

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 8 August 1989

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. G.L. Bruce)** took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

- By the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner)—
National Crime Authority—Report, 1987-88.
Daylight Saving Act 1971—Regulations—Summer Time.
- By the Minister of Tourism (Hon. Barbara Wiese)—
Modbury Hospital—By-laws—Parking.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: BUDGET

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I wish to report to the Council on the outcome of the 1988-89 State budget, and announce certain revenue measures to be introduced by the Government which will take advantage of that budget outcome. The favourable outcome means that State long-term debt has been contained and benefits can be extended to the community in tax relief measures.

The Government has achieved a 1988-89 Recurrent Account surplus of \$83 million—\$27 million more than our forecast surplus. The Capital Account shows a result equal to the budget forecast. The Government has therefore been able to achieve its budget goal of a balanced Consolidated Account with the major achievement of reducing its financing requirement by \$27 million. In relation to revenue in 1989-90, there will be no tax increases in the coming State budget. In fact, major tax cuts will be extended to first home buyers, to those paying land tax, and to businesses liable for payroll tax. Together, these measures will provide benefits of some \$55 million for South Australian families and employment-generating business during the current financial year.

The budget result has been achieved through sound financial management by the Government, and stronger than anticipated growth in general economic activity. Since coming to office we have worked to ensure that the State's financial base is strong, secure, and able to pay for the services that all South Australians require. We have rejected the easy solutions which impose debt burdens on our children and generations beyond. Government has no inherent right to spend tomorrow's money. It should practise diligent economic management which protects the resources of the State while providing a fair distribution of services at the lowest possible cost to taxpayers.

The 1988-89 budget anticipated a financing requirement of \$226 million. In fact, this requirement was reduced to \$199 million. This improvement alone, a \$27 million reduction in the budget financing requirement, is in itself a significant achievement, but much more than this has been achieved in the 1988-89 budget. The original budget estimates provided for a SAFA contribution of \$300 million from its 1988-89 surplus. The actual draw on the SAFA surplus has been reduced to \$220 million. This has allowed \$60 million to be transferred to the 1989-90 budget, with the balance being allocated to provisions and general reserves.

SAFA's retained profit, reserves and provisions will now exceed a healthy \$225 million.

Looking at the accounts overall, the budget improvement was contributed to equally by increased receipts and by spending controls. On the recurrent receipts side, the total improvement (excluding the SAFA surplus) was \$72.5 million. A number of areas show contributions in excess of budget forecast. Major contributing sectors include Commonwealth Government general purpose receipts (\$18 million); gambling revenue (\$11 million); payroll tax (\$9 million); and stamp duty (\$44 million).

The improvement in payroll tax and stamp duty collections provides a clear indication of the strength of the South Australian economy over the past year. In the case of payroll tax, while the exemption level was raised by \$60 000—or 22 per cent—total revenue still increased by 12 per cent on a comparable basis. This is a reflection of the 4.5 per cent growth in total employment in South Australia over the past year, representing some 28 000 new jobs. The property market has also been very strong, both in the number and value of transactions.

To focus just on revenue increases would fail to acknowledge the achievements of this Government in containing public expenditure through greater efficiency and restraint. Total recurrent expenditure was reduced from an estimated \$4 157 million to an actual \$4 123 million. This result includes an additional contribution of \$20 million towards the future cost of superannuation. Together with the reduction in estimated recurrent expenditure, this is equal to a \$54 million saving.

The budget result for 1988-89 means that the Government's major fiscal goals for the 1980s have been achieved and confirmed:

- the accumulated consolidated account deficit of \$63 million inherited from the Liberal Government in 1982 has now been paid off;
- the recurrent account is now in a sound surplus;
- the State's net debt has been reduced as a share of Gross State Product from 23 per cent to 16 per cent.

This does not mean that rigorous and efficient management of the State's finances will not continue, but it does mean that the Government can more fully address the issues facing South Australia in the 1990s—without resorting to a debilitating program of large scale borrowing. The details of the Government's programs will be outlined in the State budget, but today it is appropriate that I announce the measures concerned with stamp duty, payroll tax and land tax.

Stamp duty for houses costing up to \$80 000 will be abolished for applications received from first home buyers as from midnight tonight. This relief for first home buyers involves lifting the exemption level for stamp duty from \$50 000 to \$80 000, and will save a family up to \$1 050 on their home purchase. Depending on how this benefit is used, families could achieve significant savings.

For example, if the benefit is applied to a \$50 000 home loan over 30 years, the term of that loan could be reduced by up to eight years, at a saving in total repayments of up to \$73 000. At a time when many families are facing hard decisions about first home buying, the Government believes that this measure will be of great help throughout our community. It will make the difference, in many cases, between continuing in rental accommodation or moving into the home market.

In the commercial sector, the Government will from 1 October increase stamp duty exemption for rental businesses—from \$15 000 a year to \$24 000 a year. The value of these stamp duty benefits will be greater than \$4 million.

There will be several initiatives where the budget surplus will be applied, in very specific ways, to help business activity and generate employment.

To assist in job creation, payroll tax relief will be further extended. The exemption level will be raised in two further steps, from \$330 000 to \$360 000 on 1 October this year, and to \$400 000 from 1 April 1990. The value of this benefit is estimated at \$10 million. This means that from 1 October 1988, the exemption level for small business will have been increased by 48 per cent.

The Government is committed to ensuring that increases in land tax due to the considerable improvement in property values are not excessive. Therefore, rates applying from this financial year on properties valued between \$80 000 and \$200 000 will be halved, with a maximum benefit of \$450. Higher value properties will have their rate reduced by 16 per cent. In addition, rebates of 25 per cent up to \$200 000 and 15 per cent above this amount, will be paid in 1989-90.

The total value of reductions in the land tax package, which also includes exemption for shack sites subject to very long-term leases, is estimated at \$41 million. The Government has consistently reviewed the impact of land tax and, in the past four years, has given concessions worth more than \$34 million, while increasing the exemption level from \$40 000 to \$80 000.

In each of the past three years significant rebates have been provided. For properties valued at under \$200 000 these rebates have represented 25 per cent with higher value properties attracting rebates from 5 per cent to 10 per cent. These major cuts in land tax will mean that, despite the massive increase in property values, the aggregate increase in tax collection will be contained to about 10 per cent.

Mr President, these tax cuts, based on the successful outcome of the 1988-89 financial year and the overall responsible management of State finances, will help stimulate home buying and job generation. They can be made without detriment to the Government's provision of services, as will be demonstrated in the budget to be delivered later this month.

QUESTIONS

HOSPITAL WAITING LISTS

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Health a question about hospital waiting lists.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: The only thing left out of that statement is the failure of the Government to recognise health problems in this community. I have some documents from Flinders Medical Centre which indicate that there is quite a problem. Before one can get on the waiting list at Flinders Medical Centre one must wait some time to enter the clinic. If one has a cardiac problem, the wait is 35 days. If one has a respiratory problem, one waits 42 days.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: That is to get into the outpatients department.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Yes, that is to get into the outpatients clinic, before seeing a doctor at the hospital. If one has a respiratory problem, the wait is 42 days; with a menopausal problem, the wait is 84 days; with a gynaecological problem, the wait is 22 days; with an ear, nose and throat problem, the wait is 70 days; with an orthopaedic problem one would wait 77 days; and with a urology problem one would wait 38 days.

The next stage in the process is the outpatients department. If one has a general surgery problem, the maximum waiting time will be 1 836 days, the median being 66 days. If one has an orthopaedic problem the maximum waiting time is 765 days, the median being 121 days. If one has an ENT problem the maximum is not very long: 1 988 days!

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: How many years is that?

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: It is about six years. If one is an adult and needs a tonsillectomy, one will wait 1 498 days. That is the maximum; there are some minima. If one needs a prostatectomy, one would wait 388 days; that would involve a lot of discomfort. If one needs a hysterectomy, the wait is 346 days.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will ask his question in silence.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I must speak, Mr President. I cannot ask the question in silence.

The PRESIDENT: I ask for silence from the rest of the Council.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Last Thursday, in the other place, the Minister of Health claimed that things were moving extremely well in the health system. I have now obtained figures which indicate that the number of people on hospital waiting lists has just gone over 7 000, for the first time in the history of this State.

An honourable member: A record!

