relevant authorities in Malaysia. That communication has been sent to the federal authorities. As honourable members would know, the Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs has already indicated that, in his view, the death penalty on Barlow should be commuted on compassionate grounds, as the death penalty in Australia is not something that is part of our law—in most States, at least.

However, the South Australian Government wished also to draw to the attention of the Federal Government the concerns that had been expressed by Mr Galbally and, indeed, confirmed by our own examination of the material. It is now a matter for the Federal Government as to what action it takes vis-a-vis the Malaysian authorities, as clearly the matter may have foreign policy implications. Our consideration of the matter was on the basis of representations from Mr and Mrs Barlow (the parents of the convicted person); that Barlow is a citizen of this State; that representations were made by one of Australia's leading lawyers (Mr Galbally); and that there were concerns in the trial that should be addressed. We felt that those concerns should be brought to the attention of the Malaysian authorities, the Pardons Board, with a view to their considering them in their decision as to whether or not the death sentence on Barlow should be commuted.

I want to make it absolutely clear that the Government was not expressing a view one way or the other about the guilt or innocence of Barlow. All we were saying was that the procedures gone through in the initial trial raised causes for concern about whether or not Barlow had been denied natural justice, and that those concerns should be brought to the attention of the Malaysian authorities. I say that that was done after representations from one of Australia's leading lawyers and, indeed, most prominent citizens: indeed, a person prominent enough and responsible enough at one stage to have been appointed by the Fraser Government (Mr Galbally, this is) to head a very important committee on post arrival services for migrants and the general approach that Australian Governments should take towards multiculturalism, so a very responsible Australian citizen—one of Australia's leading lawyers—has raised concerns about the conduct of the trial.

It was on that basis that these representations were made, but they were made with a view to requesting the Malaysian authorities, in considering whether or not Barlow's sentence should be commuted, to address the issues that were of concern in the trial, and I believe that that was a proper action. I am sure the honourable member would agree that, if what I have outlined occurred in the courts in South Australia, there would be grave cause for concern. I am sure, also, that the honourable member would not want an innocent person hung, and that if he felt personally that there were problems with the trial he would take the same action. I have no doubt about that whatsoever, as he is a former Attorney-General who I know is concerned that people are not convicted without fair trial; people are not convicted without being accorded natural justice.

It may be that Barlow is guilty—and I am not expressing, and we have not expressed, any view on that topic. What we have said, however, is that there are concerns in the

trial that must be addressed, and we have drawn those to the attention of the Federal Government so that the Malaysian authorities can take them into account in considering whether or not the death sentence is to be commuted. I think it is worth reminding us that that is what we are talking about in this particular case, and if there is any question that Barlow has been wrongly convicted, I believe it is incumbent upon us to make those representations.

THEBARTON MAYOR

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government a question relating to the Mayor of Thebarton and an alleged conflict of interest.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: In the print media, both the *News* and the *Advertiser*, there have been articles in the past week dealing with an alleged infringement of the Local Government Act, in particular as it relates to declaration of interests, and the obligation of councillors to declare their interests in matters that come before council. My information is that at the last meeting of the Thebarton Traffic and Building Committee the Mayor (Mr Lindner) moved that a letter from Diverse Products (which embraces Coca-Cola Bottlers) be received. The letter dealt with an acquisition of up to 60 houses near the existing Coca-Cola Bottlers factory. Eighteen minutes into the discussion, Mayor Lindner declared his interest—a substantial interest of shares—virtually at the close of discussion, and then voted on the motion that the matter be deferred. Under the Act there is an obligation on a member of a council who has an interest in a matter before the council or a council committee of which he is a member, and it states that he shall disclose the fact that he has such an interest: penalty $5 000 or imprisonment for one year. Furthermore, no member of a council who has an interest in a matter before the council or a council committee of which he is a member shall *(a)* take part in discussion by the council or committee relating to that matter and *(b)* while such discussion is taking place be in or in the close vicinity of the room in which that matter is being discussed, or *(c)* vote in relation to that matter: penalty $5 000 or imprisonment for one year.

I point out that that indicates that that penalty could apply to all three of those subsections. It obviously was the intention of the Act that this be a serious matter, one that councils should take as part of their procedure in a full sense of responsibility in complying with the Act. From the publicity to date there does not appear to have been any decision so far as any legal proceedings are concerned and, in fact, it may well be that the Thebarton council decides not to proceed. It seems to me that there is a dilemma here where an infringement of the Act could take place and council, for whatever reason it may have, may not choose to proceed. My questions are as follows:

1. In the Minister's opinion, is there any obligation for the council to act under the circumstances that I have outlined?

2. If the council does not act, should it be dissolved?

3. Does the Minister agree that the Act is unclear as to who has responsibility for instituting proceedings?

4. If there is some doubt about the action of a council member under the Local Government Act, is there an obligation for the council to institute legal proceedings against that person?

5. If the council fails to institute legal proceedings and the Minister is advised that there has been a possible infringement, does she feel that the Minister or the Government should institute legal proceedings?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will begin by addressing these questions in general terms as I understand the situation with the Thebarton council. At this time this matter has not been officially brought to my attention as Minister of Local Government by anybody associated with the Thebarton council. I have received no correspondence from any member of that council asking me to take action in any way. However, a councillor from Thebarton has written to the Director of the Department of Local Government alleging a conflict of interest on the part of the Mayor of Thebarton along the lines described by the honourable member in his explanation to his question.

As a result of those allegations being made by way of letter to the Director of the Local Government Department, investigations will be carried out by officers of that Department with the Thebarton council and people associated with this matter to ascertain whether or not there is some basis to these allegations. If officers of my Department feel that there is some basis to those allegations then they will make a recommendation to me as Minister that further action should be taken, in which case I would institute a formal investigation into the matter. I would appoint official investigators to investigate the situation formally.

Dependent upon the results of that investigation, I would then have to make a decision as to whether or not I should initiate prosecutions, if indeed the allegations about confict of interest are substantiated, or whether or not I should take no action, depending on the circumstances. That is the position as far as my role in this matter stands at the moment. With respect to the general questions about whether or not the Act is clear as it relates to the conflict of interest provisions and the council's obligation to act, I really do not feel that I can comment on those issues. I am not a lawyer and cannot comment on whether or not the Act is clear in legal terms. However, I will seek advice on those specific questions about the legal aspects and bring back a report.

WELFARE FRAUD

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question about welfare fraud.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Yesterday the Federal Government announced that from today the Department of Social Security would be implementing a vigorous program to crack down on welfare fraud. As the Minister will appreciate, a large percentage of welfare beneficiaries are prompted to indulge in fraud, for instance by understating their income, because they find it impossible to make ends meet if dependent solely on the welfare benefit. Certainly, few beneficiaries have any money left over from their fortnightly benefit and even fewer save any money at all. An article in the *Advertiser* today states:

> The Government will try to recoup overpayments by cutting fortnightly payments to people owing money . . . Payments will be cut by 10 per cent where people have a private income, payments will be cut again by half the amount of the income.

In the same article the Minister for Social Security, Mr Howe, is quoted as saying:

> Payments would not be reduced if it cause extreme financial hardship.

The Minister will appreciate that over 90 per cent of the 35 000 persons who sought emergency financial assistance from the Department for Community Welfare last financial year were Department of Social Security clients—and that in almost all cases the money sought was used to buy food in family situations. I ask the Minister:

1. Does he anticipate that the Department of Social Security crack down on welfare fraud will lead to a rush on the Department of Community Welfare for emergency financial assistance?

2. As welfare Ministers across the country have been lobbying the Federal Government to assume responsibility for emergency financial assistance, can he advise if the Minister for Social Security's announcement of the crackdown was accompanied by a commitment from the Federal Government to assume responsibility, or at least to provide greater assistance to the Department of Community Welfare for those persons in need of emergency financial assistance?

3. If such a commitment was not forthcoming, can he advise if the extra demand that can be anticipated for emergency financial assistance stemming from the crackdown will be met by the State Government either increasing the overall allocation for this program or by reducing the average payment to those seeking assistance?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I must say that I find the logic underlying that series of questions a little difficult to follow.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: It is not at all—it is because the honourable member does not understand what she is talking about.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: That is not the case. I found what the position was from those who spoke to me this morning.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The situation in South Australia is that the Department for Community Welfare does provide emergency financial assistance. It has been estimated—and it can be no more than an estimate at this stage—that possibly as many as one person in 20 who obtains emergency financial assistance should not qualify if they were to adhere strictly to the truth. So, 19 out of every 20 are *bona fide*: 19 out of 20 individuals or families who are given emergency financial assistance are very genuinely in need of it.

If one out of 20 who are not genuinely in need of assistance get under that guard I think it is very difficult if we do err, as we do in one case out of 20, not to err on the side of generosity because remember that the 19 out of 20 who are receiving emergency financial assistance are doing so literally to keep a little bread on the table, and in the short term to keep a roof over their head, and feed their children.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: I am not arguing that: I am asking how, because of the crackdown of the Department of Social Security, those people, if they are in trouble, are going to meet their commitments.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member has asked her question.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: The Minister seems to have misunderstood it.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister has the right to answer any question in the manner he chooses, so long as he does not debate the matter.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: If the Hon. Ms Laidlaw has finished, I will proceed. As I was saying when she rudely and inappropriately interrupted, if we err at all—and the evidence suggests that we do in one case out of 20—please be aware that in 19 cases out of 20 we are providing short-term emergency financial assistance in order to help people feed their children, to keep a little bread on the table and literally to survive. Remember also that the majority of people receiving that emergency financial assistance are single supporting parents. Remember further that it is estimated that 16 per cent of all children in South Australia live below the poverty line. That is better than the situation in the rest of the country but it is still a very disturbing figure. I do not anticipate that a crackdown will lead to a rush, provided that it is done sensibly. We have to be very careful that, in the pursuit of people who cheat the social security system, we do not crack down on the wrong people.

I have no sympathy at all for anybody who would exploit the social security system any more than I have any sympathy for the employers who pay below or significantly below award wages and say, 'But with your dole money that will make it almost $280 a week.' That is common practice in this day and age among a small but significant number of unscrupulous employers. So, I do not have much sympathy for them either, but I do not believe that if the crackdown is handled sensibly (and there is every reason to believe it will be, since among other reasons it is being preceded by an amnesty, as I think is sensible) that there ought to be a rush for emergency financial assistance because genuine recipients of social security benefits are cut off.

Finally, the history of welfare Ministers lobbying the Commonwealth to assume full responsibility for emergency financial assistance—and remember that the Commonwealth already contributes $6.1 million a year nationally for emergency financial assistance—is a very long one. It would certainly go back to the days when Ron Payne was Minister of Community Welfare in this State, and possibly even to the days of Len King.

I have now inherited that cudgel and I will wield it with some discretion at the Australian welfare Ministers conference which I will be hosting here in Adelaide in the second half of April. It is a matter which the State Ministers believe quite rightly is a Commonwealth responsibility. Some of them believe it to the extent that they have already withdrawn emergency financial assistance within their own States. We have not taken that step yet: we think that is a drastic step, one which I am loath to take but one which we may be forced to take ultimately if the Commonwealth does not recognise its responsibility soon. So, I serve notice on my colleague and friend Senator Grimes via this Chamber that I will certainly pursue that matter with great vigour at the forthcoming community welfare Ministers conference.

HALLEYS COMET

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government a question about Halleys comet.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Members are no doubt aware that Halleys comet will again be visible in South Australian skies from mid-March and through most of April. Mr Bill Bradfield, a former President of the Astronomical Society of South Australia, is a world authority on comets. Since 1972, Mr Bradfield has discovered 12 comets, a world record he shares with a comet buff from Japan. Mr Bradfield and Mr Michael Lawrence from the Astronomical Society have advised me that Halleys comet will be at its highest point in South Australian skies on 11 April, when it can be seen at an 80° elevation when looking south. In other words, it will be almost directly overhead.

In fact, there should be excellent opportunities to see Halleys comet from 5 April through to 15 April. On 5 April the comet will be nearly overhead at 5 a.m. and by 12 April it will be overhead at about midnight. The fact that there is a new moon on 9 April setting in the west in the very early evening should assist viewing of the comet.

Mr Bradfield believes there is a possibility that the bright head of the comet and the long streak of its tail could be visible to the naked eye. This is more likely in country areas where the atmosphere is clearer and there is less scattered light.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: Hawker would be a very good place.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Exactly, I was just thinking of that: Hawker or Burra would be the very place. Although there is some doubt as to actually how bright Halleys comet will be when it reappears it is about equivalent to a magnitude 3 star—that is, its brightness is six to seven times less intense than the brightest stars, such as *Alpha Centauri.*

Viewing in the metropolitan area would be enhanced if lights could be turned off for a short period on at least one night. I understand that plans are in hand for the street lights of Brisbane to be turned off for one night between 9 and 13 April. If this is to be done in South Australia, it would require the co-operation of councils and the approval of police on the question of road safety.

I understand that the Electricity Trust is progressively installing photo-electric cell lighting which cannot be automatically turned off. This may be a practical difficulty. However, Halleys comet is a once in a lifetime occurrence and Australia is the best place on earth to view the comet. Could the Minister therefore make inquiries whether the lights of Adelaide can be turned off so the people of Adelaide can be turned on by Halleys comet?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: It all sounds very complicated to me, but I do agree that many thousands of people will be interested in viewing Halleys comet and I do not suppose that everybody will be able to get into the wonderful accommodation houses in places such as Burra. In fact, I am informed by some of the people who run the very excellent accommodation houses in that locality that they have already received many reservations for the period during which Halleys comet will appear because people will be there especially for that purpose. They want the best viewing platform and they are taking up all the space already.

So, those many thousands of people who have to stay in Adelaide will be looking for the best opportunities available to them. I will take up the matter the honourable member has raised with my department and the Local Government Association. I agree with the honourable member that the police will also have to be included in any discussions with respect to the effect on road safety and what can be done about this matter.

YES PROGRAM

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Youth Affairs a question about the YES program.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Prior to the election last year the Government spent about $350 000 of taxpayers' money on advertising the Government's $23 million YES program. The YES program, as honourable members might know, is comprised of about 13 or 14 separate programs. The most significant part of the YES program was a scheme to provide 1 600 young people with traineeships in South Australia before the end of this financial year. I refer briefly to the Premier's press release of 29 August, as follows:

> Most traineeships will be for a period of 12 months and will be directed to occupations with long-term employment and career development potential. In 1986, traineeships will be provided in a range of occupational and study areas such as business studies, health and care, hospitality, paramedical, printing, textiles, general transport and rural skills.

Yesterday, the Minister of Employment and Further Education in a telex to news editors and chiefs of staff said he was:

> ... delighted with the progress being achieved by the State Government's important youth employment and training schemes (YES).

However, in his telex yesterday no reference was made at all to the 1 600 new traineeships for young people, except for this brief comment:

> ... start up difficulties associated with the Federal Government's employment initiatives, particularly the Australian traineeship system ...

I have been advised that the proposed traineeship scheme for this year has in effect failed completely and will not provide one new traineeship this year for any young people in South Australia: that is, instead of the promised 1 600 new traineeships this year, there will be none. My questions are:

1. Is it correct that the major component of the Government's YES program has failed for this year and will not provide any traineeships for young people at all, rather than the promised 1 600?

2. What discussions were held last year before the announcement of the program with employers and unions in South Australia with respect to the realism of the promise of 1 600 new traineeships in South Australia?

The PRESIDENT: I do not wish to inhibit the Minister, but I draw her attention to the time.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Thank you, Ms President, I will be short. I have not had an update on the YES scheme for some time. In fact, just two days ago I asked for such an update. It has been some time since I had a progress report on the implementation of the YES scheme, which is the responsibility of the Minister of Employment and Further Education. When I got my last update I understood the situation was that certainly the apprenticeship scheme was working successfully and was well oversubscribed with people who were willing to be matched up. I understood that there were some difficulties with the traineeship program—the administrative difficulties that the honourable member referred to with the Commonwealth Government—but that there had been some agreements reached with some employers in South Australia to enter into traineeships.

As I have said, it has been some time since I had an update on that matter and I have called for one. When I have received the information that the honourable member is looking for I will share it with him.

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION AND YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act 1979. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill includes a number of miscellaneous amendments to the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act which have been proposed by the Children's Court Advisory Committee, the judges of the Children's Court and the Supreme Court and the Department of Community Welfare.

As the amendments are of a disparate nature I will deal with them seriatim and briefly explain each one. The definition of homicide has been altered to reflect the change in the law effected by 1981 and 1983 amendments to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. These amendments replaced section 18 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and enact new provisions relating to attempts to commit crimes.