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: It is a record—the figure has gone to 7 046. I do not think the Minister would know this, because I have obtained this information from within his department. That represents an increase of 520 in the number on the waiting list since June last year. I also have figures showing that people are having to wait longer. The number of people who have been on waiting lists for between six and 12 months is now 1 284—118 more than in June last year.

The number on waiting lists for more than 12 months is 1 188—a staggering 394 more than 12 months ago and an increase which raises very serious doubt about the Minister's claim that the average waiting time for elective surgery is about four weeks. I ask the Minister the following question, which I hope he will answer quickly.

Will he confirm that, for the first time, the number of people waiting for treatment in the major metropolitan hospitals exceeds 7 000? Will the Minister also admit that, as a result of the reductions in spending at the major metropolitan hospitals, the people in this State who cannot afford to insure themselves are now suffering from a severe form of health rationing?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

LIVING ARTS CENTRE

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the Arts a question about the Living Arts Centre.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: In mid-1983 the Bannon Labor Government established a steering committee to investigate the possibility of purchasing the vacant D & J Fowler property on North Terrace just west of the Morphet Street Bridge for a multi-purpose arts centre, which even in those days was styled as a living arts centre. In May 1984 the Premier, then also Minister for the Arts, Mr Bannon,

announced the purchase of the property for \$1.2 million. The Labor arts policy for the 1985 State election said:

The Living Arts Centre will proceed during the first term of the Bannon Government. The first stage will be the relocation of the Jam Factory to this site. The remainder of the site will be developed in conjunction with the private sector.

Over six years later the proposed Living Arts Centre sits forlornly, grossly under-utilised and unloved.

The Minister would be aware that there is widespread disenchantment among the arts community about the total lack of progress made by this Government in developing the Living Arts Centre. When first proposed it was welcomed as a bold and exciting initiative. It would incorporate the Jam Factory from Payneham Road with both workshops and a retail outlet. The centre would also have a range of venues for the performing arts, and be headquarters for the Festival Fringe and other arts groups such as the Experimental Art Foundation and the South Australian Craft Council. It was also proposed to incorporate into the centre galleries, film and video facilities and a public broadcasting studio. There was also a commercial ingredient. Studio apartments and car parking were envisaged—commercial elements which would have helped subsidise the arts components that I have already described.

The arts community saw the Living Arts Centre as an exciting and vital addition to the North Terrace cultural boulevard which is unique among the capital cities of Australia. However, more than six years after the steering committee was formed to look into this possibility, in the dying days of the Bannon Government's second term, still nothing has happened. Will the Minister for the Arts explain why the promise to develop the Living Arts Centre, made by Premier Bannon at the 1985 State election, has not been honoured?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I regret every bit as much as the honourable member opposite that the Living Arts Centre has not yet come into being in a fully fledged form. It is not true, of course, to say that nothing has happened at the site since the Government took office. The place is very much loved by the many people who use it. A considerable sum has been expended on renovation of the Lion building and the creation of the Lion theatre. More must be done before the Lion theatre can be considered complete. Nevertheless, it is now a modern, compact and much used theatre, centrally located and very welcome indeed as an addition to the venues for arts performances in South Australia. The remainder of the site is certainly being used by a number of groups but I would be the first to admit that the accommodation they have is inadequate and that more needs to be done.

However, Mr President, I am sure I do not need to emphasise to you that we live in harsh economic times. Several attempts have been made to provide a package whereby the Living Arts Centre could proceed according to the original conception, namely, a package involving private developers. Under Government coordination, such a total viable package could be produced with the Living Arts Centre being a vital and vibrant part of the development.

As yet, no viable package has been able to be produced. This does not mean that attempts are not being made. They have been made continuously over the past few years to try to obtain a solution to the problem of the Living Arts Centre. It is proving very difficult, but I certainly have not given up hope. I trust that further negotiations and discussion will be successful before too long and that we will, in fact, be able to achieve a Living Arts Centre which is vibrant, lively and a fully integrated centre for the arts, as was originally envisaged.

COUNCIL BOUNDARIES

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government a question about the Henley and Grange council.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Last Thursday, in relation to the report of the Local Government Advisory Commission on Boundary Proposals for Henley and Grange, the Minister said:

I can assure the council that I followed exactly the same procedure as I followed with the proposals regarding the Blackwood area. In other words, I read the report and promptly sent it off to the Cabinet office.

The procedure with Mitcham was that the Minister received the report from the Local Government Advisory Commission, read it and forwarded it to the Cabinet office with a recommendation for a proclamation to implement the recommendations in the report, and the proclamation was made within something like 10 days of the receipt of the report. If, as the Minister suggests, the same procedure was followed for Henley and Grange then the report was read by the Minister and promptly forwarded to the Cabinet office, presumably with a recommendation for a proclamation to implement a recommendation of the Local Government Advisory Commission.

But there, Mr President, the similarity in procedure ends. The Henley and Grange recommendation did not result in a proclamation but was referred back to the commission. The Mitcham recommendation is now law. The City of Flinders is a *fait accompli* although another proposal has been forwarded to the Local Government Advisory Commission, but that gives no guarantee of change back to the *status quo*.

My questions to the Minister are as follows:

1. What recommendation did the Minister forward to the Cabinet office when forwarding the report of the Local Government Advisory Commission on Henley and Grange?
2. Why was the proclamation implementing the recommendation not made?
3. Why were the two reports—that is, for Mitcham on the one hand and Henley and Grange on the other—treated differently?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The difference arises because the report relating to Henley and Grange was withdrawn from the Cabinet office and returned to the Local Government Advisory Commission with a question, the question being whether the commission was satisfied that sufficient consultation had occurred prior to making its report.

After the chain of events had started, there was considerable disquiet within the Blackwood part of Mitcham regarding the establishment of the new city of Flinders. Many people were claiming that sufficient consultation had not occurred; that they had not been able to take part in consultation; or that they had not taken advantage of opportunities to state their opinion to the commission before it handed down its decision. I felt that the two parts of Adelaide should not be treated differently and that, if I were to refer the matter of Blackwood back to the commission to ensure that sufficient consultation could occur, I should do likewise for Henley and Grange so that the commission could assure itself that sufficient consultation had occurred.

For that reason, the proposal was referred back. If there is a question of insufficient consultation having occurred in one area, it may be that insufficient consultation has occurred in the other area. To enable the commission to consider the degree of consultation which had occurred—which was obviously inadequate in the Blackwood situation—I referred both reports back to the commission so

that it could assure itself that sufficient consultation had occurred.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: You didn't refer the report; you referred the proposal.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I referred a new proposal because of the technicalities of the Act which stated that a new proposal had to be put to the commission so that it could look at the question again. The commission had already looked at three proposals and reported on them. By referring a fourth proposal to the commission relating to the same area, it enabled the question of the Blackwood boundaries to be reconsidered by the commission. I am sure the Hon. Mr Griffin, with his legal knowledge, would realise this is a technicality only and a device for ensuring that the question can be reconsidered by the commission and further consultation can take place.

I stressed at the time that the Government neither supported nor opposed the proposal which it had put forward. It is a technicality to enable boundaries in that area to be reconsidered.

The Henley and Grange situation was referred to the commission so that it could assure itself, in that case, too, that sufficient consultation had occurred. If there was a question about the degree of consultation which occurs during the process of the commission examining proposals before it, I did not want one section of the metropolitan area to be treated differently from any other area. That was my reason for referring it back.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I wish to ask a supplementary question. Does the Minister not acknowledge that the two recommendations were treated differently: in one a proclamation was made resulting in the establishment of a new council; and in the other no proclamation was made, so that the *status quo* remains?

Secondly, what was the recommendation in respect of the Henley and Grange council? Thirdly, how can the Local Government Advisory Commission consult with ratepayers if ratepayers do not know what the recommendations of the commission might be?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I query whether that is a supplementary question. A supplementary question, under Standing Orders, must arise from the answer that has been given.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: We have a good Chair now, not like the last one.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister has the right to answer or not answer the question. It is entirely in her domain.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I am happy to indicate that there is every knowledge of what proposals are before the Local Government Advisory Commission relating to the Henley Beach area. Three proposals are before the commission—exactly the same three proposals that have been there for many months. There is a proposal from Henley Beach and Grange to enlarge its boundaries and take part of the Woodville and West Torrens councils. Counter-proposals from Woodville and West Torrens exist to keep Henley Beach Road as the dividing line between them right to the coast—in other words, for them to absorb the Henley and Grange council area between them. Those three proposals before the advisory commission, relating to the Henley Beach area, are exactly the same proposals as have been there for months.

COMMONWEALTH-STATE HOUSING AGREEMENT

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Housing and Construction, a question on the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: As a result of the new Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement South Australia will be cut back each year until it reaches its *per capita* quota—a loss of \$16 million in money terms out of the \$100 million per annum. The Federal Government will stop loans as a method of funding public housing—that which comes from loans, either Government or private. The Commonwealth will stop providing low interest loans. The effect on South Australia, in sums which come from this arrangement, is that the Commonwealth grants untied will drop from \$82 million in 1989-90 to \$66 million in 1992-93. The State matching funds will be required to lift from \$20 million to \$33 million, still leaving a \$3 million drop in rental capital account from \$102 million to \$99 million.

The State costs involving the Commonwealth debt will rise from \$31 million in the current year to \$63 million in 1992-93, and the general allowance, the recurrent costs, will increase from \$5 million to \$10 million. The net effect will be that the CSHA grants available for new public housing and construction will drop from \$66 million this year to \$26 million in 1992-93. From those figures, members can see that only \$26 million will be available and that, at roughly a cost of \$95 000 per house, that allows for only 275 additions to housing stock for that year.

That represents only 2.75 per cent of housing stock, well below the 11 per cent target set by the South Australian Government. If, as one expects, 500 units will be sold in 1992-93, that would produce enough revenue, according to my sums, to provide a replacement of only 342 houses, resulting in a net loss of stock of 158. Added to the 275, as a result of this agreement, in that year there will be a net increase of only 117 units. In other words, 1.17 per cent of the State housing start-ups instead of the current 11 per cent. The waiting list, which now stands at 45 000 people, will blow out, and the time waiting will expand from the present estimated four to seven years to over 10 years.

To its credit the South Australian Government has taken every opportunity in the past provided by Loan Council funds and, according to my calculations, it has the highest debt but also the largest stock of any public housing of any State in Australia. It is now being squeezed and penalised for making the most effort in the past and providing the best quality stock. However, it has the highest waiting list and, significantly, the highest proportion of households in lower incomes of public housing of any mainland State. The Commonwealth is now changing the roles in a way which affects South Australia more seriously than any other mainland State. This is ironic in that the States that have done least in the past will benefit the most—namely, Queensland in particular. Most significantly, these effects will flow on, and there will be a loss of over 700 jobs in the building industry in South Australia in two years, according to my calculations.

The Federal Government should at least index its offer but, with no indexation, there will be a dramatic drop from \$82 million to \$66 million over the next three years, and this cut cannot be sustained without grave effects on South Australian public tenants on the waiting list and the building industry. My questions to the Minister representing the Minister of Housing are:

1. Recognising the enormous social benefits to low income residents from rents and rebates applying in Housing Trust houses, how does the Government intend to maintain public housing at the present 11 per cent of houses in South Australia?

2. Will the Government pressure the Federal Government to increase its contribution? If so, when and how will that occur?

3. Does the Government intend to make up the shortfall in funds by way of a State loan to the Housing Trust or from South Australian Finance Authority investment?

4. Does the Minister agree that South Australia has been treated very shabbily indeed in the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, and does he intend to protest to the Federal Government on that matter?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: As the honourable member has implied in his explanatory remarks, the Bannon Labor Government has a record second to none in terms of the efforts made during its two terms in office with respect to—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: —the direction of public housing in South Australia. I have no doubt whatsoever that, under the leadership of the Minister of Housing and Construction (Hon. Terry Hemmings), the Government will continue to maximise the program to the extent that it is possible, just as it has done in the past. However, I will refer the specific questions raised by the honourable member to my colleague and bring back a detailed reply about the implications of the Commonwealth housing agreement.

ITALIAN AND MODERN GREEK LANGUAGES

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Ethnic Affairs in another place, a question on the subject of the teaching of Italian and Modern Greek languages.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: Very recently the Prime Minister released the National Agenda for a multi-cultural Australia according to which all Australians, irrespective of their origin, shall enjoy equal rights while they unify in their loyalty to Australia. Among the principal issues highlighted in the National Agenda is the right to receive instruction in English (which is our national language) and also the right to mother tongue maintenance. Such an ability is an asset, not only for the individual but also for our society as a whole.

The South Australian Government has been very supportive of the provision to prepare teachers of Greek and Italian and of professional Greek-English and Italian-English interpreters and translators by providing in the mid-1970s substantial funds at the Adelaide College of Advanced Education. Since that time, special funds have been made available to the college to support the interpreting and translating programs, and the introduction of a course in Vietnamese. These languages are not only very important to tens of thousands of South Australians but are also vitally important in the area of trade and tourism which has steadily increased in the past 10 to 15 years.

Today, the South Australian Government continues to recognise the State's need for language teachers and for professional interpreters and translators. However, for more than a year now I have been concerned at what appears as a decision by the South Australian College of Advanced

Education to reduce its efforts in this area. First, clerical staff with language expertise has been reduced from three positions to one. The language laboratory has been neglected with only 50 per cent of it in working order and with no technical assistance available. Secondly, the Graduate Diploma in Community Languages was not allowed an intake in 1989, and there are no prospects for 1990. Secondary languages will be discontinued from 1990 onwards in favour of a generalist BA degree. The BA in interpreting and translating is under threat. The Bachelor in Applied Languages has been blocked by college administration. Thirdly, academic staff at present on contract have been told that their contracts will not be renewed in 1990.

My concern is that the continued reduction in resources allocated to languages, the non-renewal of academic staff contracts, and the proposed elimination of the School of Languages in my view represent a serious retrograde step in language education in this State. These damaging decisions are against Government policy and, if not reversed, will destroy the small gains made over many years. I hope that the college's administration and the college council would recognise this and take urgent measures to restore the School of Languages with the resources necessary for the maintenance of its academic programs.

Will the Minister make an effort to intervene so as to reverse this situation which is of great concern to thousands of South Australians, and to prevent further reductions which can only destroy the good works accomplished by the college in language education over the past 15 years?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: As the honourable member is aware, the funding of tertiary institutions in South Australia comes from the Federal Government. That applies to the universities, the South Australian Institute of Technology, and the South Australian College of Advanced Education where the language courses to which the honourable member has referred are conducted. It is then for the appropriate institution—in this case the college—to determine the priority for the expenditure of those funds.

I express the hope, as the honourable member has expressed, that a high priority should be given to language teaching in this and the other tertiary institutions. I will certainly approach the Minister about this matter to see whether any action can be taken to deal with the issues that the honourable member has raised. I am not aware of those matters, or indeed whether the matters to which he has referred are correct, but I am sure that the Minister can ascertain that and, if necessary, make representations to the South Australian college.

In this State at least, as far as State expenditure is concerned, a high priority has been given to language teaching in the tertiary institutions as well as in the South Australian school system. The high priority has been indicated in the past by the State Government making seeding grants to enable courses to be started in—if my recollection is correct—Italian and modern Greek at the South Australian College of Advanced Education. Indeed, seeding grants were made for the interpreters courses that were started at that college some time ago. Although that money was provided initially by the State Government (and it is a Federal responsibility), the college took over the funding of those courses that had been started with State Government funds. So, from the State point of view, both through the tertiary sector with the seeding grants that I have mentioned and through our general policy in the secondary and primary school areas, we have given a high priority to language teaching, which is consistent with the policies espoused by the Federal Government, the national language policy and,

of course, the recent statement of the agenda for a multi-cultural Australia.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Well, it is certainly not the State Government that has made any cuts to language teaching. I have indicated that the State Government has given a high priority to this area, in accordance with Federal Government policy as well, and I would expect that the Federal Government will give a high priority to it as well, consistent with its policy pronouncements. The specific details of the matter will have to be referred to the appropriate Minister for examination. If the facts as outlined by the honourable member are correct, I will certainly urge the responsible Minister to make representations to the South Australian college. Having done that, I will provide a reply to the honourable member.

COUNCIL BOUNDARIES

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government a question about the Henley and Grange council.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Following the replies given by the Minister to questions asked by the Hon. Mr Griffin earlier today, there are several matters which need to be raised again. The Minister has pointedly avoided acknowledging that the two reports of the Local Government Advisory Commission were in fact treated differently. In relation to the Mitcham report, a proclamation was made, and that is irreversible unless the Local Government Advisory Commission changes its mind—and that is unlikely before the next election—so there is still uncertainty for the ratepayers of Mitcham.