The Children's Court Advisory Committee recommended that section 12 (1) of the Children's Protection and Young

Offenders Act be amended to include 'unfit guardianship' as a ground upon which the Minister may apply for an order for a child to be declared in need of care. The old Juvenile Courts Act 1971 included a provision of this nature and Mr Justice Mohr referred to this provision as an appropriate reason for a 'neglected child' application in the report of the Royal Commission into the Juvenile Courts Act.

Section 51 has been amended in a number of respects. First, the Children's Court is empowered, where it considers an offence to be trifling, to order that no future reference be made to the charge or proceedings against the child in proceedings other than in the Children's Court. This places a child, referred to the Children's Court on a minor matter, in the same position as a child dealt with by a children's aid panel for a minor offence.

Secondly, the maximum monetary amount binding a child over the age of 15 years to a recognizance has been increased to $500. The bond recognizance remains at $200 for a child under this age.

Thirdly, provision is made for children to participate in a work project or program. These new provisions will clarify the power of the court to order community work as a condition of a suspended detention order. The provisions will only apply to short detention orders of two to four months duration (two months being the minimum period of detention which the court can order) and the court can only order community service if an assessment panel has recommended such a condition would be appropriate in the circumstances. Special provisions relating to work projects have also been formulated, including requirements as to insurance, hours of work, and those who may benefit from such work.

The sentencing power of magistrates has been increased to allow a magistrate to impose a fine of up to $500. The previous figure of $300 was set in 1979 and has never been increased.

New provisions relating to the return of a child to detention where the child has failed to observe conditions of release are also included in the Bill. These provisions will allow the court to issue a warrant for apprehension dispensing with the need to serve a notice on the child where the court is satisfied the child will abscond if notified of the return to detention.

Section 93 of the Act is extended by the provisions of the Bill to prohibit the publication of certain reports of charges laid against children if the report identifies or contains information leading to identification of the child.

Section 100 of the Act deals with the transfer of children to another training centre or to prison. The current provisions provide that a child may not be transferred to prison unless the child cannot be properly controlled, has assaulted any person or has persistently incited disturbance.

This section has resulted in older detainees deliberately causing disturbance in a training centre in order to secure transfer to prison. Additional provision has been made by this amendment to enable a person above the age of 18 years and detained in a training centre to make application for transfer to prison. The Children's Court will be able to order transfer to prison if satisfied that prison would be an appropriate place for the person to be detained. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses of the Bill inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 amends section 4 of the principal Act which deals with the interpretation of provisions of the principal Act. The effect of the amendment is to bring the principal Act into line with recent changes to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 in relation to the law of homicide.

Clause 4 amends section 12 of the principal Act by providing a new ground on which the Minister can form the opinion that a child is in need of care. The new ground is that a guardian of the child who has immediate custody and control of the child is not a fit person for that purpose.

Clause 5 amends section 44 of the principal Act to enable the court to revoke or vary an order made under that section whether or not the court, so revoking or varying, is composed of the same judicial officer or officers.

Clause 6 makes a number of amendments to section 51 of the principal Act. The first amendment gives the court power, on finding a charge against a child proved but without convicting, to order that in any subsequent proceedings against the child before a court not exercising jurisdiction under the principal Act, no reference be made to the charge or proceedings against the child. The court may make such an order if it considers the circumstances constituting the offence charged were of a trifling nature. The second amendment increases the sum for which a child who has been found guilty of a simple offence or a minor indictable offence may be bound under a recognizance to $200 for a child under 15 years of age and $500 in the case of any other child.

The third amendment enables the court, where it convicts a child and sentences him to a period of detention to suspend the sentence on the child entering into a recognizance on condition that he will be of good behaviour and enter into a work project or program. The court is not permitted to include participation in a work project as a condition of a recognizance unless the period of the suspended sentence is not more than four months and the court has received an assessment panel report recommending that such a condition (a work project condition) is appropriate. Where the court imposes a work project condition the period (in hours) of participation in the project is determined by multiplying the number of days of detention under the suspended sentence by two; the child is not required to work for more than eight hours on one day; and the recognizance expires on completion by the child of participation in the project.

Clause 7 makes an amendment to section 54 of the principal Act. The amount of fine that may be imposed by a magistrate is increased from $300 to $500.

Clause 8 amends section 62 of the principal Act which provides for the establishment of the Training Centre Review Board. The purpose of the amendment is to enable the appointment of deputies of the appointed members of the board.

Clause 9 amends section 64 of the principal Act which relates to the release, subject to conditions, of a child from a training centre. Provision is made in section 64 for the Minister, if of the opinion that a child has failed to observe a condition of release, to apply to the board for an order returning the child to detention. A copy of the application must be served on the child. The amendment enables the Minister, if of the belief that if served with such an application the child would be likely to abscond, to apply to a judge to issue a warrant for the apprehension of the child and dispense with the need for service of the application. The judge is not to issue a warrant unless satisfied that the child would be likely to abscond. Such a warrant authorises the apprehension of the child by a member of the Police Force or an officer of the department authorised for the purpose.

Clause 10 amends section 76 of the principal Act. This is a procedural amendment that removes the need for rules

of court to be made under the principal Act relating to appeals to the Supreme Court.

Clause 11 amends section 81 of the principal Act. Provision is made for the appointment of deputies of members of the Children's Court Advisory Committee.

Clause 12 amends section 93 of the principal Act. That provision concerns the restriction of reports of proceedings in respect of children. The effect of the amendment is to extend the restriction to prohibit publication of certain reports of charges laid against children if the report identifies, or contains information tending to identify, the child.

Clause 13 inserts new section 99b into the principal Act. The new section is consequential upon the earlier amendment to section 51 of the principal Act, concerning recognizances conditional upon participation in work projects. The following provisions apply to such conditions:

(a) the Minister must arrange insurance for participants in respect of death or bodily injury arising out of or occurring in the course of participation in the work project;

(b) the child is not required to participate in a project at a time that would interfere with his gainful employment or a course of training;

(c) the child is not entitled to remuneration;

(d) the project must benefit the disadvantaged;

(e) the work must not be such as would ordinarily be performed for fee or reward by a person if funds were available.

Clause 14 amends section 100 of the principal Act which relates to the transfer of children in detention from one training centre to another training centre or prison. Provision is made enabling the court, on application by a person over the age of 18 years who is in detention or the Director-General on behalf of such a person, to order that the person be removed from a training centre to a prison for the remainder of his detention. The court is not permitted to make such an order unless satisfied that, in the circumstances, prison would be an appropriate place for the person to serve the rest of the period of detention.

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

SUMMARY OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Summary Offences Act 1953. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The new section 78 of the Summary Offences Act, which gives police power to detain a person who has committed a serious offence for a period of four hours (extendable by a further four hours with the permission of a magistrate) after arrest before delivering the person into custody at the nearest police station, does not specifically refer to children.

The Crown Solicitor has advised that when a child is arrested, section 43 (1) of the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act, which directs that a child who is apprehended shall be delivered into the custody of a member of the Police Force in charge of any police station, will override the new power in section 78 (2) to detain for up to four hours prior to delivery to the police station. The amendment made by this Bill coupled with amendments made by the Statutes Amendment (Children's Bail) Bill clarify that children may be detained after arrest in the same way as adults.

However, it was considered that if children are to be detained for questioning after arrest on suspicion of having committed a serious offence additional safeguards should be built into the current provisions. When adults are detained after arrest they are entitled to have a solicitor, friend or relative present during any interrogation or investigation by virtue of section 79a of the Summary Offences Act.

This Bill provides that, where a child is arrested on suspicion of having committed a serious offence and it is proposed to detain that child for questioning before committing the child into custody at the nearest police station, it will be mandatory for a solicitor, relative or friend over the age of 18 years, or a nominee of the Director-General of Community Welfare, to be present during any interrogation to which the child is subject whilst detained for four hours (or up to eight hours if authorised by a magistrate). I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 makes an amendment to section 79a of the principal Act which deals with a person's rights on being arrested. The effect of the amendment is that when a minor is arrested (a minor being for the purposes of the principal Act a person under the age of 18) any interrogation or investigation to which he is subjected while in custody must be conducted in the presence of a solicitor, a relative or friend of the minor, who is not a minor, or a person nominated by the Director-General of the Department of Community Welfare.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CHILDREN'S BAIL) BILL

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Bail Act 1985, and the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act 1979. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bail Act and the Statutes Amendment (Bail) Act resulted in a new scheme for the granting of bail in South Australia. The Statutes Amendment (Bail) Act repealed those sections of the Justices Act which dealt with bail. All applications for bail for adults are now dealt with under the Bail Act.

The Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act is read as one Act with the Justices Act and together these Acts provide the scheme for children's bail. With the repeal of the Justices Act provisions relating to bail there have been some problems for the Children's Court in relation to bail matters.

To clarify the position regarding children and bail the Bail Act is amended by this Bill to include specific reference to children and is modified when necessary to accommodate the special provisions of the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act.

The Bail Act will then be the one Act in this State dealing with the granting of bail for all persons. The Bill also includes consequential amendments to the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act removing provisions relating to bail and specifically applying the provisions of the Summary Offences Act to children. I seek leave to have the

detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 makes a number of amendments to the Bail Act 1985. A definition of child, in relation to an offence, is inserted, being a person under the age of 18 on the day on which the offence was committed. A definition of the guardian of a child is inserted. A new category of persons eligible for bail is inserted, namely a child who, having been arrested on suspicion of committing an offence, has been delivered into the custody of the member of the Police Force in charge of a police station.

A number of other amendments to the Bail Act 1985 are included in the Bill and are consequential upon the application of the Act to children.

Clause 4 makes a number of amendments to the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act 1979 that are consequential upon the amendments to the Bail Act. Briefly, the provisions of the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act 1979 which currently relate to the apprehension and bail of children are modified or removed, and dealt with in the Bail Act by means of the amendments to that Act effected by clause 3.

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 12 February. Page 73.)

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I support the motion and thank His Excellency the Governor for his speech. For the second time in recent days I affirm my loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen. I pay my respects to former honourable members of this place who have recently retired after having given valuable service to this State, in particular, former President the Hon. Arthur Whyte, former Liberal Leader and Minister in this Council the Hon. Ren DeGaris, the Hon. Cecil Creedon and the Hon. Lance Milne. May I congratulate you, Madam President, on your election. I know that I will need your help and advice if I am to follow the proper procedures of this Council.

I congratulate Ministers in this place for retaining or gaining extra portfolios. I congratulate my colleagues on this side of the Council on their shadow ministerial portfolios. I suppose it is a long time, if ever, since five shadow Ministers have resided in this Council; in fact they make up half our numbers on this side. I will be watching with interest to see how much the executive and shadow executive influence the historic nature of this House of Review.

It is interesting to reflect on the statement made by the Hon. Trevor Griffin at the declaration of the Legislative Council poll when he referred to the fact that more than 50 per cent of legislation is now introduced in this Council. Over recent years the progression has been as follows: in the 42nd Parliament, 22 per cent of Bills were introduced here; in the 43rd Parliament, 12 per cent; in the 44th Parliament, 45 per cent; and in the 45th Parliament out of 403 Bills introduced in both Houses 206 or 53.6 per cent were introduced in this Council. If this Council is the Chamber through which a large number of Bills is introduced, it may well become increasingly difficult to argue that it is in fact a true House of Review.

I record my appreciation for the great amount of help I have received from honourable members and staff in my period of settling in. I congratulate the Premier and his team on their conclusive election victory. It was well led, well planned and well executed, and had the appropriate amount of good fortune. The people of South Australia, I believe, voted on perception rather than on facts. For good or for bad they have now got what they deserve. Despite some good factors, South Australia is not up and running where it counts. In taxes, unemployment, job growth, inflation and in population growth South Australia has faired worse than most of the other States over the past three years.

In the three years of this Government, those seeking full-time work have increased by 4 300, or 8 per cent. In the area of teenage unemployment, those seeking full-time work on the latest figures (which are out today) have increased by 3 200 over the past three years from 24.6 per cent to 28.7 per cent. The State deficit of $51.1 million in 1984-85 can be added to very considerably by the deficits of the major statutory authorities, such as STA, ETSA and the E&WS Department. I have, of course, researched much material in preparing for this speech, and I have read many maiden speeches and Address-in-Reply speeches. I know that, for instance, the philosophy of uranium mining and exporting was a familiar topic in 1982-83. The ALP's principal stand on this issue was that the mining and exporting of uranium should be banned until the nuclear fuel cycle was safe. I can only say that the ALP's present position is still decidedly muddy.

South Australia is allowed to mine and export uranium from one mine (Roxby Downs); others in South Australia and the rest of Australia are not. How could the nuclear cycle be safe for South Australia and not anywhere else? Where is the principle? My purpose in referring to this matter is not to attack the principles of honourable members, but to wonder out loud about how far we are prepared to go to defend our principles and the collective principles of our Parties. The broad membership of the ALP in Australia must wonder what has happened to the principles thrashed out at its annual conferences, only to see in many cases those policies not being carried out by their Governments. I can say thank God they are not, in many instances. Just as I can stand here and say that my Party has also lost its way at times and has not promoted or defended its principles I know the proverb: those who live in glass houses should never throw stones. However, there are fundamental things which I hope to sustain and in which my Party believes.

I will not forget that I represent the people who put me here. I would like to see more conscience votes, as occurs in local government. If this were ever achieved I am sure that not so many principles would be compromised and the public might begin to rebuild its confidence in the honesty and integrity of those who represent them. My personal wishes must take second place to the collective wisdom of the Party, to which I will be loyal. I will, however, continue to do my best to influence decisions in the direction I believe to be right. Over the years the written principles of the great Parties have not changed greatly. However, there has been some evolution—as there should be—to keep up with contemporary community expectations. Just as individuals' definitions of their principles change by evolution, no-one can say just where their principles become immutable. Experience in life must go on redefining our fundamental truths. Sincere redefinition of our principles is one thing: blatant hypocrisy is something which should be exposed for what it is. As an outsider until now—and before

I become inextricably immersed in this club—I will record some examples of what people outside perceive.

Why does the ALP, for instance, continue to use—prominently displayed on all its material—the Australian flag when its own national convention has voted to replace it? If ever there was a heritage item, this is it. It is our flag and I will fight for its retention. It must not be changed by stealth as other important things have been.

There was the superphosphate dumping duty fiasco in association with the Western Australian election, where the pretence was to do something for the farmer when the real aim was to help the politician. Then there was the incredible performance of the Prime Minister angrily attacking the South Australian Liberal policy of offering beneficial purchase terms to South Australian Housing Trust tenants, necessitating a renegotiation of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, on the one hand, while on the other, one month later, we had the so-called Wriedt 'trump card' for the Tasmania election of a renegotiation of the Tasmanian dams compensation agreement with the Commonwealth without so much as a whimper from a compliant Prime Minister.

To be fair, on my side we have had the spectacle of a Prime Minister telling the OECD countries to reduce their tariff protection while doing nothing about it in his own home. Having said all that, I know I lay myself open to be, as Hamlet said, 'Hoist with his own petar.' If I stray from my own guidelines—some of which I have alluded to here—I deserve to pay the penalty, and I know honourable members opposite—and on my side—will be quick to do the hoisting.

I pay tribute to my family and my community for their long support and encouragement. The family and community have taught me the principles and standards for which I will fight. Although my family has played a part in the birth and growth of this State since 1837, the saying now goes that I am the first Hon. Irwin—by title and, I hope, by performance. I am honoured to enter Parliament from a town called Keith in the South-East in a district called the Tatiara: the good country. I follow a former President of this place, Les Densley, a former Speaker of the other House, Gordon Riches, and R.W.R. Hunt. Of course, the Prime Minister was born in Bordertown. Indeed, some of the family of the Minister of Local Government came from Mundulla.

I support the policies put forward at the recent election. I believe in smaller less intrusive government. I support the principle of privatisation—I do not care what name it is given. If it is the opposite to nationalisation, then I am all for it. Harold Allison took the problem front on in Mount Gambier; we should heed what he did and the lesson that he taught. No-one else in the State increased the winning majority by 5 per cent, let alone 7 per cent. I will not go to water because Liberal Party policies were rejected this time. The benchmarks announced by John Olsen for the election will stand out more and more clearly as the days of this Government go by.