Obviously, the Henley and Grange report contained a recommendation which was politically sensitive, and so the situation did not get to the point of an irreversible proclamation. Both reports were reports to the Minister under the Act, and there is nothing to prevent disclosure of the recommendations relating to the Henley and Grange council, in the interests of freedom of information, and certainly in the interests of informing ratepayers of that area what the conclusions of the commission may be. Therefore, why will the Minister not acknowledge that in fact the two reports have been treated differently? Secondly, why will the Minister not disclose the commission's recommendation in relation to Henley and Grange? Is it because it is political dynamite?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I repeat what I have said previously for those people who are obviously hard of hearing. The reports—and there were three of them—relating to the City of Flinders were presented to me, and I followed the same procedure with those as had been followed by my predecessors for all reports received from the Local Government Advisory Commission in relation to all 34 previous reports. The reports were forwarded to the Cabinet office and then acted on according to the decision of the Local Government Advisory Commission. If a change had been recommended by the commission that change was implemented by proclamation. Where it recommended no change, that recommendation was accepted and no proclamation was issued. I followed exactly the same procedure for the three reports relating to the City of Flinders.

As I am sure all members in this Chamber are aware, it was then that many citizens in the Blackwood area complained that they had not been consulted. They formed a committee known as 'Poll for Justice'. Also, another com-

mittee was formed known as the 'Save Mitcham Committee'. The cry from these groups, as I understand it, is that they were not consulted and that they did not have a chance to put their views to the commission before it made its decision. The action taken was to enable further consultation to occur. I do not wish to enter into any arguments about whether these people did or did not have the opportunity to make their views known. However, it is obvious that they felt that they had not had the opportunity to make their views known, or had not taken advantage of the opportunities that were available.

To enable further consultation to occur, which the people obviously wanted, I used the technicality of putting a new proposal to the commission to enable the whole question of local government boundaries in the Blackwood area to be reconsidered by the commission. Before I made that decision I received the reports relating to the three proposals which have been put forward for the Henley and Grange council area. I followed the same procedure of forwarding them to the Cabinet office. It was then that it became apparent that the divisiveness in relation to the Blackwood Hills would lead to great difficulties in the new City of Flinders unless there was an opportunity for further consultation provided. It was at that time I decided to refer the matter back to the Local Government Advisory Commission to ensure that there was no question of favouritism.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: If there was a complaint about lack of consultation in the Blackwood area I wanted to be assured that the Local Government Advisory Commission could be sure that there had been sufficient and adequate chance for consultation in the Henley Beach area. It seemed to me that, with the question of degree of consultation having been raised in one area, it was possible that it could be raised in the other area. I am sure that the Local Government Advisory Commission had followed exactly the same procedure for the Henley and Grange proposals as it had followed for the Mitcham proposals—and as had been followed for the 34 previous proposals which it had considered.

Consequently, I withdrew the reports from the Cabinet office and referred them back to the Local Government Advisory Commission, asking it to assure itself that there had been sufficient consultation in that area, as well as providing the extra chance for consultation in the Blackwood area. I have not yet heard from the Local Government Advisory Commission in answer to my questions.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: As the Minister has refused my initial suggestion that she may care to answer my questions, I ask again why the Minister will not disclose the commission's recommendation in relation to Henley and Grange. Following the Minister's earlier reply, how does she envisage that the commission will satisfy itself that the people have been fully consulted until a proposal is put to them, and will she say whether that proposal will be the recommendation from the initial report?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: It seems to me that that is for the commission to determine. It is not for me to tell the commission how it is to conduct its business. It is an independent commission, and the methods of consultation that it—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is a lot of audible conversation. Interjections of the right kind do not go astray, but conversation between members is not helpful at all to the Council.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The matter of how the advisory commission undertakes consultation is for it to determine. If it wishes to make a recommendation to me in relation to matters of consultation, I am very happy to receive any recommendation or opinion from it in that regard. I have not heard from it to this point.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Regarding the reports which the commission has recommended to me, given that I have referred the matter back, it would seem to me improper to reveal publicly the recommendations from the advisory commission. If the commission feels that further consultation is required, and if further consultation is undertaken, the commission may wish to change its recommendations. I have no idea: I do not direct the commission. Its decisions are a matter for the commission and certainly not a matter for me to determine.

With regard to the proposals before the commission, as I stated earlier, it is no secret: three proposals are before the commission, and they have been before it for many months. First, there is the proposal to enlarge the boundaries of Henley and Grange and to take part of the council areas of Woodville and West Torrens. That was the original proposal. The other proposals, which came from the Woodville and West Torrens councils, are to continue Henley Beach Road as the boundary between them right to the coast so that, between them, these two councils would absorb the council of Henley and Grange. There is no secret whatsoever about those proposals. They have been public knowledge for well over 12 months.

HOUSING COSTS

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Housing and Construction, a question about comparative housing costs in Adelaide.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: A report issued yesterday by the economic forecasting group Bis-Shrapnel showed that the percentage increase for new housing costs for the 12-month period ended 31 March 1989 were: Sydney, 25.1 per cent; Brisbane, 24 per cent; Perth, 23.6 per cent; Melbourne, 12.9 per cent; and Adelaide, 7.2 per cent. Given the obvious advantage that those statistically compiled figures mean for the new home buying citizens of Adelaide, a number of questions spring to mind. However, I seek the answer to only one question, namely: can the Minister inform members of this Council why the citizens of Adelaide should enjoy such a significant cost advantage over other Australians who live in other States when purchasing a new home?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: There are obviously many reasons for the cost advantages in Adelaide. One of those reasons is the policies which have been pursued by Labor Governments over a number of years with respect to the release of new land for building and other purposes, and which have helped to keep down the cost of house construction. Of course, there are many other reasons for that. I will be happy to refer those questions to my colleague in another place, and I will bring back a comprehensive report on these matters for the honourable member.

INDICATIVE POLLS

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government a question about indicative polls.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: The Minister is reported to have said:

They are trying to pretend I am anti-democratic because they asked me to hold a poll for them and I declined. They should have held one themselves, the difference being who pays for it.

My questions to the Minister are:

1. Was the cost factor the only reason she declined a poll, despite the Act allowing for a poll called by the Minister?

2. Is the Minister giving the advice that councils should conduct their own polls to every council under threat of amalgamation or part amalgamation?

3. If councils, or the Minister, do direct a poll as part of the consultation process that we have been talking about in Question Time today, will the Minister release the proposal for the making of a proclamation so that a fair summary of the arguments will be available to people before they vote, as in the Mitcham area and, hopefully, in the Henley and Grange area—in other words, so that the indicative poll is called prior to proclamation and not during the Local Government Advisory Commission hearing? The people will not know the basis for consultation if this course is not followed.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I refute the final comment made by the honourable member. The people do know what are the proposals before the Local Government Advisory Commission. The proposals are public knowledge.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. Irwin: We don't want guesses. We want to know what the proclamation was so that they can answer it.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The idea—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is too much conversation between members. Relevant interjections are not too bad but, if members are going to talk amongst themselves, it is not very conducive to the good running of this Council.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The cost of a poll is certainly a factor in whether a poll should be conducted by the local council or by the Government. It seems to me that in the case of Mitcham council this was a question relating to what the council boundary should be between Happy Valley and Mitcham in the Blackwood area.

This was not a matter of great concern to the residents of Mount Gambier, Kimba or Enfield, and I see no reason why they should pay for a poll through their taxes. If a poll is to be held it should be held by Mitcham council, and Mitcham council should pay for it. That is the correct procedure. It is not a matter of my asking Mitcham council to hold a poll. Mitcham council is an autonomous body and a part of the third tier of government in this country. If it wishes to hold a poll at any time on any topic, it is free to do so. It has the power to do so under the Act passed by this Parliament. The same applies to every council in this State. They have that power and whether or not they exercise it is up to them.

If people in the Mitcham, Henley and Grange, Brighton or Peterborough areas—or indeed in any other area which is subject to a proposal before the Local Government Advisory Commission—wish to have a poll, they should approach their councils and ask them to hold a poll. Their councils are supposed to be closely in touch with the electors within their council boundaries. They are the ones who can decide whether a poll is to take place. Obviously, the time for taking a poll is before the commission comes down with its final recommendations. The results of the poll would be very strong evidence for the commission to consider. While

the commission does not determine only the value and merit of proposals, it takes a number of factors into account when determining where council boundaries should be, or when considering any other proposal that has been put to it. Certainly, it considers the views of people in the area.