I am trying to resist the temptation of chasing hares all over the place during this speech. However, I intend speaking briefly about the rural situation before addressing a subject of current interest to me which will affect rural costs. As a country man I could have spent time in this speech ranging over the problems now confronting rural industry and rural people. I will not do so now at any length, because they have been, and are being, well articulated by respected rural leaders. A slow understanding is dawning on the people of Australia.

One cannot fail but notice that the people of the great farming areas are stirring. These are self-help communities throughout South Australia. They do not wish to be aggressors but will, most certainly, soon react against any Government or union which would seek to disrupt the flow of their product on to the market, here or overseas, and those who disrupt the flow of materials used in production. They will react against those who continue to inflict more and more costs on producing their products that have to compete overseas.

Farm costs are rising much faster than income and are much higher than those of our overseas competitors, including the ever-increasing inflation and interest gap. General quotas and tariffs propping up secondary industry in Australia result in a 17 per cent reduction in the total value of agricultural commodities. This represents $1.1 billion to the farm sector per annum, or an average of $7 000 per year per farm. This is after subsidies to the rural industries have been deducted.

For a long time farmers have been passive. Rural communities are tired of having to shoulder the unequal burden, especially when we consider that the hard earned export income, without having the advantanges enjoyed elsewhere of superannuation, holiday loadings, union hours of work, overtime, etc., is used to fund the non-productive. Australia is living beyond its means. Borrowings, huge deficits and Government subsidies are not the way out. If rural communities and others have to live within their means, so should everyone else. They are tired of being bled, and taken for granted, while providing Australia with the most efficiently produced and the cheapest food in the world, cheapest at the farm gate and cheapest because of family input. Farmers are individuals, pretty rugged individuals—they are great survivors and, as such, make Australia survive. They want Australia to return to being a self-help country. They have had enough of the 'gimme, gimme' mentality and want to be paid for what they do and to pay for what they want. They want that to apply as broadly as possible within Australia.

Surely at a time when more and more individual members of our society are suffering the dehumanising effects of poverty and unemployment, and at a time when the ability to produce all the requirements of life has never been greater, it is time to ponder and, more than ponder, to act on the perversions within our system. The way that the Liberal Party and the ALP would go about acting does, of course, show the great differences we have—the polarisation that is crippling this country. It is quite clear to people who want to see that the policies of the Fraser years, 1975 to 1983, and the Hawke years, 1983 to 1986 and continuing, have not worked.

If we look at the bottom line of unemployment and welfare we see that these areas are acknowledged to be still unacceptably high. Anyone who accepts 8 per cent unemployment as full employment is either greedy or has his head stuck firmly in the sand. The new member for Briggs seems to understand the problem and his quote of one figure alone is daunting—a rise of 400 per cent since 1971 in dependent children. I hope that he and his Party really do something about it.

Unfortunately, we can quote hundreds of equally daunting figures, such as the cost to taxpayers of maintenance in divorce cases—in excess of $1 billion per year. If the socialists' ultimate aim is to control all people and make them dependent on the State, we can say that things are generally moving in a direction to achieve that. It is my aim to stop it.

I will now take some time to scratch the surface of a single complex issue that will affect most people who pay local government rates in urban or rural areas. I refer to the national inquiry into local government finances known as the Self Report. Although this is a national inquiry commissioned by the Commonwealth Government, its rec-

ommendations most certainly impact on State local government grants commissions, their methods of distributing Commonwealth grants money and, ultimately, on individual councils. We are talking about Commonwealth grants of at least $534 million per annum, and for South Australia at least $46 200 000. I say 'at least' because the Commonwealth Government is refusing to pass on the full 2 per cent of personal income tax legislated for by the Fraser Government when moving from 1.75 of the personal income tax in 1979-80 to 2 per cent in 1980-81. The properly calculated amount for redistribution should have been around $607 million, as 2 per cent of personal income tax collected in Australia in 1984-85. This estimated shortfall of $70 million is being kept by the Federal Government to help with its own abysmal housekeeping. I do not intend going in to all the recommendations now. I hope that the Coalition Party and the Democrats will strongly challenge many of the assumptions contained in the inquiry report, as I hope that the ALP will not adopt the report in full.

My comments will now concentrate on some key matters that this Government and this Council will debate soon, because the South Australian Local Government Grants Commission Act 1976 may have to be amended. First, I will give a very brief history of Commonwealth general revenue assistance to local government. Commonwealth general purpose revenue assistance to local government was first introduced, and welcomed by local government, in 1973. The Whitlam Government's stated purpose was to promote fiscal equalisation between regions. The grants were to be additional to and not a substitute for rates.

The fiscal equalisation approach implied determining standards of rating capacity and expenditure upon local government services on the State as a whole. The standard adopted may represent the average or medium level of revenue capacity and expenditure requirements, or they may be placed higher than these levels. A council would then be entitled to an equalising grant in respect of these revenue expenditure factors, of which it has disabilities when compared with the chosen standard.

In 1976, the Fraser Government introduced a new Act, the Local Government (Personal Income Sharing) Act 1976, which required allocation of financial assistance to be determined subject to a basic entitlement in a manner consistent with a general fiscal equalisation principle, that is, on a basis that has the object of ensuring, so far as practicable, that each of the local government bodies is able to function by reasonable effort at a standard not appreciably below the standard of the other local government bodies in the State. That is much the same principle as in 1973, but the grants were to be distributed out of shares of personal income tax by State grants commissions.

Although the equalisation principles were the only objectives stated in 1976, as in 1973, other purposes were embraced: first, enhancement of local government autonomy in using grants money; and, secondly, the abatement of rate increases as part of the fight against inflation. Recommendation 17 of the Self inquiry report states:

> The new legislation should permit the payment of a minimum grant to each local government at the discretion of the relevant State or Territory Government. These element A grants may be calculated to absorb up to 30 per cent of the total funds available.

It is clear from recommendation 14 that the Commonwealth could determine the general policy to be applied in determining grants for equalising purposes and, on advice from the States, the general methodology adopted for this purpose by the Local Government Grants Commission Element A is a per capita payment and is justified as some payment for the narrowness of the local government tax base. It works out at present at $10 per head in South Australia. Element A is at present fixed at 30 per cent. The new inquiry is recommending that they absorb up to 30 per cent. However, the South Australian Grants Commission points out the following in its 1985 report:

> It is important to note that the commission does not calculate per capita grants and needs grants separately and then add the two together to give a full grant. It calculates on a needs basis and then checks to ensure that each council receives at least its per capita entitlement.

This, I believe, is in line with recommendations of the inquiry report, but much will depend on the percentage element A argument.

Inquiry recommendation 18 (ii) states:

> The minimum entitlement element A should be distributed in accordance with the population and the distribution may be weighted to favour demographic groups which, in the judgment of each local government grants commission as appropriate to conditions in the State, make particular demand on local government recreation, educational, cultural, health and welfare services.

It is important for councils with small populations, including most rural councils, that this 30 per cent element A component stays in South Australia and, not as recommendation 17 says, up to 30 per cent. Any diminution of element A below 30 per cent will, in due course, increase the element B money available. This was together with the assumption contained in other recommendations, such as ability to raise rates and other disadvantages as described later. I underline this element A component because in the inquiry analysis horizontal equalisation is judged to be the main aim of general purpose assistance to local government.

I hope that the State Government argues strongly with the Commonwealth that the position of the South Australian Local Government Association is supported: that is, that detailed guidelines, including the fixing of horizontal standards, should be set at the State level following consultation with local government so that an amount of flexibility is not removed from the State Grants Commission and so that there should be no weighting. Element B then is a distribution of the remaining grant money and is determined now by the South Australian Grants Commission on an equalisation basis so as to take account of relative financial needs of councils. Recommendation 18 (iv) states:

> The aim of the horizontal equalisation element in general purpose assistance to local government should be to assist the more disadvantaged local government authorities, and that subject to any minimum entitlement being met all funds should be directed to such authorities up to the point where they are brought to the same level of disadvantage as the least disadvantaged authority not eligible for any equalisation grant.

This then says a number of things. The recommendations are moving well away from the Local Government (PIT) Sharing Act 1976, and two of its argued purposes: enhancement of local government autonomy, and abatement of rate increases as part of the fight against inflation. This is back to the philosophy of the 1973 distribution where grants were to be 'additional to and not a substitute for rates, and that the standard of fiscal equalisation may represent the average of revenue and expenditure requirements or may be placed higher'. Needless to say there are never the grants available to bring all councils, under any arrangement, to the average standard, let alone a higher standard. South Australian local government argues full equalisation from the bottom up is not the only method of equalisation, and the Government should avoid too much detail in legislation.

The stated definition of horizontal equalisation means a big move away from the traditional role of local government—rates, roads and rubbish and in rural areas, weeds and vermin control—to people services. 'People services' is a phrase often used in local government circles to distinguish council services consumed by individuals from those council services involving usually engineering, construction and maintenance work. People services include health, edu-

cation, recreation and welfare, whether developmental, therapeutic, rehabilitative or preventive in character.

Evidence from the inquiry report suggests general purpose services in South Australia have gone from 55 per cent of ordinary service outlays in 1973-74 to 66 per cent—in real terms up $507 million, or 60 per cent in 1978-79 dollar terms. While roadworks in 1973-74 accounted for 45 per cent of ordinary service outlays, it now accounts for 34 per cent, or an increase in real terms of 1.8 per cent to 1982-83. While this illustrates the obvious dropping off of road-making, as against people services, in Australia as a whole, it does not, because of its broad nature, illustrate what I suspect are the real facts in South Australia or metropolitan versus rural South Australia. Roads and associated works in rural areas are still very high. People services may well be higher than roadworks and increasing in urban councils. They have finished their road-making; rural areas have not.

From the South Australian Grants Commission Report 1985, we see that the metropolitan area population of 957 000 spent $39.36 million on roadworks or $41 per head. Provincial cities, towns and a rural population of about 394 000 spent $41.6 million on roadworks or $105 per head, which is more than double. Net income with grants deducted showed the metropolitan area at $26.60 per head and provincial cities and rural areas at $56.80—again, more than double. The inquiry report says, using a different split, per capita expenditure on roads in rural areas was on average four times greater than inner city areas and three times greater than non-metropolitan cities, and is the most important expenditure in most Australian council areas.

As an important aside, Commonwealth road grants as a proportion of total Commonwealth payments to local government have fallen from 31.8 per cent in 1974-75 to 22 per cent in 1984-85. I would be very reluctant to support Commonwealth road grants allocations to the States being absorbed within Commonwealth general purpose grants moneys for the State Grants Commission allocation. Under this set up, it would not be long before horizontal equalisation would have road money being used for welfare and recreation purposes. However, I could support federal road grants being allocated by the State Grants Commission using methodology agreed to by local government and kept completely separate in every way from other grant allocations, that is, element A and element B.

General public services (health, social security, welfare, housing, community recreation, etc.) account for net expenditure, adjusted by S.A. Grants Commission allocation in metropolitan areas, of $55.78 per head, while provincial city, town and rural areas are $49.07 per head.

When this is coupled with effort recommendation 18 (xiv and xv), the report proposes rewarding positive effort by councils in certain defined functions, but does not propose any satisfactory method of measuring effort. It also proposes giving the Grants Commission a reserve power to penalise councils for low rate effort. Members can see that life is not going to be easy for councils who do not want or are not ready, to move away from the three Rs, and this also applies to those who want to contain rates, because the physical ability to pay is in real question for many councils encouraging self help.

What then is horizontal equalisation?

It involves making grants to those councils which are less well endowed than others, more or less in proportion to their deficiency in endowment. As such it constitutes an attempt to combine the virtues of centralised bureaucracy with local democracy.

I leave members to ponder whether they want centralised bureaucracy and what is the virtue of it anyway? I hope we would all want local democracy for local government.

Finally, and the most important reason for the points I have already described, is the vexed question of rates. The Commonwealth Department of Finance observed in its submission to the inquiry that the States appear to have responded to Commonwealth funding of local government by reducing significantly their real contribution, and in some cases they have forced local government to share the cost of their initiatives. Commonwealth assistance to local government in South Australia was up 82.8 per cent from 1976-77 to 1983-84. South Australian Government assistance to local government was down 23.6 per cent for the same period.

An examination of tax collections in each level of government as a proportion of GDP provides no support for suggestions that the introduction of personal income tax sharing has resulted in a diminution of tax effort. The years following personal income tax sharing show a slight increase in local government tax effort.

Two other factors should be mentioned in conjunction with any rate discussion. As to borrowing, because of the CPI, inflation, high interest rates and unavailability of loan money over some years, many local councils have been reluctant or unable to borrow. Since 1983, however, total local government borrowings have increased in real terms by 26 per cent. The latest figures I can find in the library show that from 1980-81 to 1983-84 the metropolitan area went up by 8 per cent in real terms, provincial cities and towns went up by 19 per cent in real terms, and rural areas went up by 15 per cent in real terms. We are talking about two different periods there, but it is intended to show that rate money is being augmented by a certain amount, and up to a reasonable amount, by borrowings. I move to inflation, in particular inflation as it affects local government on its major expenditure—roadworks.

The CPI inflation has only little to do with this, when compared to labour, bitumen, fuel, machinery, etc. For instance, since 1979-80, the CPI in South Australia has increased by 51.4 per cent. Against this, asphalt has risen by 72 per cent, precast concrete by 57 per cent, sand and aggregate by 88 per cent, machinery by 54 per cent, fuel 44 per cent, and average weekly earnings have increased by 73 per cent and building materials by 59 per cent, as against the CPI figure of 51 per cent. Within horizontal equalisation there appear two interlocking arguments or principles: first, revenue disability, or local governments less well endowed than others, for instance, in measures of valuations, road and property; and secondly, people service demands or a move away from traditional services and an identification of new services in the disadvantaged people area.

In addressing these two points, I must say I agree with this quote from the report (and I think it is from the Federal Treasury):

In the theory of responsible government there is a strong presumption that government should be fiscally independent. They should raise from their community sufficient revenue to cover the entire costs of the service they provide so enabling electors to vote according to the perception of the value of the services they receive as against their cost. One of the chief reasons for having a system of local government is to enable this choice to be made locally in respect of services of local significance. There is therefore a *prima facie* case against any system of grants to local government.

Unfortunately too much expectation has built up in Australia for the sentiment expressed in that quote to be achieved again, although I am sure early local government in Australia was exactly like that.

If it did happen, then we should demand an enormous decrease in federal and State taxation charges and excise, so enabling local government to increase the tax base with very real accountability for money raised and spent. The States have not exactly jumped at tax devolution even when it was recently a Fraser Federal Government aim, as part of federalism.

It does not matter to me in 1986 that the States and local government are not equal—they never have been and never will be. It does matter to me, however, that initiatives, good planning and management at local level should be rewarded by being at least recognition as better than fiscal equalisation (or any equalisation, for that matter) to the lowest common denominator; and most certainly thrift should not be penalised.

Having said that, we do in fact now have federal and State moneys going to local government—tied or untied grants—and it is not likely to change. Only the calculation of the amounts and the distribution will change. This in itself is a central problem because recent examples show that in 1973 we had the first Commonwealth general purpose grant to local government with its philosophy. In 1976 we had another philosophy, and in 1986 we have yet another philosophy outlined.

The councils are the bunnies because, no sooner do they learn to live with and work with one philosophy, then it changes and the game starts all over again, even though the last one has not been completed. Undoubtedly, local government was set up to administer roads, rates, rubbish and general engineering services. There is now this move evident from the inquiry recommendations that this is changing towards people services. The point I make strongly is that this may be so in the urban areas but it is not the prime aim in rural areas and some outer metropolitan areas.

I also make the point that, generally speaking, councils raise a quantum of money in rates and, when various jobs for which the money was raised are completed, they never reduce. Instead, they cast around to find something else on which to spend it. This is the case with every level of government; hence the Hawke Government's difficulty with fuel excise, etc. You can always stop a bicentenary road project, but you cannot stop a welfare project, because the recipients can vote.

Clearly, the rural and outer metropolitan areas are still completing the basic development tasks. In most instances in these areas there are certainly people problems, but in most cases the communities are looking after their own needs and these costs are additional to rates raised and, therefore, additional to the rate data that appears on all the academic reviews of Grant Commission allocations. The inquiry recommendations frequently refer to a lack of data in certain areas, and this is one of them (and quite a big one)—not to mention that the data used in calculating is on an Australia-wide basis and, therefore, a mish-mash of urban and rural philosophy and spending patterns. The South Australian Grants Commission says clearly in the 1985 report:

> A fiscal equalisation approach is one which attempts to equalise the financial capacity of councils. It attempts to compensate councils for relevant lack of revenue raising ability and inherent cost disabilities.

The South Australian Grants Commission allocations do not give any indication of just what they are compensating for, and that, in the grant, are compensations for effort in the previous year. Plus the fact that all sorts of juggling is done between the two elements A and B. Bearing in mind, as stated earlier, there is never enough grant to do the job properly with the standard set in South Australia of the top 25 councils.

There is little doubt to my knowledge that the factor that compensates for inherent cost disability is widely accepted in South Australia. A simple example, I expect, would be the cost difference between bitumen in Adelaide, and bitumen in any rural town or area.

I suspect this may not be the case for a relative lack of revenue raising ability because, quite frankly, this factor is not well understood and if we go to the inquiry report for help we find these sorts of quotes, not necessarily agreed to by the report, as follows:

1. Rates are a tax imposed on property but paid for out of current income.
2. Rates are a tax on wealth rather than income.
3. In the literature of taxation, wealth rides alongside income as an indicator to pay rates and taxes. It can be said that rates in so far as they are paid by property owners are levied on an aspect of ability to pay and are complementary to income tax.
4. Rates, like fuel tax, but unlike income tax, are a tax which farmers find it difficult to avoid and which they may complain bitterly about [as I do] especially in times of cost/price squeeze.

It is with us now and has been for some years. The quotation continues:

5. Rates, as a tax on calculated capital wealth, take no regard for the ability to pay or the ability to be profitable.

Commonwealth Treasury has made the point that rates on owner occupied housing are paid by the householder; rates on rented housing are paid by the landlord but can be deducted in calculating tax, and can also be passed on to the tenant in increased rent.

Rates on rural properties are deductible in calculating tax, but farm prices on international or open markets make it difficult to pass on to customers. Selling on domestic markets can pass on rates as well as treating them as a cost for tax purposes.

In South Australia with an average value per metropolitan property of $16 511 and $15 040 in rural areas, the rate income per capita is $119 in the metropolitan area and $136 on average in rural councils. Rate income per property is $300 in the metropolitan area and $195 in rural areas. The average teacher salary, as an example, is $24 500, and such a person would pay on average $40 a week in rent in a rural area. Therefore, the average landlord is paying $4 a week in rates in rural areas. The average rate in my district for a 400 hectare or 1 000 acre property is $900 a year or $17 a week.

When arguing if the local government tax base can handle increases for any reason, or especially if horizontal equalisation grants take large sums of grant money away from local government areas judged to have high capital value and therefore able to raise more rates, a number of factors must not be forgotten:

1. Enormous federal and State rises in taxation. (Average single income earner tax has risen 435 per cent since 1976, or three times more than average wage increases.) In 1959-60, total tax revenue for the three tiers of government was $3 billion of which 11.8 per cent was State and 5.6 per cent local government. In 1984-85 total tax revenue of the three tiers of government was $65.9 billion, of which 16.1 per cent was State and 3.9 per cent local government. I am saying that you cannot bleed the people any more at any level.

2. General charges and price rises of commodity inputs for small business and rural enterprises.

3. Superannuation, retirement, holiday pay, etc., being carried by the owners of small business and rural enterprises—in many cases part of the so-called capital gains are not available until the property is sold and when it is sold it is then taxed again.

4. Many cases of the community looking after its own welfare and disadvantaged—not showing up in rate requirements.

5. Calculation of grants made by State and Federal Governments to local government areas such as CEP grants.

6. State Government passing on costs of its initiatives to local government.

There are in fact two completely different factors in the rate argument:

1. Rural rates, mainly farming, are calculated on the capital value of the business, with no account taken of the ability to pay.

2. Urban rates are calculated on the capital value of the residence, again without any account of the ability to pay. They are strung together by the philosophy that capital value indicates an ability to pay. In present circumstances this is flimsy indeed.

I am sure the councils generally and electors/ratepayers were in the main happy with the general position of councils' performance and rate raising prior to 1973. If they were not, they were certainly able to make their feelings known locally or take the appropriate action at annual polls. The very evidence of poor turnout at local government polls supports this.

I am not aware of any great dissension following the advent of the Personal Income Tax Act 1976, and the advent of the State Grants Commission, even though funds were being fiscally equalised. Most have a very high regard for the South Australian Grants Commission and the work it does in its approach to fiscal equalisation.

However, I believe that if the Self inquiry report recommendations are adopted there will be great ructions in South Australian local government, because even if the financial arrangements are phased in over three years many councils will lose grants while some grants will greatly increase.

If councils were to receive nil or greatly reduced grants, it is certain they will immediately reduce staff, and effort, including rate effort. This approach would only tend to bring down those councils above average so that we again have the inevitable achievement of the lowest common denominator effect. I believe local government has an established right to a share in personal income tax or the total tax take of the Federal Government. As I am one who will encourage Governments to dramatically reduce taxes, I believe that local government should understand that, if this is ever achieved, general sharing grants should also reduce.

State Grants Commissions, after a review, including local government, should be able to distribute grants on the basis and methodology they have developed and use now. Individual local governments should make their own decisions on rate raising and spending priorities. The Commonwealth has the responsibility and fiscal ability to make grants to disadvantaged people and groups. Why not make these grants through the established welfare payments, CEP projects and the like, rather than this attempt at pulling the wool over our eyes by using State Grants Commissions.

Welfare and looking after the disadvantaged is the responsibility of those Governments causing the disadvantage. In Australia they have something like $66 billion to do it with, having given $534 million in untied grants to local government. Madam President, mercifully for you all, I have kept my remarks on this very comprehensive report to just a few recommendations. As the Minister of Local Government and others would know, there are 50 recommendations and 16 guidelines. I have no doubt there will be opportunities presented later to discuss other matters more fully. I thank you, Madam President, and honourable members for their traditional courtesy during my speech.

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: I support the motion and in so doing I extend to you, Madam President, my congratulations on attaining the high position of President of the Legislative Council. It has always been my belief, and I have made no secret of it, that this Chamber has an important role to play in the political and law making scene of South Australia. I am sure that you, Madam President, in your new role will do nothing to diminish the stature of this Council. I am sure that you will serve it well and I wish you all the best in your office.

At times like this, following an election, it is fitting to remember those members who through retirement or the whims of the electorate have foresaken their seats in this Parliament. Fortunately, in this Chamber the only casualties of the election were the retiring members. However, I suppose the Hon. Arthur Whyte could be almost classed as a casualty of the election, although in my view that is not true—he retired from this Council. The Hon. Cec Creedon, the Hon. Ren DeGaris, and the Hon. Lance Milne in their own ways added to the colour and character that contribute to the making of this Chamber. They are all different and yet their coming together helped to create a balanced view that could be accepted and recognised by those people whose votes we depend on. I wish them well in their retirement and trust that their new interests and relationships give them a full and healthy future. The Hon. Frank Blevins was also a straight shooter. I wish him well in his new role in the other place. He will be sorely missed here as he had a very capable mind and a very brilliant way of putting a point across.

I welcome the new members to the Chamber—the Hon. Caroline Pickles, the Hon. Terry Roberts, the Hon. George Weatherill, the Hon. Jamie Irwin, and the Hon. Mike Elliott. I am sure that with the many varied backgrounds that they come from they will also add and contribute to the colour of this Chamber. With the many viewpoints that they will put forward we should again be able to have a reasonable and balanced view on the subjects that we deal with. I wish them well in their new careers. I trust that all the points outlined by the Governor in his speech on Tuesday become realities, especially item No. 4, which states:

> My Government's first priority remains the development of a regional economy which can provide jobs for all South Australians who seek work. Policies for the development of the State will be directed towards the broadening of our economic base.

Year after year I and other speakers here and in the other place have raised the issue of unemployment and the traumatic results that it can have on a person. I sincerely hope that all members of Parliament can work for and contribute to policies that help alleviate this terrible problem. The spin-off to our society through unemployment—and I refer to vandalism, robberies, violence, drugs and broken homes —are putting a price and strain on our community that is becoming impossible to bear. On my way to work every day I read a poster, which is quite relevant and has been well circulated, as follows:

> Young Australians should be seen, heard, educated, employed, encouraged, respected and all treated as if they are the future of this country. Priority 1.

Young people are indeed the future of Australia and we must do everything in our power to ensure that their future is rewarding and fulfilling to them. I now turn to a recent advertisement that I read in the *Australian* of 28 January 1986 by John Leard, because it raises my next matter of concern. The advertisement is headed, 'The unions are taking over Australia'. I understand that the advertisement cost some $10 000. In fact, it is the second of a series, so he is obviously not short of money. By way of introduction the advertisement states:

> We are about to be fooled again. The so-called superannuation issue represents the biggest financial takeover attempt in our history and is all about the socialisation of Australia.
>
> The much-heralded debate on the productivity case and superannuation is in reality simply another smokescreen and confidence trick by which the present Government and the ACTU leadership are trying to mislead and hoodwink the Australian people. The issues are far more critical than productivity and superannuation. They strike at the very heart of Australia's democratic tradition.

Further on it states:

At the heart of our problem is, once again, Government spending and, in particular, the massive increase in the cost of welfare in this country. Over the past decade, the number of people dependent upon welfare payments in Australia has increased from 1 788 000 to 3 350 000, an increase of 87 per cent, and the cost of welfare in the past 10 years has increased from $3.7 billion to $17.8 billion.

The advertisement carries on in much the same vein for the whole page and towards the end he even has a go at the Opposition, as follows:

For too long in Australia, in recent years, the Opposition has been divided, spineless and has lacked direction.

I do not know whether he is getting ready to form a new Party. I believe that Australia and most Australians are caring and conscientious people. I believe that governments do no more than reflect this attitude and attempt to implement aims and laws that meet the needs of those people.

It is becoming quite obvious, in the arguments about tax avoidance schemes and the Government's attempts to close loopholes which abound, where billions of dollars are going, yet Mr Leard does not give one line of space to this item in his full page advertisement. In fact, it is a matter of conscience, as we all know, whether or not someone on a high income pays income tax. Money can be moved around in such a manner and in such a way that the payment of taxation becomes a matter of conscience. Mr Leard concentrates solely on union power and his main tirade is about setting up a superannuation scheme under the ACTU umbrella. In fact, if one reads the advertisement closely it is not so much that he objects to the scheme but who will control the moneys relating to the scheme and the power that the investments from the money can wield.

On the other side of the coin I refer to the Melbourne *Age* of 25 January 1986 which contains an article by Tim Colebatch entitled, 'Fitting the Australian jigsaw pieces together'. The article has some interesting thoughts which I will quote because they give a balance to the other side. The article states:

Three years ago it seemed possible that Australia could find the consensus path that has done such wonders for Japan, West Germany, Sweden and Austria, and emerge more disciplined, unified and competitive. That now seems less likely; not because the unions have failed to fulfil their side of the bargain, but because the employers are rejecting the idea of consensus.

Instead of entering the accord constructively for the potential benefits it could bring them, Australia's business leaders have cast themselves as Jeremiahs and embarked on an unwinnable ideological crusade against the accord, wage indexation and the union superannuation claim.

The crusade is unwinnable not only because the union-government alliance is far stronger than the employers, but because it is fundamentally unjust. It is not unreasonable for workers to want to protect the real purchasing power of their wages, and to want to retire with a reasonable income security. The managerial class cannot deny this because they are doing the same, and more.

In the year to last August average wages rose by just four per cent. All the data for executives remuneration shows that their salary packages rose by about twice this amount—while corporate profits are soaring. As for superannuation, business executives to a man enjoy the security of schemes far better than their workers can dream of.

Where is the morality in the business crusade against the ACTU-Government package of a 2 per cent cut in real wages coupled with a 3 per cent superannuation rise? Have you heard of any business leaders offering to take a cut in their wages? To renounce their lavish superannuation entitlements? To hold down their profits?

This year, for example, Victoria will spend $1 500 million on public transport, of which $440 million will be paid for by the users—and more than $1 000 million by the taxpayers. In just one State, that is, taxpayers are paying a billion-dollar subsidy to prop up an obsolete and overmanned industry that has resisted restructuring. Across Australia, the cost is far more. Why don't the employers target their energies on abuses like that?

Take superannuation. While most workers in private industry have no superannuation at all, those in the public sector enjoy very comfy schemes and are demanding more. Why don't employers fight to have the line drawn there rather than denying workers' rights to any benefit at all?

Employers could have done a lot for Australia at this time by trying to tackle union abuses from within the accord. Instead, they are running the risk that when this Government falls, as one day it will, Australia will return to the old law of the jungle without any lasting benefits from the consensus experiment. And, as employers found to their cost in 1980-81, there are stronger animals than them in the jungle.

I believe that the time has come for equality of security for workers in the form of a superannuation package. In the industries I came in contact with in my previous occupation it was the greatest hotch potch of superannuation schemes—and lack of them—that you could imagine. In fact, I worked for a firm where wages and conditions were not spectacular but the carrot offered was a free or non-contributory paid-in superannuation retirement scheme for the worker, with absolutely no control, say or input by the worker in that scheme.

The firm decided who went into the scheme, the firm decided when you went into it and the firm decided who they paid out and who did not get paid. I was given nothing after many years of service to that firm. In fact, I believe it was used as a form of blackmail to try to prevent a person from leaving, yet in other cases it was paid to people with less service than I had, and without any apparent fairness or reason.

Is it any wonder that workers seek a fairer and more uniform system? A case springs to mind which relates to an employee of that firm, and just to show what happens out in the real world I will quote it. After around 20 years of service, they decided that this employee was not the sort of worker they wanted, and he was dismissed. Prior to his dismissal a wage increase was gazetted. At this time I was a union organiser, and he felt at his termination that he was short on his pay and entitlements.

I worked it out, and it was obvious he had not been paid the wage increase for his termination pay which had just come through a month or two previously. I think it was some $90 to $100 that he was short. He wanted me to claim it there and then. I asked him what about this marvellous non-contributory scheme he had been in, and he replied that the firm had indicated to him that it was looking at it to see whether he could receive any benefits from it. I advised him to wait and see what happened to his superannuation before we claimed wage and termination pay shortages.

We waited some five or six weeks and the employee rang me up several times asking why I did not get on with it and his mates said I was no good and that the money was there to be picked up, and why did I not go and do it. I advised patience. Eventually, he rang me to say that he had received a cheque for just over $1 000, if I recall—not a great deal over—being from his superannuation scheme. It was then that I approached the company and advised it that a possible underpayment of wages could have occurred when the employee's services had been terminated. They checked it out and agreed that there was an underpayment, but the reaction was—as I expected—that if they had known they were going to be hit for the $90 to $100, no way would they have given the ungrateful employee any part of the superannuation, etc., and this was after 20 years of service by that employee.

I advised them that I thought that would be the case, and that was why we had waited until the superannuation had been looked at and, in this employee's case, had been paid. Is it any wonder that the worker is looking for a better deal with superannuation, and why should not the worker and his representatives have some say as to where and what superannuation investments are made? This event that I relate happened some years back, and I know of nothing that makes me think things have changed to any great extent with some of the companies or firms.

Of course, there is the other side of the coin. There are large, responsible companies with a decent, fair system of superannuation with both parties contributing and with a sliding scale of reimbursements if one decides to leave that company. In my view some, but definitely not enough, firms operate superannuation schemes. After all, in any superannuation scheme it is eventually the consumer who pays, and it never ceases to amaze me that when a production line superannuation is accepted, and at the other end at the point of sale, in many cases it is a definite no-no. There is no fairness in a system that does not treat everybody on an equitable basis, and I for one believe a decent national superannuation scheme is long overdue. I would think that women would be virtually non-existent in any superannuation scheme anywhere.

Another issue I wish to raise is the media's mad preoccupation with anything that, in their minds, remotely resembles a perk to politicians. Matthew Abraham of the *Advertiser* seems in recent times to have a positive mania for it. When I first met him, he was called Mat Abraham. I guess that time changes us all and he now has the distinguished title of Matthew. We start off with the *Advertiser* of the 23rd—front page news and headlines: 'After Voting Comes the Supersized Payout'.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: It is not very accurate.

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: I would not know. He goes on to list the details of what he reckons every one of the retired members gets. The article is fair and reasonably factual and, I have no doubt, reasonably accurate on his calculations. Two points are worth quoting just for the record, and I quote them:

State MPs pay 11.5 per cent of their salaries into their superannuation fund, with the Government topping up the fund when needed. A spokesman for the Deputy Premier, Dr Hopgood, refused to give details of the pay-outs because he said the majority of the money from the fund came from the private contributions of MPs.