Naracoorte is the prime example of this. There were many good, logical grounds for changing the boundaries between the corporation and the District Council of Naracoorte. However, as the Hon. Mr Cameron drew to the attention of this Council on many occasions, considerable local feeling was made known to the commission and, as a consequence, the commission's recommendation was that there should be no change to the boundaries, because there is little point in forcing change where it will cause such antagonism that the resulting council will be unworkable. The Hon. Mr Cameron made many statements to this Council in relation to that matter.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: This is not an isolated case. Obviously, the results of a poll, as with any other expression of popular opinion, is one of the factors—and, I imagine, a very strong factor—which the commission considers when making its recommendations. However, it looks at other factors, such as the financial arrangements, the viability of the councils and the services which the councils are able to provide under different circumstances. However, as in the Naracoorte case, public opinion may be the overriding factor when the commission makes its decision. To answer one of the numerous points made by the Hon. Mr Irwin, I will certainly not advise councils to hold polls; nor will I advise them not to hold polls.

Whether councils hold polls is a matter for councils. It is not a matter for the Government. Councils are an autonomous tier of government and claim responsibility and authority on their own—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I draw to the Council's attention that Question Time has expired. I call on the business of the day.

STANDING ORDER 14

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

That for this session Standing Order 14 be suspended.

Standing Order 14 provides that no business beyond that which is of a formal or unopposed nature shall be entertained by the Council before the Address in Reply is adopted. I assume that the rationale for the Standing Order which is still the law relating to the conduct of proceedings in this place, was introduced, first, to ensure appropriate courtesy to His Excellency, the Governor, in responding to the Address in Reply at a reasonably early time following the Governor's speech opening the Parliament and, secondly, to give priority to members to address the Governor's speech. Also, and in particular, of course, the tradition with the Address in Reply is that honourable members are entitled to canvass whatever issue they wish. In other words, the question of the relevancy or otherwise of a speech to a particular issue before the Council is not a matter that is of importance in the Address in Reply debate. I assume that that was the original rationale for the Standing Order.

It seems to me now that neither the spirit nor indeed the letter of the Standing Order is being complied with by the Legislative Council. The suspension of this order has now occurred for some considerable time. I have not got before

me the exact date but, nevertheless, it has been customary for some time. It has generally been customary to suspend the Standing Order to enable the introduction of Bills so that, following the adoption of the Address in Reply, honourable members could go on with the business of the Council, having had notice of the Bills that were being introduced.

It is clear now, however, that the suspension is being used for other purposes, and I note that already there are on tomorrow's Notice Paper seven items of private members' business, many of which are obviously very contentious, and which will be disputed. Another four were announced today.

So, clearly, as I said, the spirit of the Standing Order is not being complied with, as indeed the letter of it has not been for some time now because it, as a Standing Order, has been suspended. However, there was some understanding that the Standing Order was suspended for a certain purpose, that is, to enable the introduction of Bills so that they could be considered by honourable members before the adoption of the Address in Reply so that the Council could get on with its business immediately following its adoption.

It seems to me that if the Council wants the Standing Order no longer to be of any effect and for the practice which has certainly occurred in the past two sessions to continue (namely, that it is in effect open slather on any introduction of Bills, motions of Government business or of a private nature), that should be addressed formally by the Standing Orders Committee and the Standing Order repealed if honourable members feel that it is no longer of any purpose.

All I say, at this stage, is that I think certainly the spirit of the suspension which has occurred in the past is no longer being followed and, if the Council wants that to occur in future, it should address that formally. I indicate that the date for presentation of the Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor has been set for Wednesday 23 August at 4.30 p.m. I ask members to bear that in mind in considering their contributions to the Address in Reply and, indeed, on the other matters for which notice has already been given.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General) brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor's speech:

1. We, the members of the Legislative Council, thank Your Excellency for the speech with which you have been pleased to open Parliament.

2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to all matters placed before us.

3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I move:

That the Address in Reply as read be adopted.

The PRESIDENT: I draw to the attention of members that this is the Hon. Mr Roberts' maiden speech and that it is customary for such speeches to be heard in silence.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: It is with great pride that I rise today to make my first contribution in this place. It is an honour to have the opportunity to move acceptance of the Governor's speech. I am also proud to have the honour of representing the people of this State and, more particu-

larly, I am delighted to be able to represent the people of my home city, Port Pirie.

My appointment to the Legislative Council is the culmination of years of hard work by many people over the years since the former Lower House seat of Port Pirie was lost in the redistribution of electorates in 1975.

The Port Pirie City Council, the Port Pirie Trades and Labor Council and the local Port Pirie ALP sub-branch have lobbied continuously over a period of many years to have a resident of that city sit as a member of Parliament. This view has been held and supported enthusiastically by my colleague in another place, the Hon. Gavin Keneally, who has, since the first redistribution in 1975, represented Port Pirie, and indeed the whole of Stuart, in a fair and proper manner. I should place on record the very high regard with which Gavin is held in the two principal cities in his electorate, and I pass on to him my thanks and the thanks of his electorate as he nears his retirement from Parliament.

Port Pirie has for many years been the largest export income earner in South Australia through the city's major employer, known formerly as the BHAS Pty Ltd, but now called Pasmenco Smelting, Port Pirie, the world's largest lead smelter. Its people are proud of their city and its contribution to the continued economic development of this State and of this nation. They believe that they deserve to be represented at the highest levels of public decision making and I am delighted, indeed honoured, to have been chosen to fill that role on their behalf in this place.

I reflect on occasions—and indeed the question has often been asked of me—'How does a rank and file country unionist get to be a member of Parliament in this day and age', especially the son of a timber worker and a home provider. Some people would have us believe that one needs to be a lawyer, a school teacher, an economist, a businessman (whatever that means—rolling in money, I expect, and that does not apply to me), a university graduate, or a woman who speaks two languages and is a rabid greenie, to achieve such high office—not an ordinary working man. I believe that it is partly a reflection of the broad base of the political Party that I proudly represent.

I believe, however, that I would not have been able to stand here today if it had not been for the influence, assistance and, more importantly, the cooperation of many people within the sphere of activities in which I have engaged over the past 20 years, basically as a trade unionist working for working people.

My first interest in the trade union movement, and with community affairs, began in Port Pirie as a third year apprentice when I decided to attend some union meetings to see what really went on there. This is something I would encourage many of the expert commentators on union affairs to do, as I am sure that it would lead to much better commentary.

The Electrical Trades Union (ETU) in Port Pirie was indeed fortunate at that time to have on its executive three people of outstanding trade union and community involvement, as well as leadership and political ability, who in many respects laid the foundations for my own activities in these areas. It would be remiss of me to allow this occasion to pass without recognising them. They were Mr A.E.M. (Mick) Sly, the long-serving and diligent secretary, whose patience and counselling helped shape and temper the enthusiastic, impetuous and somewhat impatient young Ron Roberts. Mick Sly was a man who, before all others, saw, hopefully, something in me worth nurturing. It was he who said to me in 1972, 'If you keep your head on, son,

you could finish up in Parliament', and I can remember thinking, 'That's absurd', or words to that effect.

The President of the ETU was Mr Jim Veal, a returned serviceman, who was a strong and competent chairman and was also President of the Port Pirie Trades and Labor Council, as well as chairman of football clubs and other community organisations. He provided a strong example of leadership for us all. The Vice President was the late Mr Tom Hackett, who took over as president of the ETU and the Trades and Labor Council from Jim Veal. Tom Hackett was a thoroughly decent and fair-minded man who was tragically killed in 1970 returning to Port Pirie after attending an ALP State Convention as delegate for the Port Pirie ETU sub-branch. This sad and tragic event probably started my career on the executive of the ETU.

I am sure that, had Tom Hackett not died so tragically, it would have been he and not I, probably in 1975, who would have fulfilled Port Pirie's parliamentary aspirations of a resident in a House of Parliament. It is a very sad thing that these three men have all passed away and cannot be here today to support me in body.

The ETU, an organisation of which I have always been proud to be a member, has always been fortunate to have very good executive committees in the Port Pirie sub-branch—people who are prepared to work and plan with common sense and fairmindedness—and I have always appreciated their loyalty and support. I especially pay tribute to the present executive, for in recent years I have not always had the time to devote to them, owing to my responsibilities as president of the Port Pirie Trades and Labor Council. However, it was comforting to know that the shop was in good hands at all times.