'The money is invested and it's paid out—the Government tops up the contributions as required,' the spokesman said.

There is a bit more there on the front page. I have no objection to the article: it is fair and reasonably accurate, even if it is very prominent. However, an article in the *Advertiser* of 11 February again raises the superannuation issue. He sees it as a perk and says that for a member of the public to figure the payout to an MP he would need the full Act and all the service, committees, etc.—and a calculator—the inference being that it is beyond a lay person to fathom. I have news for him—it is beyond the scope of most politicians to figure out.

I know that I pay over $400 a month out of my pay. I understand that it is 11½ per cent of my salary, so I would guess that in the six years I have been here I would be getting up to having paid some $28 000 to $30 000 into the scheme and, no doubt, by the time I leave that will be some $60 000 or $70 000 paid in. I left a job where superannuation was a recognised part of my employment. Through the number I achieved on my Party's ticket I can be reasonably assured of completing two terms of office. However, many members of Parliament do not enjoy that luxury, and I fail to see that people entering Parliament should not be assured of a good superannuation scheme. The likes of Michael Wilson (a chemist, as I understand it) would find it very difficult and virtually impossible to go back into that job. John Carnie, who was in this Council three years ago, lost his preselection and was dumped after 12 years. John would have been in his early 50s and was also a chemist and, no doubt, would find it impossible to continue in that area.

The Hon. Dr Ritson (a doctor of medicine) would also have the same difficulty if he had missed out in this election. He is a medical practitioner, and I very much doubt if he could have picked up his career after six years. The Hon. John Burdett—No. 5 on the ticket—is a lawyer, I am an ex-union official; the Hon. Dr Cornwall is a veterinarian; the Hon. Mr Chatterton, a winemaker. All of these people, and many others, if not elected, would face hardship in picking up their careers, which in many cases carry as much salary, etc., as any politician earns.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: It often carries a lot more.

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: I agree: it does. Without a reasonable scheme we would not be able to attract a cross section of the community that go to make up a Parliament. I was going through some papers, and saw *Viewpoint* by Paul Lloyd. It had a heading 'Pittance of a Payout for He Who Takes Flak'. Would you believe that it is somebody supporting Peter Duncan's payout! I think it is worth going into the record, as follows:

In South Australia, this land of enterprise and opportunity, it is as though we believed Socialists, like artists in the bohemia of a lost romantic era, had to live in garrets.

Witness the case of Peter Duncan, this week resting between engagements as an MP, who cops the most extraordinary flak with every cent he gets.

Duncan wins a libel suit, Duncan owns property, Duncan sells his 5AA shares . . . and now Duncan gets $221 000 superannuation payout after resigning his State Parliamentary seat, plus a $7 000 indexed annual pension.

The public attitude is either reflected in or conditioned by the way it is reported; front page and prime time, and with such emotive adjectives as 'huge' payout and veiled hints that the naughty traitor to the working class 'is on his way to becoming a millionaire'.

In fact, since an MP's affairs are quite open to public scrutiny, it takes surprisingly little investigation to reveal that Mr Duncan is no richer than many lawyers and other professionals of his ambition and age. But then what sin is it to be rich anyway, Socialist or not?

What is forgotten—perhaps because of the controversy Mr Duncan attracts—is that he has earned it.

It is not just that for 11 years, as the majority of the people of Elizabeth attested by their votes, he was a solid representative of the area in Parliament. Nor that, in the Dunstan Government, he was a brilliant and socially innovative Attorney-General.

It is that for 11 years and seven months as State member for Elizabeth, some of that time on the extra pay of a Cabinet Minister, he contributed 11.5 per cent of his salary to a superannuation fund, as does every other MP.

The benefits available to MPs vary according to their length of service and reason for leaving, but generally they get as superannuation 41.2 per cent of their salary after six years service, this figure rising by 0.2 per cent for each month of service above that to a ceiling of 75 per cent.

They are entitled to take between 75 per cent and 30 per cent of their superannuation as a lump-sum payment, the percentage dropping as their age rises.

Of course, with taxation and conversion now of superannuation, I doubt whether any of us will be taking the maximum conversion. The article continues:

The money paid out as superannuation comes from the individual's contributions, Government contributions, and interest earned by the fund's investing these moneys.

To many people it could seem that MPs have high superannuation payouts, as do those who serve the public in the police and armed forces.

But people do not always enter Parliament for the money and are not highly paid for the work they (or at least the good ones) do.

They do not have the job security of the humblest employee in private enterprise, let alone the Public Service. Come an election and an MP can be summarily sacked, not necessarily because of doing a bad job but because of a public perception that somebody else could do it better.

It is hardly surprising they have what seems a relatively good superannuation package.

Of course, anybody else but Peter Duncan and this storm would never have blown up.

Mr Duncan's known political enemy, the Premier, Mr Bannon, is complaining loudest of all, saying that it is unfair of Mr Duncan, who seems set to take the Federal seat of Makin, to take the money and run to Canberra, where he can start a new career building up another superannuation.

But the South Australian Parliamentary Superannuation Act specifically allows for such a superannuation payout in the event of an MP's resigning, to contest a Federal seat, win it or lose it.

Those who are complaining, and invoking the spirit of the Act, might have had the foresight to have amended its letter before this happened.

In fact, we all know that it has been amended since then. The article continues:

There could well be arguments now for looking again at what the Act allows, although taking a lump sum in the event of going to Canberra rather than transferring the money to the eventual federal pension, might be irrelevant. Mr Duncan could have gone into private enterprise where a person of his talents might build up even greater benefits.

When an MP named Malcolm Fraser resigned, after a federal career which included a Prime Ministership, there were no significant bleats about his entitlement to a $600 000 lump sum, a pension of $60 000 a year and other perks.

No, the bleats about Peter Duncan are not about money, they are about Duncan himself.

The article goes on with a few other things that I will not read. Matthew infers that the super is topped up by the Government. Maybe there is something sinister in this, but I do not believe that there is. All of the super schemes that I have come into contact with are matched by the employer or bettered by the employer's contribution. Surely that is a top up.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: What is the Public Service percentage contribution?

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: I would not have a clue, but in a lot of private funds the worker pays 6 per cent and the company pays 6 or 7 per cent—a total of 13 per cent. So, there are a lot of top-up schemes outside in business. When I came into the Parliament I had no idea how the superannuation scheme worked. I knew that there was one and that everybody thought it was good. I agree with that assessment, but I can assure Matthew and his readers that that was not a factor in my entering Parliament. He states that members of select committees receive from $6 751 to $4 930 for a Chairmanship and $4 686 to $3 520 as committee members. There is also a payment of $12.50 for attending meetings of *ad hoc* committees. Let me put the record straight for Matthew. The committees he is talking about are standing committees such as the Public Works Standing Committee, the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, the Industries Development Committee and the Public Accounts Committee. They are extra work over and above an MP's normal role and, as such, are paid committees. If they were not paid committees, with the demands and time factors involved, why would anyone serve on them? It would mean someone on a backbencher's salary taking on an extra demanding task for the same remuneration as his fellow backbenchers.

That $12.50 referred to is for attending at select committees set up for a specific purpose, for example, for such select committees as those involving random breath testing, council boundaries, the casino and the disposal of human remains. I could go on. I have sat on dozens of worthwhile select committees. Those committees are responsible and time consuming. The $12.50 per meeting has operated for the six years that I have been in the Parliament—I do not know for how many years before that. It has quite evidently operated for a long time before that, from my understanding gleaned from other members. If ever there was a case for a catch-up in money terms, that is it. If these committees were not paid (and for the pittance one gets, they might as well not be classed as paid) there would be members performing extra work above that of other members for no reward. I believe that that is an unjust situation.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: The amount was six guineas before the introduction of decimal currency.

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: I am advised that the amount was once six guineas. I am amazed that it has never kept pace. It is recognised that Ministers receive extra money for extra duties and have a car placed at their disposal, yet it is implied that a standing committee member is getting a perk. It is also implied that a member of a select committee who receives a lousy $12.50 for attending time consuming and demanding meetings of that committee is getting a perk.

Matthew goes on to mention dining-room perks, with its 'red velvet drapes'. I have news for Matthew: they are blue, not red. He says that a four course meal costs $2.50. I have news again for him: a four course meal costs us $3. A visitor's meal in the strangers dining room costs the member $3.20 for three courses and $3.70 for four courses. I can take Matthew to any number of industrial canteens where workers pay in much the same price range as politicians and guests.

Parliament House has about 190 persons employed either permanently or casually to service its many needs. The catering facilities have comparable prices available to all, not necessarily in the dining room—there is a canteen downstairs. In fact, Matthew and his colleagues are welcome to eat and drink there, and no doubt do. The surroundings downstairs have been upgraded for the staff. I was downstairs the other day and saw new carpet and tables and chairs. It is an attractive area and I see it as an industrial canteen. I see our catering as no more or less than an industrial canteen with its associated benefits. Admittedly, it has more elegance and flair than basic canteens do, but if one thinks of the visitors who often come to South Australia and use its services it deserves to have extra flair and elegance.

If people do not want this service to be provided let them say so, but let us get away from this wink wink, nudge nudge, 'the boys' get cheap meals.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Does the *Advertiser* have an industrial canteen?

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: I would imagine. I can name any number of industrial canteens where it costs $2.50 for a good, substantial, pleasant, three-course meal. They may not have the service and the silver, but that is the only difference. If prices were high in the dining room, as with any industrial canteen they would have no patrons with the local delicatessen getting all the orders or people bringing in a sandwich from home.

Matthew says that MPs get 200 stamps free each month. I have more news for him: my colleagues and I in the Legislative Council get only 60 and I can assure him we have no trouble in using them. He also states that we have free use of Parliament House telephones for local and STD calls. Surprise, surprise! What are we supposed to do? Talk on our hands? Send smoke signals? We are, after all, members of Parliament and should have the right to talk to constituents and people who seek our assistance.

Every business of which I know has the phone connected for the use of staff and clients. Of course, the inference is that politicians use the phones for nothing other than private business—not true, Matthew! Then we come to the travel allowance—$4 700 a year and the greatest perk of all time, if the press is to be believed. Through no fault of their own, the new politicians got swept up in Matthew's enthusiasm in an earlier edition and again in an article of 11 February. The new politicians neither asked for nor sought in any way the travel allowance. It is one of the entitlements or perks, as Matthew has put it, that go with the job. Wink wink, nudge nudge. Matthew states that the oveseas trips are relatively new and worthwhile. I could not agree more. Matthew fails to grasp that we may use that travel allowance anywhere in Australia without reporting on it, but if we go overseas and spend any of that allowance a report must be tabled in the Parliamentary Library.

Matthew evidently took delight in singling out my report as failing to give a full travel report. For Matthew's infor-

mation I complied fully with what needs to be lodged in the library: the purpose of trip, who went and for how long. If and when they want a two, 10 or 50 page report, I am prepared to give it. The reason I do not give any more detail is obvious from the way journalists have slanted their write-ups. I also believe that a politician would have to be as thick as two planks between the ears if he did not gain some benefit from an overseas trip, or any trip for that matter. For the record, I will now read the report I made for my records of my last trip to New Zealand. For Matthew's information, if anyone wants to see me after reading my brief report in the Library, I am available.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: He will not publish your—

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: He might. I will read from my personal report, as follows:

Purpose—To study Information Centres covering National and Maritime Parks and Reserves.

Places visited—North and South Islands of New Zealand.

Persons accompanying—Mrs O. Bruce.

Duration of tour—17 days.

The following information was derived from a recent visit to New Zealand—where I had the pleasure of touring and visiting information centres.

This is dated at the time I filed the report in the library, but I filed this in my cabinet. The report continues:

Visitor centres are under the control of the New Zealand Department of Lands and Survey and fall into three categories:

(1) Large visitor centres with permanent staff where park or reserve management and administration staff are based.

(2) Smaller visitor centre/ranger stations which may not be staffed; at all times centres are open.

(3) Visitor information structures which can be quite extensive but are not an enclosed building.

(i) Sixteen visitor centres mainly located in national parks or special sites such as at Waitangi.

(ii) Seventeen visitor centres located in national parks, maritime parks, historic reserves and scenic reserves.

(iii) Three visitor information units with display panels in some form of open structure.

Listed are 36 centres. I seek leave to have the names inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

INFORMATION CENTRES

The locations are:

Waitaki Landing	Te Paki Farm Park
Waitangi	Waitangi Treaty Grounds
Russell	Bay of Islands Maritime and Historic Park
*Kawau Island	Historic Mansion House, B.O.I.M. and H. Park
Auckland	On Waterfront
	Hauraki Gulf Maritime Park
Rangitoto Island	Hauraki Gulf Maritime Park
Aniwaniwa	Urewera National Park
Taneatua	Urewera National Park
Murupara	Urewera National Park
Cape Kidnappers	Gannet Sanctuary (New unit under construction)
North Egmont	Egmont National Park
Dawsons Falls	Egmont National Park
Whakapapa	Tongariro National Park
Turangi	Tongariro National Park
Ohakune	Tongariro National Park
Pipiriki	Wanganui River Reserves
Taumarunui	Wanganui River Reserves (Area has been recommended for a new national park)
Havelock	Marlborough Sounds Maritime Park
St Arnaud	Nelson Lakes National Park
Takaka	(Abel Tasman National Park, Golden Bay Reserves)
Totaranui	Abel Tasman National Park
Springs Junction	Lewis Pass Reserves
Arthurs Pass	Arthurs Pass National Park
Mount Cook	Mount Cook National Park
Peel Forest	Peel Forest Reserve
Franz Josef	Westland National Park
Fox Glacier	Westland National Park
Punakaiki	Punakaika Reserves (Area has been recommended for a new national park)
Wanaka	Mount Aspiring National Park
Makarora	Mount Aspiring National Park
Glenorchy	Mount Aspiring National Park
Owaka	South East Otago Reserve (Shared with Forest Service)
Cromwell	Otago Goldfields Park
Queenstown	Reserve Complex
Te Anau	Fiordland National Park
Clifton	Fiordland National Park

*The Mansion House on Kawau Island is a restored historic building.

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

Manning of visitor centres is carried out in a variety of ways. The larger visitor centres have full-time receptionists with part-time receptionists at weekends and holidays. In general, all talks are given by rangers or by seasonal interpreters. The latter group is usually only employed for from three to five weeks over the peak summer holiday period. Smaller or less busy centres have either receptionist/typists or rangers or rangers' wives manning the centre at peak use times. Some small centres are not usually manned, but will have a notice with instructions on how to contact some member of the staff for further information.

The capital cost range is considerable. A large visitor centre is currently planned for Te Anau to include not only visitor facilities but space for management and administration staff. The building will replace the existing park headquarters/visitor centre which is totally inadequate. At present there is no firm cost, but it is likely to be in the range of $450 000 ($NZ600 000).

Small visitor centres containing, say, two offices, would generally cost about $100 000-$140 000 (NZ). Small open type display/information units are often built by staff at a probable upper limit of $NZ60 000.

All of the centres provide the type of information that most people require when visiting a park, reserve or historic site. As there is more experience and understanding of exactly what visitors require, it is hoped to achieve a steady improvement with all services provided. As would be expected, centres range from poor to very good.

At present there is a plan to build a new visitor centre at Te Anau. The steps taken to finalise a design for the building and grounds may be of interest.

Input is required from specialist staff involved with planning, architecture, displays, audio-visuals, communications (radio, inter-office communications and telephones for internal and external management, as well as search and rescue), landscape, architects and staff at the park. From these inputs a brief is prepared for the architect who will design the building. From experience, this level of input or team effort is essential if mistakes of the past are not to be repeated.

The department has a visual production unit consisting of display artists, cabinet makers, graphic artists, researchers, photographers and dark-room staff. This unit prepares many of the displays and audio-visual programs. They also provide professional advice and oversight for displays and audio-visual programs where these have to be contracted to other organisations.

It would be fair to say that the department now has a far better level of professional expertise but is still learning and experimenting. The department also works very closely with the tourist industry so that it can meet their special requirements where this is appropriate. Communication with all staff and other interested parties is helped by production of an *Interp News* which contains information as to what is being done at the various centres throughout New Zealand.

This bulletin is circulated to all those centres and to all staff working there; it is a very valuable communication. My report continues:

There is no doubt the importance of the centres, not just to educate and inform, is recognised, but also their importance to tourism. From the centres I had the pleasure of visiting and observing, I must say I was most impressed with the quality and obvious care that had gone into their setting up.

There is no doubt that such centres could play an important part in South Australia in understanding and appreciating some of our fragile regions, and I think of the Coorong, Flinders Ranges, Murray River and many of our national parks as falling into this category. It is just not good enough to bring people into those areas we believe have merit as tourist attractions, or reserves, without making available the interpretative details that go hand in hand with the appreciation of an attraction.

It is my firm belief that as South Australia is now entering into the field of interpretative centres, i.e. Goolwa for the River Murray, and Port Augusta for the Flinders Ranges and northern areas, a lot could be learnt from the New Zealand experience in setting up and servicing interesting and informative interpretative centres.

Of course, this report is brief and just a summary of what I saw and visited. To me, what is more important than the

report is the impressions I formed, and the chance to use international airports, and see the smooth way in which tourists' needs are catered for and the type of promotional material made available.

Matthew did not go back far enough. I had a report on a trip I made to Norfolk Island the year before and, for the record and before he rushes off to study it, let me detail a few of the highlights now. My purpose on this trip was to study the effects and control of tourism on Norfolk Island. How is that for a perk or junket! In fact, the study of the Legislative Assembly on Norfolk Island is a study in itself. I have a three page preamble that I would be happy to discuss with Matthew, but the part which I find interesting and which vitally affects my thoughts and impressions is the following points:

In April 1983 after months of study and debate in relation to tourism, the Legislative Assembly [on Norfolk Island] accepted the following policies on tourism:

- Tourism is recognised as the basis of the island's economy.
- Norfolk Island is to be regarded as primarily the home of its residents and not primarily as a tourist resort.
- The desired level of tourism was set for the time being at 24 000 people per year.
- The Assembly recognises that tourism has both good and bad effects and seeks the best balance between these.
- The commercial benefits of tourism should go mostly to Norfolk Islander residents rather than to non-residents.
- Local ownership of tourist facilities is encouraged and overseas ownership is not encouraged. As an illustration of this the Assembly does not seek an overseas financed international luxury standard hotel.
- The quantity of tourist accommodation should be controlled by appropriate legislation and for the time being should not be increased.
- Conservation and ecological protection are recognised as essential not only for tourism but for present and future generations of residents.

These were some of the points made and, while the tourist industry on the island is neither operated nor controlled by the Government, its decisions can influence the way it develops and these points give some idea of how Norfold Islanders think.

While it is very difficult to form opinions about a situation from a brief visit, I am of the impression that tourism is a very fragile package to promote, whether it be on Norfolk Island or wherever, as without proper constraints it can destroy what tourists come to see. I believe that the island people are fully aware of this and are using their best endeavours to protect a very fragile and sensitive industry.

I am sure what I have learnt and seen during this study trip will be relevant to other areas and aspects of the tourist industry that I become involved with in South Australia. And I believe that only by the ability to visit other areas and locals that depend on tourism can one achieve ideas as to how our own tourist industry should develop and a more balanced viewpoint should result from one's deliberations resulting from this study tour.

In fact, I drew on my experience at Norfolk Island during a recent visit to Burra. What was true for the deliberations of the Norfolk Assembly was also relevant to an area such as Burra in its bid to develop tourism.

For the benefit of Matthew, I point out that my interest in tourism is not just newly found. All my life I have enjoyed travel and in my previous employment tourism was the catalyst that created employment for the people in the industry I served. It is a vital and dynamic industry, and I hope I never lose my interest in it.

Before my coming into Parliament I had visited and viewed all major Australian cities, Tasmania and Kangaroo Island. I had a trip to Japan, the Philippines and Hong Kong. I enjoy Australia; I enjoy travel; and, given half the chance, I will certainly use my travel allowance. To illustrate how travel broadens one's outlook, I indicate that I had the pleasure of going to Japan about seven years ago before I entered Parliament. I was shown industry in Japan, including the Keerin brewery. We were taken in to what was one of the most up to date breweries in the world.

The only breweries I had seen until then had been Australian breweries. We were taken into a huge room which, I assumed, was the staff dining room or canteen. One flick of the button and all the curtains came down, a screen came out and a projector on the back wall showed a film in English on how beer was made. The first thing we saw was South Australian barley and the statement that Keerin brewery bought the best products in the world, including that South Australian barley. The film showed how it was used.

We were then taken on a conducted tour of that brewery. Will members believe that in that hot and humid atmosphere every individual worker was air-conditioned: workers were sitting and working while attached to flexible pipes with huge nozzles that they could put over them wherever they were working in a restricted area. The work area was not air-conditioned, but the workers were. That was an eye opener.

If one travels, one can see such things. It is worth the effort to go. Again, I made a friend overseas and made contacts in Manila. I had no idea what it was all about and now I watch with fascination what is happening in the Philippines. I met a person involved in the trade union movement who had spent time in gaol because of his trade union activities. I spent a week in Manila. He had a friend who drove me around. If ever there is a corrupt place it is Manila. I saw millionaires row and one had to go through armed guards and pill boxes to get there, yet a mile away were the slums of Manila with one tap serving hundreds of people and open sewers and everything else. I saw the war museum in Manila and I went to Hawaii to see the war cemetery. These areas show the futility of war and, if more people could travel, they could see what our world has to offer. They could see the good and bad in it, and then we might all be able to do some good.

I believe that everyone should have the opportunity to move around, to compare and to judge. How can one compare whether our casino is the best, whether our tourist facilities are good, and whether our airport, roads, can leglislation or RBT regulations and the thousand other things are up to the standards in other States and countries if one does not have the opportunity to move around.

People in business have that opportunity. I moved around in the circles of business and not one of the people I know in major industries that I covered had not been overseas several times. No ifs or buts or beg-your-pardons. Their trips were paid for by the consumer; they had to be. Trips do not come from anywhere else: companies sell their products and the profits go to pay for such activity. However, let one politician leave South Australia and the roof will fall in: perks and lurks. Okay Matthew, if you do not believe we should have $4 700 in travel allowance, say so, and I will adjust my lifestyle accordingly. However, while I have it, I am sure that my colleagues and I will use it, and to good advantage for South Australia, I would trust.

What about Matthew? I understand he had six or 12 months in America. He must have had two planks between his ears if he did not come back with some increased knowledge from that trip. But he assumes that politicians all have two planks between the ears and that they should not be able to go anywhere and absorb anything.

I have no doubt at all that Matthew in his 12 months overseas absorbed many impressions that he will never be able to put in black and white, and that will never come up in the press, but it forms and helps formulate his future life and how he observes Australia in the future, as well as other countries in the rest of the world.

Matthew, travel broadens your outlook and, if you are going to attack politicians for the lousy $4 700 travel allowance, and if you are going to get the public on side to see that we cannot move outside South Australia, do it.

Now for the grand coup—the gold pass—the greatest perk of the lot, or so says Matthew. I have used my gold pass to

go to the Royal Adelaide Show, but that was by invitation. The Royal Agricultural Society has been kind enough to send us a letter—wink wink; nudge nudge; we get to the show for nix.

I have used the gold pass about 10 times on public transport in the metropolitan system. I have been to Perth once and Alice Springs once (that is in six years). I have not been to Adelaide Oval, Matthew, and I have not been to the races. For Matthew's information, the zoo sends us a pass. We do not use the gold pass, and the same applies to the trots, too. That organisation sends us an invitation. Thank you Matthew—I see that Matthew is now in the gallery. The trotting organisation sends us an invitation to attend if we want to. We do not go on the gold pass but by personal invitation, just as applies in the case of the zoo, where we are invited to take a friend. We are welcomed if we attend because these organisations realise that we are in the position of legislating. They realise what we are about. They like to see us visit their activities. That is why we are invited to the Royal Show and the trots.

If Matthew believes that the gold pass should go, let him say so. It is my belief that some of the things that a gold pass allows should be used as a mandatory exercise for politicians to keep in touch with the State and what is happening in it. How can we know what is happening in public transport if we never use it? You will never go on public transport if you are a politician but, if you have a gold pass, according to Matthew, you rush out and say where is it—I want you to use it. Joke! Joke! They ought to make it mandatory that politicians have to travel on the pass. Politicians cannot win in regard to salaries either. If they go to an independent tribunal they are blasted if they get a rise. If they lock into the CPI along with the rest of the community—and these are Matthew's words—'their pay climbs gently upward with little publicity'. According to Matthew this is something clandestine and secret.

Relativity is the name of the game and, if a politician was worth so much a year five years ago, he should maintain that relativity in present times, and there is nothing wrong or obscene with that. Certainly, I do not think so.

Under the heading 'Who should decide what an MP is worth?' is an article that came out in last year's paper thrown across the fence. It is an article by Stan Evans. Stan was re-elected, so people must have thought that Stan was not too far out. He writes:

> How should we decide what a member of Parliament is to be paid?
>
> Some years ago the press praised Parliament's action in taking that decision away from MPs, and resting it with an independent tribunal. Yet now that independent tribunal has established that members' salaries have fallen far behind the community, the press is loudest in condemning, not the tribunal, but politicians.
>
> Federal members too, whose salaries and allowances have increased to about $10 000 above South Australian State MPs, have joined the outcry, yet their salaries and perks are the highest. How foolish we were in South Australia to twice reject an increase. Even with the much-criticised increase, we would still receive $3 000 less than a sixth ranking public servant.
>
> We would also receive less than an A class primary school principal and $12 000 less than the Clerk of the Parliament in which the members sit.
>
> The editorial of one daily paper suggested State MPs have generous provisions of staff and offices. Few of these knowledgeable scribes would have visited my office in an old home at Blackwood with far from generous provisions. And for the workload the provision of one dedicated secretary is also far from generous.

I will not quote it all. However, Stan is on our side. It is an interesting exercise to examine how the public thinks. I think it was the year before last that a member of the public appeared before the remuneration tribunal arguing against giving politicians an increase in salary. Some weeks later that same individual sent a letter to every politician asking for a donation to the charity that he supported. It is no wonder that we become cynical!

Randall Ashbourne had a go, but he gives the other side of the coin. In the *Sunday Mail* of 9 February he wrote a half page article headed 'Pollie wants a cracker but is afraid to ask.' A good headline! If I seem to be taking up a lot of time in the Council on this, I am taking up no more time than the press does when it examines our internal interests and affairs. The article cites the wages of politicians in South Australia and the other States as follows:

> South Australia pays its 69 MP's a base salary of $39 937. In Queensland, they would be getting at least $40 878. Then follow Victoria with $44 019; Western Australia with $42 350 and New South Wales with $42 129.
>
> Tasmanian MP's are paid a base salary of $36 880.

The article continues and, for a change, we do not receive a bad write-up.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: No, I mean a change for the press; it is not a bad write-up. I am not singling out Randall Ashbourne. I mean that the press has given us a reasonable write-up. Of course, wink wink, nudge nudge, we also have all the perks that go with the job—'she's right mate, don't worry!' Just for the record, there are 37 Labor members who hold their Caucus meetings in a crowded tin-pot room about 16 feet by 30 feet without adequate ventilation or seating facilities. Backbench members—

The Hon. C.M. Hill: Faceless men.

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: Yes. I have a room in my back yard—a games room paid for before I entered Parliament—as big as our Caucus room. I also owned my own home before I entered Parliament. Backbench members of the Legislative Council have two secretaries for six members. The secretaries are housed in a tin-pot office in a passageway of Parliament House. If Matthew wants to wander along that passage he will see what tin-pot premises and facilities the staff have. I shared an office with a colleague for some six years. In fact, members of both sides of the Legislative Council still share offices.

The telephone exchange for Parliament House has long passed the state of the art, according to Telecom. In fact, modern office equipment and modern telephones are non-existent. Members of Parliament come into this place with a high degree of skill and competence, high ideals and principles. Parliament and the community should give them every opportunity to exercise these attributes. If the public believe that all these great perks are so much, let them adjust our salaries accordingly and let us get on with the job of governing and legislating instead of this mad preoccupation with 'pollies' perks.

Matthew is welcome to view my bank accounts any time he wants to do so. If he reckons that I am making a great fortune from politics, he is welcome to tell his readers all about it. That is an open invitation. I am not crying poor mouth and I do not need anyone to rush in and say, 'If you do not like it, what are you doing here—get out of it'. I enjoy being a Legislative Councillor, but I am just a bit fed up with the continual 'wink wink, nudge nudge' syndrome that the press and the public seem to have in relation to politicians. I support the motion.

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: Madam President, I should feel much more relaxed following that speech by the Hon. Mr Bruce. Having said that, I certainly join with other honourable members in supporting the motion. I take the opportunity to express my thanks to his Excellency the Governor for the address with which he opened the new session of Parliament. First, I address my sincere congratulations to you, Madam, as our new President. The South Australian community has been amply made aware through

the press that your appointment to this important position is a first. It is indeed worthy of note.

In a society which prides itself on its love of equality and a fair go perhaps this event has been too long in coming. It is also curious that today, when we feel we have broken every record possible, our society can be delighted with such a new conquest as the election of a woman President for this Council. Of course, I am mindful of the fact that I may appear insensitive to your newly won position by not abiding by your request that I should address you by a title different from one that I have already used, that is, 'Madam'. The problem, Madam President, is that I come from a different language background which places two constrictions on me: one is the sheer difficulty of placing my tongue around two consecutive consonants such as 'm' and 's'. As you know, Madam, the Italian language is most melodious and lacking in harshness. I am afraid that my mouth has been shaped to pronounce smooth flowing words, and hard combinations of sound become very difficult for me to pronounce.

The second reason relates to the traditional respect that my cultural origin affords to women. Indeed, names such as Mrs which perhaps in some other societies do not enjoy an aura, in the society of my origin are still a source of high respect. Therefore, Madam President, you will understand and pardon the difficulty I experience and at the same time will accept the respect that is implicit in my choice of the word 'Madam' in preference to your suggestion. As I have said, the word 'Madam' confers upon you that aura of respect and honour which suits your position and your own personal attributes.

While I am in the mood for offering congratulations, I express similar thoughts to the honourable members who have been elected to this Parliament for the first time. I also place on the record my best wishes for a long and happy retirement to the Hon. Mr Creedon, the Hon. Mr Milne, the Hon. Mr DeGaris and, in particular, to the past President, the Hon. Mr Whyte, who was very kind to me and assisted me in every way possible since I was elected to this Parliament. Finally, I congratulate the Bannon Government on its achievements during its first term of office. One does not have to be partisan to recognise this. In any event, the population of this State seems to have indicated its appreciation through the ballot box at the last election. In an area that I have spoken to before—the area of migrant affairs—I propose a word of satisfaction and congratulations, especially to our Attorney-General and Minister of Ethnic Affairs, who is also the Leader of the Government in this place. While I have never avoided critical intervention or an inquisitive question, I am equally free to acknowledge success and bestow praise. However, I will say a bit more about that later in my speech.

A move by the returned Bannon Government which has attracted little public comment, perhaps, but which to me appears significant, is the proposed amalgamation of the Health Commission and the Department for Community Welfare. I believe that it is a sensible decision. It was not, as I know, presented without appropriate study and consultation.

It reflects a logical response to a view of the human person as a whole, rather than fragmented into its various components. In practice, people experience their needs precisely in this fashion. One does not suffer some physical illness without also experiencing some emotional turmoil. Conversely, people's needs in the welfare area often affect physical wellbeing. Dr Cornwall, the Minister for the two services, should be congratulated on what must surely be seen as a vote of confidence by the Premier, Mr Bannon, and the entire Cabinet, in his management skills and his ability to make something as complex as his departments work effectively.

Dr Cornwall will certainly not need to be reminded by me that he assumes the responsibility for those departments at a crucial moment—especially for our migrants. Both departments have just completed a preliminary analysis of their needs, and they have developed appropriate plans for a suitable response. Both departments have established respective units to supervise and advise on migrant issues. As I said before, the previous Administration has provided a sound base for an implementation initiative. In speaking to this topic, I must add here that the pattern of our unification of departments should be accompanied by an opposite enlargement of the concept of health and welfare.

Movements in this direction are already noticeable in the policy platform of our Party. Some of them are also being translated into programs such as new proposals for the establishment of grants for cooperatives and, generally, all the structures set up by the Department for Community Welfare to help the private voluntary sector.

Within this mood of finding a new definition of welfare, one must not forget the great contribution that migrants have made and still make to this country and this State. I have been a constant advocate in past years of an examination not only of the ways in which welfare is provided but also the type of welfare that is provided. The concept of multiculturalism is not limited to the right of access to services; it extends to the right of defining welfare, of developing programs and policies.