I would also like to acknowledge the past State secretaries of the ETU, Mr Murray Glastonbury, Frank Fahey and the longest serving research officer of the trade unions, Mr Vern Berry, who taught me a lot about the legal aspects of trade unions.

I come to this place with two particular interests: one is industrial relations and the other is the problems facing people living in country areas, rural as well as small and large country towns and cities. I believe that I can contribute to debates on both of these issues with the feeling and experience of someone who lives with the 'indigenous' people—people who know, people who have passed on information and experiences over many years, people who understand the sort of law that keeps communities together—'lore' as well as 'law'. I am talking about grass roots knowledge gained through experience and associations with great trade unionists over many years.

I refer to people like the late president of the Port Pirie Trades and Labor Council, Jack Clarke, and my good friend, Jack 'Bluey' Rawson, current secretary of that organisation, who often had to place a steady, wise and counselling hand on my shoulder. I refer also to diligent and honest, unpaid trade unionists like the late Morrie Hutchison from the Australian Workers Union and John Green from the brickies union—a man who, no matter whether things were good or bad, hot or cold, turned up to put in his contribution. I refer to people like Mr Jim (Junior) Watts, from the FEDFA with 30 years service and 23 years unchallenged as secretary. I refer to rational, sensible people like Alan 'Bluey' Macklin of my organisation, the ETU, and Brian Savage of the Plumbers Union, whose honesty and dedication have always impressed me greatly. These people are the essence of what makes Port Pirie, our State and this nation great.

Over the years I have always followed the affairs of, and worked with, the Port Pirie City Council. During that time

I have fought many community battles with, and indeed sometimes against, them. However, I have always managed to maintain good relations and, I hope, we have both enjoyed mutual respect.

One could not mention local government in Port Pirie without paying tribute to the past Mayor of the city, and still a serving alderman, Mr Bill Jones, A.O., who has served Port Pirie for some 23 years, nine as Mayor, and has fought as hard and as long as any person I know to have a 'local' represent the city in Parliament. But for ill health, Bill Jones would himself have made an excellent member of Parliament and it is unfortunate that Bill would have been in the gallery today but for ill health. I have often claimed to be Port Pirie's second most parochial son next to Bill Jones—a title that I hope to hold, as second fiddle, for many years to come.

It is not my intention to take up the time of the Chamber by listing all of the competent Port Pirie city councillors. If I did I would be here all day, but I must acknowledge the contributions to local government and also to my own learning process of people such as Mr Charles Robinson, O.A., and ex-alderman, Mr. Alan Tomkins. Of course the assistance of the aforementioned distinguished people would, of itself, have been of little use had not, I hope, the standards of decency, honesty and respect been instilled in me by my parents and family. Their ongoing support, even today, has always been given cheerfully and freely to me. My involvement in numerous industrial, community and sporting affairs has, as most members would be aware, thrown considerable weight to bear on my wife. In the running of the home and the rearing of our children, from day one of our marriage, she has borne these responsibilities with loyalty and good cheer—loyalty 100 per cent of the time and good cheer 90 per cent of the time. It is my earnest hope that she will be able to enjoy some of the benefits which flow from my new career.

As a grass roots trade unionist for many years, I was concerned about the direction, or lack of direction, that our industrial relations system was taking and, in particular, as it affected the people on the shop floor. I was never comfortable with the old theory that management has the right to manage and that the worker was not there to think but just to do as he or she was told.

The confrontationist approach to industrial relations, although I revelled in it, did not ever seem to change anything. The 'trip wire' mentality toward negotiations (and again I set more than my fair share of them) did not even seem to produce any lasting or effective solutions. In my early days of union activity, I was involved in a number of disputes which went before old Commissioner Lean of the South Australian Industrial Court—'old fifty-fifty' we called him. Commissioner Lean was a conciliator and an arbitrator as an absolute last resort.

In those days, neither the unions nor the employers were represented by lawyers, let alone barristers. This said something to me then, as it does now, that, although in essence the decisions were 'fifty-fifty' decisions, both sides accepted them graciously and they worked. It has been with some disappointment that I note that this situation has changed. This is probably due, I suspect, to the fact that more higher learning opportunities have produced more lawyers, and more and more of them have become involved in Industrial Commission proceedings. In my view this has been a bad thing.

From my experience, the person with the smartest silk, generally the party with the most money and resources, wins, leaving the other party feeling wronged and vowing revenge. Arbitration based on apportioning blame and on

technicalities of law has recently replaced a forum where ordinary people could sit down and resolve problems on the balance of probabilities based on equity, good conscience and the substantial merits of the case. I was happy to see legislation that addressed some of these problems passed by this Parliament in our last session, and I must say that I am looking forward to the positive results of that legislation.

Three years ago I had the opportunity to attend the first industrial participation course organised by Mr Tony Briscoe at the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology under contract from the Commonwealth Department of Employment and Industrial Relations Working Environment Branch in Canberra, which was under the ministerial control, at that stage, of Ralph Willis. I went on to the course full of scepticism and suspicion that it was just another con. However, while I did not accept everything that was presented, I was able to recognise for the first time in 20 years that a more sensible option to confrontation in industrial relations was becoming more and more possible in Australia.

In short I recognised, through what I learnt at this course coupled with my past experiences and with actions of the Federal Government, that the Australian Council of Trade Unions and the peak employer organisations, through the framework of the accord, were making traditional goals achievable in non-traditional ways for trade unionists. It became apparent that the achievement of those goals is the important thing, not necessarily the method used, provided, of course, that the method used was an honest and honourable one.

When working with the Trades and Labor Council, and with its support and consent, I have been able to assist in introducing some of the principles involved in industrial democracy, with pleasing results for workers and for the BHAS. It was also helped by an encouraging sense of propriety by management towards a change in industrial relations. These results have reflected equity and fairness, maintained the dignity of the parties, and produced an industrial relations climate in Port Pirie which would be the envy of many.

During my working life I have often encountered legislation which inhibits the introduction of a more participatory management style, and it is my earnest hope, over time, to be able to assist through legislation to remove or modify some of these barriers so that workers can be assured of humane, safe, dignified and well-paid working conditions, and companies can have stable, secure and profitable businesses.

I would like, in closing, to touch on the record of my predecessor, the Hon. John Cornwall, former Minister of Health, whose untimely resignation facilitated my entry into this place. John Cornwall's contribution to the Parliament and people of South Australia, especially in his contribution to the health care system, were, are, and will be, for many years to come, of enormous benefit to us all. Port Pirie in particular has reason to thank John Cornwall for his willingness and resolve in tackling complex, sensitive and sometimes volatile environmental and community problems, initiatives which have dramatically changed for the better the face of the working and community environments of our city.

His initiatives have seen the greening and cleaning of the city and, in some areas, the removal of old dwellings and the replacement in selected areas with high quality pensioner cottages which have assisted the Port Pirie city council with its plans for urban redevelopment of the city.

His initiatives as Minister led to the redevelopment of the Port Pirie Hospital, and its health care systems will have ongoing benefits for the city and surrounding districts for years to come. John Cornwall was one of the longest serving, competent, innovative, visionary, courageous and dedicated Health Ministers in Australia. As proud as I am to take my place in this Council, it is of great sadness to me that this honour comes to me at such a great loss to South Australia. John Cornwall is my friend and, whether or not all South Australians accept it, he was indeed the friend of all South Australians who needed or may have needed health care. I hope to retire from this Chamber one day with half the credits due to him.

I wrote that speech some days ago and, in his own inimitable style, John Cornwall has upstaged me again by appearing on the front page of the *Advertiser*. I am pleased to see that he has found a niche for himself in community involvement, and I am sure that all members of this Chamber would wish him all the very best in his new career.

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: It is with much pride that I second the motion of my colleague the Hon. Mr Roberts in support of the address given to us last week by His Excellency the Governor with which he opened the Fifth Session of this Parliament. In doing so, it is with regret that I also join His Excellency in expressing my sincere condolence to the families and relatives of the former members of this Parliament, Mr Alexander Heaslip, Mr Charlie Nicholson, Mr John Ryan, the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin, and the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill, who died some time ago.

On a happier note, I take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr President, on your elevation to that position, and I promise you my full cooperation. I also take this opportunity to congratulate my colleague the Hon. Mr Roberts on his maiden speech, and I personally extend to him my warm welcome to this Chamber, although he did join us some time ago. I also share the words expressed by my colleague previously in relation to our good friend and colleague Dr Cornwall who regrettably resigned from this Parliament of his own will. We wish him well in his new career in public life.