As a specific example, with which the Minister, I am sure, will quickly become familiar, there is the condition of many migrant growers in the Riverland. I have referred to their condition in a previous intervention. As I understand, and as I am advised by many people living in the area, the situation unfortunately has not improved much, or has remained almost the same. Admittedly, the question is neither easy nor clear. However, one must come out of a frame of mind where the situation is considered simply in economic terms. Needs of whatever type are human, and the distinction between welfare and economic may be of use to bureaucrats but of little value to people on the land.

However, bureaucrats as well must be forced to expand their concepts, bound by tradition and limited often by the friction caused by the change. I cannot see how any economic program can be simply analysed in terms of market requirements. There is always a social, human welfare component to it, and the migrants in the Riverland have for a long time spurned the traditional definition of welfare as offered to them through the department. It is not that what is offered is wrong: it is that it is too limited.

Their request for help falls comfortably within the new initiatives that this Government has already taken in a different but similar situation, such as the subsidising of rising interest rates for home buyers. Growers in the Riverland do not buy houses in the same way as city people do: they buy properties with houses. The type of transaction which they undertake makes them eligible for different types of loans. However, they do not always have access to remedial initiatives by the Government which other home buyers have. It may be said that this argument is true not only of migrant growers but also of all growers, and perhaps I agree with that.

Maybe the need is based on a difference between rural and urban people. Whatever the case, I urge the new Minister for the department to consider this aspect of the development of welfare policies, so that the department truly responds to the needs of people as presented—not dependent on whether they conform to traditional or available services. We can no longer neglect the request from the rural people in the Riverland. Ultimately, intervention now

may save, even in economic terms, a great deal of money, as testified to by Katherine West in an article in the *Australian* of 8 February 1986. Finally, one has to be reminded of the level of frustration suffered by these people, who may be led to unfortunate violent action. This has also been witnessed by several commentators and people who know better in a similar situation.

Concluding on this topic, I am once again forced, unfortunately, to make at least a passing reference to the discordant voice occasionally raised by Professor Blainey. As you know, I have been overseas for three weeks and my attention to the remarks of Professor Blainey has been drawn by a press release dated 27 January 1986. I receive such information regularly from the office of the Federal Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs (Mr Chris Hurford).

Mr Hurford not only refuted Professor Blainey's claims, but he rightly defended the harmonious unity of our community, of which the minority groups are part, and I quote part of the press release:

> There is a remarkable and commendable unity in our diversity. We are not breaking down into separate groups. We have become a more interesting society, developing our own distinctive culture. Although that culture is basically an Anglo-Celtic one, it has been influenced by others in this exciting multicultural society.
>
> It is significant that the reports of Professor Blainey's views do not give any examples from him as to where we are allegedly being pulled apart. I believe, as with the last infamous debate in which he was involved, he is strong on obsession but very weak on the facts to substantiate those obsessions. I shall be making a full response to his remarks when I obtain a copy of his speech, and I am not relying on reports.

Professor Blainey's intervention is even more critical if one is to accept the often repeated statement that, in any case, he represented the thinking of a majority of Australians. I will not accept the truth of his statement. In any case, the test of any statement is surely not its popularity, but its truth. The ancient Greeks and Romans believed in slavery. Surely this mass misconception of Professor Blainey's does not make it right.

In the case of the intervention of Professor Blainey again on 24 January 1986 one feels particularly annoyed and insulted. From a position of privilege such as his one has neither the right nor the justification to reprimand minority groups for seeking equality.

His assertion that previous generations of Australians created a successful democracy with a high level of freedom, a high standard of living and an ability to help other countries when they were in need is surely a statement in doubletalk. It is the kind of 'motherhood statement' that becomes irrefutable. After all, cannot every country in the world claim exactly the same. Has not India, for example, enriched England with its contribution of wealth through export, whether legally done or illegally done? Have not minority groups brilliantly contributed to the democracy, freedom and wealth of this nation.

What is wrong with Professor Blainey, a scientist of his calibre? Is he becoming a master of pitiful comments and sweeping statements? With the presentation of incomplete statements, half truths and innuendo one can always be assured of an audience and of cheap applause. It is to this cheap applause that I wish to refer.

I wish also to draw attention of members of the Opposition to a matter that was reported in all papers, that the Leader of the Federal Opposition, Mr Howard, was present at the Australia Day speech given by Professor Blainey. Although Professor Blainey was unanimously condemned by the people he often offends, he was praised by the Leader of the Federal Opposition as a man with a 'deep and enlightened understanding' of Australia's history. I will now quote from an article in the *Western Australian* of 25 January 1986 entitled 'Blainey: Rethink minority rights', as follows:

> Professor Geoffrey Blainey created a stir at an Australia Day Council lunch in Melbourne yesterday by speaking out against special rights for minorities.
>
> He said: 'Our emphasis of granting special rights to all kinds of minorities, especially ethnic minorities, is threatening to cut this nation into many tribes' . . .
>
> Yesterday he said that in recent years there had been a shift of emphasis from duty to rights.
>
> 'Thirty years ago we possibly gave too much weight to the duties demanded of Australians as citizens,' he said. 'Now we give too much weight to all those minorities who are interested only in their rights' . . .
>
> 'Our lucky country is no longer so lucky, mainly because many of us have emphasised our economic rights more than our economic duties,' he said.
>
> Yesterday's lunch was attended by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Howard. After the speech, Mr Howard praised Professor Blainey for his important contribution to Australia through his work as a writer and lecturer. 'His Australian nationalism is built upon a deep and enlightened understanding of our past,' said Mr Howard.
>
> However, the deputy commissioner of the Western Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission, Mr Matt Ngu, condemned Professor Blainey's speech. He said that the professor had made broad-sweeping statements that showed he did not know what he was talking about.
>
> 'Professor Blainey does not understand that what we want is not special rights but equal rights,' he said.
>
> 'He is obviously unaware of the difficulties some ethnic groups have in simply gaining the same rights as everyone else.'

What can I say! One wonders whether the man knows the history of this country. Of course, neither Professor Blainey nor Mr Howard needs a 'migrant' like me to teach him Australian history. But why then present such a distorted image. Of course Australia is a great country! I know, because I chose it for my adopted country and I am proud of that decision. I know because I raised my family here and I have given my personal contribution to make this country great as it is today. However, I also know that it has not treated all its migrants with the respect that they deserve and have earned.

I also know that the very people who laid the foundations of our society were the same ones who decimated the Aboriginal community, kept them separated from the rest of us and granted them citizenship rights only 20 years ago. What a shame! The legacy of this cruel, unwarranted treatment of the Aborigine still haunts us today, or is Professor Blainey saying that we should stop talking about the rights of Aborigines? Is he perhaps regretting the fact that some of them escaped the hunters' weapons and survived to demand their rights today? As I have said before, that kind of half spoken generalisation will always appear attractive to some people.

It is a phenomenon that is neither new nor original. Italy and Germany experienced this kind of approach during the unforgettable period of fascism. The reference is made neither in the heat of the moment nor without thought. Respected public commentators have alluded to the growing attractiveness of this kind of approach and have suggested that a new movement may be developing around these people who have achieved prominence with their insensitive assertions and who are capable of attracting the people who ultimately have the highest disregard for human rights and human duties.

If one needs to be convinced, one need only read the list of suggested potential leaders as identified in an article by Katherine West that appeared in the *Australian* newspaper on 8 February 1986 in which she identified the possibility of a new mobilisation of forces around such extreme leaders as Sir Jo Bjelke-Petersen, John Leard, and, of course, Professor Blainey, and I quote:

> Australia's welfare bill will rise and its crucial export income will fall. This will play havoc with the Government's national economic strategy and with our national standard of living . . .
>
> A new campaigning team led by a national figure such as Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen, and including others such as Mr John Leard and Professor Geoffrey Blainey, would attract community support

across party lines in a way the present federal non-Labor parliamentarians do not.

It is a source of shame that the federal Leader of the Opposition should ever provide fuel for this potential coalition by praising one of its leaders, or is Mr Howard perhaps so threatened in his position as Leader that he will resort to any group for support irrespective of its morality or otherwise? Are members of the Opposition in this Chamber, the members of the Liberal Party, aware of their federal Leader's dangerous position? I plead with and challenge them to come out in strong condemnation of the position taken by Professor Blainey once again and the words of praise uttered by Mr Howard.

Let them not hide behind the smokescreen of freedom of expression. Perhaps that needs to be reserved, but it does not take away from them the right and duty to condemn openly the dangerous attitudes and the ideas spread by Professor Blainey and apparently condoned by Mr Howard. Is it not a sad comment of Professor Blainey's intervention that the report of his speech in the *Advertiser* of 25 January 1986 was placed immediately above a report of a speech by Dr Roberta Sykes, an Aboriginal, who says that her community is still living under siege? I refer to an article in the 25 January issue of the *Advertiser* headed 'Two sides of the significance of celebrating Australia Day', as follows:

> Australian Aborigines were still living under siege almost 200 years after white people arrived on their land, black activist and Harvard scholar Dr Roberta (Bobby) Sykes said yesterday.
>
> In her Australia Day address at the National Press Club, Dr Sykes said Australia's small black community had high infant mortality, high youth mortality, low life expectancy, high morbidity, high imprisonment, low employment and a death rate in police custody nine times higher than South Africa's.
>
> Even if Aborigines celebrated their survival on 26 January, this was premature, Dr Sykes said.
>
> 'The black community is still living under siege,' she said.
>
> She described the life of the average black person in Australia in these terms:
>
> > Somebody is always dying; somebody always seems to be in mourning—mourning premature deaths of infants and young people. There's always someone to visit in hospital—if you're lucky- -and a funeral to go to if you're not.
> >
> > Someone you know is always in gaol, visiting loved ones in gaol, out on bail, needing bail or seeking legal advice. There seems to be an unbroken march into the prisons. It's hard to find anything to celebrate (for Australia Day).
>
> Dr Sykes said that next year would be the 20th anniversary of white Australians voting in a referendum for blacks to have the right to vote in their own country. Blacks in Australia still lived in racial and cultural oppression. She said:
>
> > There is not even legislation to protect us as a group from insult or denigration.
>
> Young black people did not commit crimes or sniff petrol for fun; they were frustrated. She said:
>
> > They are angry young people who have been promised so much, but who continue to receive so little.
>
> Dr Sykes described the Australian Government's support of South Africa's black activists and New Caledonia's independence movement as 'a big joke'. She said:
>
> > Between now and the mega-event of the bicentenary there is only one Australia Day left, and (Australian) blacks still don't have anything to celebrate.

What has Professor Blainey to say to our Aboriginal community today? Will he tell them to stop talking about rights and to join the queue to celebrate the 200th anniversary of the foundation of Australia? Where does his sense of right and wrong, or of a 'fair go' go? What about his understanding of our declaimed 'democracy' in a matter so abhorrent as the plight of our Aboriginals? Does he align himself with the policies of Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen? What about members of the Liberal Party in this Chamber?

Where do they stand? Will they speak out or will they keep silent or, worse still, join Mr Howard in what he has said and done to our communities? For the record once again one needs to restate that the migrants have never failed in their duties to this country. In the face of odds never experienced by Professor Blainey, they have with profound dignity put their hands, backs and minds to the task of carving themselves a living in this great country. They have succeeded eminently without the help of special concession. Whatever they now demand is deserved and long overdue. They ask not for privilege but for equality.

My comments on the Blainey affair are an apt introduction to the next concern in my speech. As I said before, the previous Bannon Administration well deserved the praise and support that it received from the migrant communities in this State in terms of the preliminary work that was done. The foundations are now laid, and the next four years should see a more determined effort at implementation of the program. There is always a danger in policy planning of this kind that work stops at the theory level. Whilst in the past my own intervention in this Chamber has been mostly in this vein, from now on I propose to examine its implementation.

The role of advocate by me will remain, not to prove that multiculturalism should be adopted but to ensure that multiculturalism is implemented. The policy of multiculturalism should, from now on, be taken for granted. It is no longer a question of debating the pros and cons of such a theory. Australians of all political persuasions have officially adopted this policy. The fact, however, that incidents such as the one brought to the attention of this Chamber are still occurring demonstrates that there is a gap between theory and practice. Thanks to some creative and enlightened legislation at both federal and State levels, the policy on multiculturalism now has a solid legal frame.

At the federal level the Sex Discrimination Act of 1984, the Racial Discrimination Act of 1975 and the Human Rights Commission Act of 1981 represent a solid base for equality. This last Act is due to be revamped shortly since the previous Act automatically expires.

I express the hope that the new Act will lose none of its original force but rather specify even more strongly and with even less exclusion the rights and duties of all Australians. At the State level recent legislation passed by this Parliament is surely exemplary. Congratulations are again due to our Attorney-General for the Equal Opportunity Act. It represents precisely what we need at present.

I hope that the Federal Government will consider it in its own review of legislation in this field. It is an Act that is both theoretically sound and able to be implemented in practice. It is an initiative that is due to be taken shortly by the Federal Government in the introduction of affirmative action legislation. Although its real value and final effect will need to be left to time, one has at least to approve its intention.

It falls into that category of initiatives that are meant to implement the theory. My only regret is that in scope it is limited to women. I call on the Federal Government to consider similar action for other groups that, like women, have suffered discrimination due to race or physical impairment. The same principle to achieve the goals of equality applies to women as to any other group. It is in itself too selective for a Government to introduce legislation of this type when it could be all-embracing. From here on we need to look more specifically at targets and objectives to be achieved within a set period of time and within a studied implementation program.

I appreciate the impossibility of imposing quotas. Honourable members in this Council, including you Madam President, will I am sure appreciate the difficulty in suggesting quotas. However, one should not run away from deciding acceptable and achievable forward estimates, goals to be sought and achieved within the real circumstances of our organisation. Regarding this last point, I share the view of the Working Party on Affirmative Action Legislation

Report that was presented to the Federal Government on 26 September 1985. At page 35 of that report it is stated:

> 'Forward estimates' are conceptually different from 'quotas', which are a fixed number or percentage, determined by an outside agency or a court, which must be met to comply with the law or a court decision or order. Quotas have been used in limited circumstances in the United States of America, when an organisation has unsuccessfully implemented or not implemented a program as required by the law and an analysis of the organisation's workforce has demonstrated that a certain group (for example, women, blacks) are under-utilised. In the Australian view, this could result in the recruitment or promotion of unqualified or under-qualified people to meet the quota. This can mean that the merit principle is not adhered to and can cause long-term detriment to the workforce as a whole.

I look forward to hearing from various Government departments that this planning has not only been done but also is being implemented. I feel bold enough to assert this because I know that in practice this is being done. I would suggest that the administration of the Bannon Government should make it its goal to ensure that within the current tenure of office most innovations in this field are achieved. We cannot continue as a multicultural society with the kind of discrepancies that are unfortunately still the norm. Within the next four years one should be able to note from year to year a progressive redressing of the balance of anticipation by all minority and previously discriminated groups into the mainstream of our entire society.

Finally, I will maintain an interest in these issues and I hope that my inquisitive nature will be seen as constructive not only for the migrants but also for all discriminated groups and for our society as a whole. I am talking about equality and not privilege.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: Ms President, my somewhat harsher use of English enables me to get two consonants together I hope in a manner which you find satisfactory. I have sympathy with the Hon. Mario Feleppa and congratulate him on his speech in this debate. I congratulate other members, particularly those who have given their maiden speeches. I find it most heartening to hear the calibre of the ideals expressed in the speeches and, contrary perhaps to the prediction of the Hon. Jamie Irwin, most of us retain at least some remnants of those bushy-tailed bright-eyed aspects into political semi-dotage. It does not all disappear in the first week.

I particularly welcome my colleague the Hon. Mike Elliott into this Chamber. I assure honourable members that he will be a very valued and appreciated member of the Council. I say that not only with my political affiliation and loyalty but also because I have known him, have admired him and have been fond of him as a person over several years' acquaintance.

I will not repeat what I said in appreciation of your appointment, Madam, nor will I identify in particular detail the new members who are joining us. However, I assure them all that I am glad they are with us. I look forward to a very exciting and satisfying period for this Parliament.

In supporting the motion I would like to comment on several of the points in the Governor's speech. The first relates to Technology Park. I congratulate both previous Governments on Technology Park. It is a very exciting initiative. I have visited it, but I do not claim to have an in-depth and detailed knowledge of it. Its promise is yet to be fulfilled. It is still very much at a stage of show and status and it could easily fail. It could become a white elephant, but I do not think that that will be the case. It has caught enough imagination of industry and people with investment potential for it to catch on. The benefits are long-term—probably 10 years before South Australia could reap financial benefits, but the benefits to the South Australian taxpayer will be greater than those of that horrendous white elephant, Roxby Downs, which I will discuss briefly a little later in my remarks.