In my contribution today I wish to talk briefly about two groups within our society who can be easily identified as distinctive groups with particular needs and aspirations. I refer to the aged and the youth in our community. The youth look forward to a future which appears unlimited in its technological capacity and opportunities, yet they live in a society that does not distribute the benefits of that technology fairly to all members in the community. The aged should look forward to security and comfort following a life of hard work and sacrifice, a life of contribution that is all too often forgotten by succeeding generations who see the aged as a burden that needs to be coped with.

In many ways, these two distinctive groups in our society share a similar optimism for the future. However, it is an optimism that has been tempered by the harsh reality of a post-industrial economy being directed all too often towards the 21st century. For many young people, their life experience will be coloured by limited opportunities of education and therefore limited opportunities in the job market. As a result, they will have a limited ability to fulfil themselves in their role as productive members of our society. They will find themselves in long periods of unemployment or, at best, they will find themselves employed in marginal areas of the economy.

These young people may also find themselves homeless at this stage in their lives and, unfortunately and regrettably, many will fall into the terrible situation of drug and alcohol

abuse. The key for young people to take their rightful place in society has always been education, and it is in this area that the Australian Labor Party can take much pride in its achievements over many years. There can be no doubt that here in South Australia we have the best primary and secondary school system in Australia. It is not faultless, like any other organisation of its size and role in society. There can always be complaints about some aspects of its operation, but there can be no doubt that it is easily the best system in Australia.

This claim can be put to the test in a number of vital issues. For instance, in the area of student-teacher ratios, figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics show that South Australia is well ahead of the national average of 14.7 students for each teacher. In 1988-89, the Bannan Labor Government set a new standard of 12.9 students for every teacher. Another indicator is that more young people successfully completed year 12 in South Australia than in any other State in the nation. These two indicators alone are proof positive of the excellent job being done by this Government in the education area.

If more evidence is needed, one should examine the amount of money expended by the Government for every school student. The recurrent expenditure of each student in the State school system was set in the 1988-89 State budget at just under \$4 100 per student. This represents a 17 per cent increase in real terms since 1982-83. More money can always be spent on education, and more can always be done to improve classroom resources, standards, curriculum development, discipline and staff conditions—just to name a few.

There is no doubt that without an adequate education many of our young people will be unable to gain mainstream employment and that we will again face the situation that occurred in the late 1970s and early 1980s of hundreds of thousands of young people relegated to the unemployment queue. Unfortunately, the Federal and State Government successes in lowering unemployment over the past six years are now almost totally ignored by the media, which seems to be obsessed with personality politics. An instance of this was the recent announcement of the lowest unemployment rate recorded since 1981.

In the *Advertiser* of 14 July this year, this announcement was headlined as 'No joy for the economy despite fall in jobless'. This was followed with the following statement:

Australian banks and the Federal Opposition yesterday warned of a possible further hike in interest rates in the wake of another drop in unemployment

Obviously, for some banks and for the Liberal Party a drop in the unemployment rate is bad for the economy. They would rather return to the good old days of 25 per cent youth unemployment—which was the situation inherited by the current Government from the former Liberal-National Party coalition. For me and for the Australian Labor Party no policy of forced unemployment could ever be acceptable. I congratulate both the South Australian Government and the Federal Labor Government on their continued commitment to a further reduction in unemployment.

Much of the success in reducing the youth unemployment rate to the June level of 14.3 per cent can be attributed to a number of employment and training programs initiated by the Federal Government in conjunction with the States. One of these programs, the Australian Traineeship System, came about as a direct result of the report of the committee of inquiry into labour market programs—the Kirby Report—which identified the need to upgrade substantially our education and training program in order to improve the long-term labour prospects of young people in this country. The Australian Traineeship System was introduced as an adjunct

to the formal apprenticeship training system and it gives an opportunity for young people to work and gain training off the job through the TAFE system. At the end of June 1988, over 18 000 young people had begun traineeships, and this was since the inception of the program in August 1985. Of these traineeships, over 57 per cent have been in the private sector.

The target group has been the 16 to 18-year-old category, which to the end of June last year accounted for 91 per cent of trainees, while 73 per cent of all trainees had not completed year 12 at secondary school. The continued success of a program such as this, and others, relies on a commitment from the Government to properly fund and staff the programs. Such a commitment can only come from a political Party which cares about providing opportunities to all in the community regardless of their financial situation. Such a commitment cannot come from a Party which sees a falling unemployment rate as a danger to the economy. Our young people deserve better than that, and it is only through a continuation of the efforts of Labor Governments at both State and Federal levels that our young people will be given an opportunity to fully participate in the community.

In many ways the aged in our community feel threatened by the New Right policies of the State and Federal Liberal Parties. We hear now of secret Liberal hit lists in the area of welfare spending—hit lists that are too terrible to spell out to people now or before the next Federal election. Such an attitude towards those on social security income support, such as aged pensioners, is absolutely appalling. It is no wonder that many aged people feel that they are no longer seen by society as being a useful and productive component, when one of Australia's major political Parties, the alternative Government, treats them with so much contempt.

The recent rise to prominence of a number of so-called 'grey power' groups throughout Australia tends to indicate the feelings of powerlessness and dispossession felt by many old people in our society. I venture to suggest that it is not only Governments and politicians that are being asked to listen to calls from the aged but that it is the whole of society that is being asked to take note of the aged in our community.

The issue of an ageing society has received much prominence in recent times, although much of what has passed for rational debate on the issues concerning an ageing population has been of the doomsday variety, and much of it has been grossly insulting to the aged in our community. In general, the thrust of much of the media coverage of these issues tends to paint a picture of a rapidly ageing population which will become an unbearable burden on succeeding generations of taxpayers. Again, I stress that in my view this picture of the aged in our society being a burden on the rest of the community is both insulting and incorrect.

The fact is that the aged would generally far prefer to lead an independent lifestyle free from having to rely overly on the rest of society. This is not to say that the issue of an ageing society is one that should be ignored—it should not be, but it should be discussed in a more calm and rational way than has been the case in recent times. The ageing of our population is an issue that requires the attention of all politicians and all Australians—because none of us, including you and me, Mr President, will remain untouched by the effect that an ageing population will have on the way that we live.

It is imperative that the issue of our ageing population be discussed now, and it is imperative also that strategies

be developed to take into account what will be the changed nature of our society in the twenty-first century.

A few simple statistics from the 1987-88 Annual Report from the Office of the Commissioner for the Ageing in South Australia tend to highlight the likely age make-up of this State's population in the next 30 years. I should point out that, in my view, our ageing population is not a problem that needs a solution, but rather it is the logical outcome of hundreds of years of scientific, technological, and social progress in the way in which the First World has developed. We must never forget that the issues associated with an ageing population do not confront those in the less developed nations of the world. It is the privilege of more developed countries, like Australia, to have an ageing population.

As I have already stated, the ageing Australian population is not a problem in itself; it is instead a challenge for all sections of our society to face and to come to terms with. It will only become a problem if we fail to deal with that challenge.

The statistics on ageing from the Annual Report of the Commissioner for the Ageing show that in 1987 the over 60 years age group in South Australia accounted for 16.9 per cent of our State's population. In total numbers this age group totalled over 235 000 people out of a population of 1.39 million people.

The Australian Bureau of Statistics predicts that by the year 2021, which is only 32 years away, this over 60 age group will represent 24.4 per cent of our State's population—from 16.9 per cent to 24.4 per cent. In real numbers this represents a jump from 235 000 people in 1987 to 441 700 people in the year 2021. This represents an 87.9 per cent increase in the number of people over 60 years old in that 32 year period. Such a fundamental change in the age make-up in our State's population would require a fundamental re-think in all areas of policy making and service provision for all tiers of government—local, State and Federal.

The fact is that policy responses need to be addressed in the very near future and cannot be left to the last moment. This is especially so in the case of South Australia where, currently in every age group over 50 years, we have a higher proportion of people than is the national average. South Australia is indeed an ageing State, and this will continue into the future. For instance, in 1987, 12 per cent of our population was over 65 years old while that age group only accounted for 10.7 per cent of the total Australian population. The projections for the future indicate that this trend will continue.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: Well, let's also do something about that. It will be the South Australian Government's policy decisions that will provide the benchmark by which other States will measure their responses in the future. It is reassuring that the Bannon Labor Government in South Australia is already setting the standard in response to aged issues in this State. It should be remembered that it was the South Australian Government that, in 1985, established Australia's first, and only, independent Commissioner for the Ageing, as a focal point for older South Australians with various concerns about their ageing and the community and Government's response to them.