Technology Park will force diversification and modernisation of industry in South Australia. Most managers are not entrepreneurs and are not prepared to take risks unless they are virtually forced on them either by example or the fact that their competitiveness demands it of them. The possibility of Technology Park boosting research in South Australia and the fact that the Institute of Technology is immediately adjacent to it make a very happy combination. There will be an advantage to those companies located nearby because access to those resources, equipment and knowledge will be much more readily used if they are in relative propinquity to existing companies and companies that establish at Technology Park.

At present, so much of the technology is developed in Asia; Australian technology becomes the development potential for Asia. The ideas originate here, and it is recognised that there is often a lead time of about 12 months between products being advertised in Asian trade magazines and their availability on Australian markets.

Technology Park has the potential at least for this development to occur here, thereby helping our situation in international trade. The major risk of Technology Park is that the industries not located there—well over 90 per cent—could be neglected at the expense of Technology Park. However, I believe that the mention of a chair of manufacturing referred to at a later point in the speech gives some ground for optimism that the Government is willing to look constructively at the strength and development of the whole of South Australia's industrial manufacturing scene.

I am a little uncomfortable that this Government, as was mentioned in the Governor's speech, puts great store in the grand prix and the casino convention centres. My warning both to this Council and to South Australia generally is that the quality of life will not be determined by the spectacular, the circuses or the magnificence of structural development—

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

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: It is pleasing to see that that view is shared. South Australia has many more strengths that it can develop. I feel a concern that one can, as an individual and as a community, become intoxicated with certain jingoistic trends. Although I do not have any reluctance in supporting South Australia as a State and its development and achievements in sport, I believe that at this time we are being swept into a sort of fanatical obsession in regard to South Australia for South Australia's sake so that the visible and spectacular developments in South Australia are the answer to our problems as a society. That is not a balanced view.

The Governor referred to the chair of manufacturing to be established in one of the State's tertiary institutions. We can only commend it. No doubt its results will depend on the quality of the school and the product that it turns out, and hopefully the product will remain in South Australia in order to improve the technology, technique and management skills of those who are guiding our manufacturing sector in South Australia.

The development of the export drive is to be commended. I hope that it will not be restricted purely to Shan Dong Province in China and possibly an office in Los Angeles. There are in the world many more potential markets for South Australian products. Although there is the indication that South Australia International will take off, there is nothing to beat actually getting the right product and the skill of good salespeople who know how to sell products on the ground and our getting out there. Governments cannot substitute for genuine sellers of products and marketers from the private enterprise sector. They should be encour-

aged or possibly supported in some way if the Government believes that it is necessary. It must be from there and not from Government entities that the trade links are forged.

The potential to South Australia from large scale projects, in particular, Roxby Downs and the Australian Navy submarines that were mentioned in the speech, is also worthy of comment. I have said before, and I take this opportunity to say it again, that the Roxby enterprise is a very sad infliction on the people of South Australia. Although I do not intend to debate the pros and cons of uranium mining, I do remind the Council that economically, unless there is a dramatic change in the actual price of the product, there is no way under the current indenture Act that the people of South Australia will benefit economically from Roxby Downs.

When this project was first vaunted as having received its initial notice of commencement and various eulogies were being sung in relation to it, a little simple calculation at that stage showed—bearing in mind that the Government had also surreptitiously announced in a paper that $30 million had been allocated to be spent on infrastructure in one year—that the cost to the State, with the estimated returns from the product, would leave a net loss to the State, by our calculations, of approximately $1 500 000.

The royalty bonanza just will not eventuate, so it is our intention (and this session is not adequate for us to do it) to move amendments to the indenture Act. If Roxby is to proceed, part of our responsibility is not only to object about uranium mining on moral grounds but also to ensure that the people of South Australia get a fair deal and, until that royalty calculation is dramatically changed, there will be no potential for economic gain to South Australia.

The other major project which is vaunted in the Governor's speech is the Royal Australian Navy submarine replacement program. The interesting thing about that is that during the State election it was portrayed as being virtually just around the corner. I took the trouble to send some telexes to the Minister for Defence, Mr Beazley, and to the Prime Minister through the course of the campaign. Part of the result of that received a modicum of publicity, although unfortunately not enough to debunk what I believe was the quite erroneous impression being given: that, if the Bannon Government was elected, it was almost certain that South Australia would get the submarine project. It was deceptive on two quite clear lines. Whether the Government was re-elected or whether John Olsen was at the head of the Government would virtually have made no difference, and neither should it.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson interjecting:

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I do not think anyone did. The other area of deception was that the project was on the brink of a decision and virtually ready to be allocated to its specific locations. This evening this Council will be very privileged to hear me read a letter dated 10 February 1986 which I received only yesterday from Lionel Bowen, the Minister Assisting the Prime Minister. Prior to my receiving this letter, I had received a reply by telex from the Minister for Defence to my earlier telex, in which he had at that stage, in telex form, quite clearly defined the fact that, in spite of his public statements, the actual contract let in regard to the submarines was to undertake project definition studies for the Royal Australian Navy, and these studies would be completed in November 1986.

So there was no absolute and hard factual information upon which anybody could make reliable statements on the future of the submarine project—certainly not at that time, and not even now. On 3 December I sent a telex to the Prime Minister. I will read that telex, because it is rather extraordinary that it was not replied to. It states:

In light of reports that your Federal Labor colleague, WA MHR Graham Campbell has described Kockums as a 'Straw Contender' in the bid to get the submarine contract, to ensure HDW-IKL gets it, and his criticism of the whole tendering process, and further, in the light of the re-assertion of your Defence Minister, K. Beazley, that the allocation of tenders hinges on a Labor win in the South Australian election . . . I call on you to issue a clear statement on the tender process involved in the submarine project. Are you satisfied that there were no unfair leakages and preferences involved?

The people of South Australia demand to know from you first-hand will there be a better chance for South Australia wining a substantial share of the submarine contract under a Bannon Government than under an Olsen Government as stated by your Minister Beazley? If so, on what basis can such a statement be made?

In reply to that telex I received a letter dated 10 February, which states:

The Prime Minister has asked me to reply on his behalf to your telex of 3 December 1985 concerning the selection process for the Australian submarine project.

As you may be aware, the Government signed contracts with two consortiums last year for studies based on their respective submarine designs. The studies, scheduled to be completed late this year, are only one phase of the project and are intended to provide the information needed to decide on a submarine design for the project, the location of construction facilities and the nature and extent of Australian industry involvement in each boat.

These decisions will, of course, be based on economic and technical considerations, bearing in mind the proposals put forward by each State. The Commonwealth has briefed all States at the official level on progress in the project.

I would emphasise that, irrespective of where the new submarines are actually assembled, the project will generate numerous opportunities for competitive firms with relevant skills throughout Australia. Yours sincerely, Lionel Bowen.

What desceptive rubbish it was to parade this imminent dream of a submarine project before us during the last State election. It shows how hollow it was; unfortunately, it also shows that the emphasis in the Governor's speech on a large scale project is completely premature and quite without foundation at this stage. I hope that we do get it, but let us be realistic about it.

I now refer to the point in the Governor's speech on the development of metropolitan Adelaide. Members who were in the Chamber yesterday will realise that I went to some pains to try to get some information about a study which was commissioned by private consultants for recommendations on this issue. I believe that the study will be made public tomorrow and that it will have firm recommendations, and, because it does not require parliamentary legislation or regulation, it is completely out of our hands. Apart from the fact that it may well be grounds for some grumbling and complaint, I do not expect that it will be an issue that we will have an opportunity to debate and decide on in this Chamber. I regret that.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Will local government, as you asked yesterday?

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: No, it is my opinion that local government will be presented with a *fait accompli* and that it may very well grumble about that. The Minister may choose to override the normal role of local government in this, and he is entitled to do that through the Act. There are sections of the Act which empower the Minister to do that. Although he may be able to do that legally, I believe that ethically that is a deplorable way to deal with local government. I feel sure that the Hon. Jamie Irwin, who has carried such a strong torch for local government, will be hurt to the quick at this slight at the importance of local government in making plans for and up to the year 2000.

I refer to the Governor's speech and his comment on the death and injury on the State roads. I do not need to remind honourable members of our involvement and my particular involvement in trying to deal with this problem. It grieves me profoundly to read that we are already ahead of last year's total in this State by three or four deaths. It appears that, if we do learn at all—and I am very depressed about

whether we do in fact learn—we are mighty slow learners. I do not want to dwell on this at length, but I have given this matter some deliberation and I repeat that the real solution will not be found in legislation; will not be found in technical or mechanical measures; it will be found only by educating the public in relation to road use.

I ask honourable members to ponder this question: can members think of any other arena in which an individual can exercise his or her right to put his or her life at risk by driving dangerously, at high speed or simply through lack of due care? Of course, there are people who say that they have rights, but is it a right to perhaps put our own lives at risk? In what other area can people exercise a right to put at risk people who are completely innocent, who have no choice but to place themselves at risk of being killed or maimed? It is a horrendous situation. We have not educated the public to have a responsible attitude. In fact, I am guilty of this myself. We are encouraged by car salesmen and the hype to buy a fast car. That is one of the thrills and kicks in life.

Those South Australians who want those thrills and kicks in life should get on to a speed track, or somewhere where there is not a car or an individual for 50 or 60 miles. They could then exercise their right to drive fast or dangerously. Until we can inculcate in the mind of every South Australian the message that road use should be undertaken extremely responsibly and that it requires a high degree of caring activity we will continue to slaughter ourselves and maim ourselves, and tragically, every now and again it will impinge on one of us, involving a member of our family or someone whom we know.

I refer now to some other points mentioned in the Governor's speech. I am pleased to see that the Government is to reintroduce legislation to alleviate the trauma suffered by victims of crime. The Democrats support the intent of the legislation. It is long overdue. I cannot really understand why, in a relatively compassionate society, we have not recognised the need for this before. I hope that the measure receives the unanimous support of the Council. Although some amendments may be made to the legislation, I hope that it does receive the resounding support of this Council.

Legislation relating to licensing under the Travel Agents Bill is also welcomed by us. Dramatic incidents have been portrayed in the media of people who have not yet started their travel, who have invested large amounts of money in a proposed trip, and who are then left desperately stranded, emotionally and physically.

Proposed amendments to the Builders Licensing Act are also long overdue. Protection must be provided for home builders, who are frequently left, if not with completely disastrous houses, at least with significant features in those houses which are cruel for them to live with, and in many cases they have no redress. Incidentally, I think there is, and should be, some protection for the builder and that in relation to builders being left with bills unpaid there should be some orderly way in which they can be protected from that hazard.

Finally, in commenting on the Governor's speech, I would like to say that we are enthusiastically working on the Bill to amend the workers compensation scheme. The Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Bill will be introduced here. It does offer some dramatic changes to the current procedure. The Bill will be substantially debated in both Houses. I want to make one or two points about consideration of the Bill. First, one aspect that has had little, if any, recognition is that the premium rate which impinges on rural producers of 11 per cent, on house painters at 13 per cent, and on brickies at 18 per cent (and I know it applies to others as well) is a very real disincentive to employment.

Those people currently debating the matter and looking at it from their own vested interest aspect (many of them with good justification) ought to consider as well the impact that this on-cost (and it is a very substantial on-cost) is having as a deterrent to taking on extra people. Obviously this is not the only arbiter, but quite often it is the final straw—and a very substantial one. I can say from personal experience that I have been reluctant (and at times have not done so) to employ an extra worker on the farm because it would have meant a substantial increase of the premium paid for workers compensation.

That is one of perhaps many examples relating to this matter that will come up elsewhere. I plead with honourable members that, when pushing for this legislation, they should bear in mind that unless we can reduce the premium we will continue to have a very substantial deterrent on employment in the workplace.

It must then, of course, be an incentive for safety. Unless the legislation actually is an incentive to a safer workplace it will have missed in terms of what I regard as the responsibility of the legislation in that area—coupled, however, with the Occupational Health and Safety Bill. I am very sorry that the Government has been unable to get this legislation on occupational health and safety up at the same time as or ahead of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Bill.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: They have been working on it for about the same length of time.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I have not seen any sign of it, but I think that if one gets to the basic ingredients, devoid of political point scoring, it is important that, regardless of premiums, regardless of a single insurer, and regardless of the particular benefits, the most significant benefit to South Australia would be to reduce the accidents—and that is a fact.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: They'll need to be bated at the same time.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: They may well be. Whether they need to be at the same time, I am not sure. They certainly should be in the same session so that we have them before us, but I am unhappy that we do not know in any detail what is intended in the Occupational Health and Safety Bill.

I will briefly cover a couple of other points in concluding my speech. There is the issue of the dangerous substances legislation. I gather it is intended to bring in amending legislation. We have been quite enthusiastic in our policy and in public statements to see that there is a closer surveillance of the handling and storage of dangerous substances and that there will be adequate fines to be punitive and to be deterrent.

I remind members that we made efforts to prevent the dumping of radioactive waste in South Australian waters, but it is not only radioactive waste. We are at hazard from all sorts of dangerous substances that could eventually find their way into our waterways, and the spillage at Gillman was rather a stark example. I hope that the Government has taken due note of that, and that adequate legislation will be introduced to help control it.

Finally, I would like to comment on the unique year that we currently have—the International Year of Peace. It is rather an exciting world phenomenon that we do have years with specific emphases, and I think that it certainly behoves us, if we are conscientious members of Parliament, to apply ourselves with particular attention to the subject of the year.

There can be no more important issue before us than that of peace. The tragedy is that the word 'peace' has become politicised. It now has the connotations of a leftist plot and that it is really just a front for those who want to overturn the structures of Government to come in with their stooges,

the churches and a few innocent starry-looking pacifists up front.

I think that part of the challenge to those of us—and I hope I can embrace all members in this statement—who really do care for progress towards the cause of world peace, is that we must be prepared to take the opprobrium and not shirk it because the debate is introduced with unfortunate overtones and certain groups are given a prejudicial bad flavour. In itself this is an interesting lesson for us. Peace will not be achieved unless we as a community can deal with the confrontation that has erupted since this, I believe, quite distorted reaction to the Red Cross material. That is not the point: the point is that a peaceful society must be able to deal with that particular dispute or that confrontation in a peaceful manner. We may have to change the word so that we do not have this unfortunate connotation of the word 'peace', and talk of the resolution of conflict.

It is the resolution of conflict that we deal with in this Chamber. It is part of its fuel, part of the sort of energy that in many ways produces the end product. The conflict can never be removed. There will always be a continuing cause of conflict, both in the national and international spheres, in our private lives, and in this Parliament.

It is important how we deal with the matter—with what understanding, with what tolerance and with what real work we apply to resolving the conflict. The analogy of the Parliament is not a bad one to follow in that there tends at least to be an encouragement for open exchange. There is the protection of this place for honesty. There is a procedure whereby the majority can have a say. When there is what appears to be irreconcilable conflict between the two Houses there is the structure of the conference from which there needs to be a resolution of the conflict if there is to be a product at the end.

I think that we, as members of Parliament, have a challenge to celebrate the International Year of Peace by thinking about it and by introducing it into our daily activities in our private and public lives and in our influence on the State and the nation. I think that all members are sensitive enough to realise that it is a day by day issue. There is the Philippines and South Africa—they are there all the time. We will have coming to South Australia people who will be immediately involved in those situations and who are crying out for our understanding and help.

I suggest that it will be worth while for members to take particular interest in material which may be the cause of confrontation so that all members are personally aware of what is the basis of dispute in peace education or peace issues, and that all members read the material that comes from time to time from those who are given publicity in the papers regarding various sides of the peace issue and the confrontation between the USA and the USSR because there is no mandate of right on either side. Neither side has a mortgage on moral or ethical rectitude. That is the position that I think the International Year of Peace should encourage.

In this State on 23 March there will be a Palm Sunday rally with the theme 'Disarm and feed the world'. If nothing else of my Address in Reply speech is remembered, it is my exhortation to all members to be seen and to participate in that rally. Statements with which members might find themselves uncomfortable will possibly be carried by some people. There may be people with whom members violently disagree, but, unless all members get with those people on that particular day to rally for peace in a year which is a particular year for peace, what hope is there for this world to resolve its conflicts? I appeal to all members to make it a personal challenge for this year to be at that rally, to support it and to encourage other people to go to it. I support the motion and wish the Government well during this session.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.19 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 18 February at 2.15 p.m.