The Office of the Commissioner for the Ageing has done an outstanding job in advocacy of age issues and this agency's role will grow in importance in the years to come. The Bannon Government has also appointed a Minister for the Aged—the Deputy Premier, Don Hopgood—who is also responsible for the vital portfolios of health and community welfare. These two portfolios are of vital importance to the

aged in our community, and the appointment of Dr Hopgood as Minister for the Aged indicates that this State Government recognises the need to plan for the future in relation to aged care issues.

There are many other initiatives in the field of aged care services that have been established by the Bannon Labor Government in South Australia. These include:

The establishment of a task force of Government members of both Houses of Parliament to examine and report directly to the Premier and Cabinet upon the problems and concerns facing older South Australians;

The production of *Age Pages*—which are easy to read information sheets on a variety of topics of interest to older people. It is interesting to note that these information sheets, which were first produced in 1985, are now published in 14 languages and are very popular throughout Australia;

The establishment of the Nursing Homes and Hostels Enquiry Service in 1988 to provide information and receive complaints about nursing homes, as well as to provide information on vacancies in hostels and nursing homes through its computerised bed listing service.

These are just a few of the many initiatives embarked upon by the Bannon Government in the interests of our older population. The State Government, through its many departments and instrumentalities, offers a number of other services to the aged community. These services and concessions include access cabs; STA transport concessions; a whole range of health and dental care services provided by the Health Commission; concessions on a whole range of Government charges such as licence and registration fees; and also concessions on utilities such as gas, electricity, water and sewerage, to name a few.

Another major achievement in recent times has been the establishment of the Commonwealth-State funded home and community care program, which provides basic home care and community based services for the frail aged as an alternative to inappropriate admission to nursing homes or aged hostels. The program is based on the understanding that most people, as they grow older, wish to remain in their own home, in a familiar environment with their neighbours, friends and family often in close proximity, rather than a nursing home or hostel. Unfortunately, because of a number of factors, many aged people find it difficult to remain in their own home and often find themselves inappropriately placed in nursing homes or hostels. To alleviate this problem the HACC program provides a range of services including: domiciliary care; food services, such as meals on wheels; home maintenance and modification; community respite care; transport services; and community nursing, amongst many others. The funding provided by the State and Federal Governments for the provision of these services has doubled from \$13 million in 1984-85 to over \$25 million in 1987-88.

There can be no doubt that, in the next three decades, our ageing population will place an ever increasing demand on the types of services funded under the HACC program. It will, therefore, be necessary for Governments, both at State and Federal level, to allocate increasingly larger shares of taxpayers' dollars to programs under HACC.

Such increases in funding, to cope with the increasing numbers of aged people in our community, will need to be well in advance of inflation if we are merely to maintain current levels of service for the aged community. To expand the range and scope of this service will over time require a massive expenditure in real terms. Given the New Right's obsession with reducing Government expenditure in the welfare area, I am not hopeful that a future national Liberal

Government would have any understanding at all of the need to provide services under programs like HACC.

It should be acknowledged that, whilst many people wish to remain in their own home, it is not always possible for them to do so. Residential care in the form of nursing homes, hostels and aged people's cottages will play an ever increasing role in our society, and funding for the provision and ongoing running of these services will need to increase considerably over time to meet the needs of our community. The capital and recurrent funding of many of the current services is provided by the Federal Government; in 1987-88 over \$1.36 billion was spent in residential care programs for older Australians. These levels of funding will again need to increase well above the inflation rate simply to maintain the existing level of service, let alone to provide increasing levels of service for an expanding aged community.

We therefore face a dilemma in the provision of aged-care services in the future. We must bite the bullet now and start planning and making provisions for the future or we will find ourselves unable to provide the types of service which are taken for granted today. It should be clearly understood that our society will be facing a massive call on public financial resources to provide the basic infrastructure for what will be nearly one quarter of our population.

There are some in our society who claim that it is not the community which should be responsible for providing much of this infrastructure, especially at a time of a shrinking tax base. Rather, some of them have argued that the aged are the responsibility of the family. These views ignore completely the fact that families already contribute greatly to the care and maintenance of elderly relatives. For instance, in 1987 the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs found that, in terms of the provision of support for old people, the family is the key provider for 86 per cent of the aged from non-English-speaking background, for 70 per cent of the aged from English-speaking background and for 66 per cent of Australian-born aged people.

Generally, within financial and time constraints, families do provide much of the needed support for their aged relatives, but they cannot provide, and they should not be expected to provide, the levels of service and expertise available in the residential care situation and in some of the HACC-funded programs. As lifetime taxpayers, aged people expect a minimum in return and that some of their tax dollars be invested in the necessary infrastructure that will care for them in later years.

There is a lesson in this for all Australians, and in what I am about to say I do not wish to be seen as being critical; it is no good crying out for cuts in taxes today and then tomorrow demanding the provision of services. In many ways the approach to providing for our ageing community should be tackled in a bipartisan manner. As a society we should be able to recognise first and foremost that providing for an ageing nation will be the dominant social issue of the next few decades.

Yet the challenges of this situation have yet to be accepted into the mainstream of public debate, except in the most superficial of ways. Many of the issues raised by the grey power movement are based wholly and solely on increasing disposable income for aged people. In most instances these claims are totally unrealistic and could be described, at best, as ambit claims, and, at worst, as downright selfish claims.

An example of this was the report in the *Advertiser* on 13 February of this year in which the Australian Pensioners Federation was reported to have called for a \$20 per week tax free increase in the aged pension. The fact is that such a rise in the aged pension for Australia's 977 128 aged

pensioners on full pension would cost over \$19 million per week, or over \$1.016 billion per year. One should remember that the total outlay by the Federal Department of Community Services on its residential care program for aged people in 1987-88 was \$1.366 billion.

Another often heard claim from the grey power lobby is for the aged pension to be increased to 35 per cent of average weekly earnings. Based on figures obtained from the annual report of the Department of Social Security and from figures published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, this claim alone would cost an additional \$49.16 million per week or \$2.556 billion per year.

It should be well understood that these are unrealistic claims, and I would suggest that they do not represent the wishes of the majority of aged persons in our community. However, they are claims that have been made in the name of aged people by the so-called grey power movement. Some elements in the grey power movement, in their rush to gain massive pension increases, have totally ignored the many aged care services and facilities that are provided by government. They have fallen into the unfortunate trap of wanting more for themselves without giving any thought to how it is to be paid for; nor have they given any thought to the long-term consequences if their financial claims were to succeed.

In fact, one prominent grey power spokesperson was quoted in the *News* of 18 January this year as saying, 'We argue that for elderly people today the long term is meaningless.' Such an attitude, if reflected in Government policies, would, I suggest, be both irresponsible and unjustifiable. It is an attitude that reflects the view of many in the society of 'I'm all right, Jack,' and it is a view that ignores the many varied needs of the aged.

One final point, Mr President, which I hope grey power supporters will bear in mind when they hear criticism of the current Labor Federal and State Governments is that the Liberal and National Parties have clearly committed themselves to cutting expenditure on what they term 'welfare'. That is what they should remember. This means cuts to aged care services and programs and perhaps even cuts to income support systems such as the aged pension. This is not scare-mongering on my part: it is clearly stated Liberal/National policy.

In fact, in the *Advertiser* of 17 July the coalition spokesman on finance matters, Senator John Stone, called for further cuts in Government spending, claiming that there was further fat to be cut away from the budget. He went on to say that any future coalition Government would make spending cuts 'more substantial than \$1 billion'. He blamed the poor performance of the Australian economy on those who are on what he terms welfare.

I trust that the 'Grey Power' movement will realise the gravity of the situation and not be fooled into thinking that a change of Government will provide them with what they are lobbying for.

I wish now to move along to an area of aged care policy which is of particular concern to me—aged care for our ethnic population. Like our society as a whole, the ethnic population in Australia will age dramatically in the next two decades. In 1981 the ethnic aged—people aged over 60 years—accounted for 216 700 people in Australia. By the year 2001, it is estimated that this will increase by over 200 per cent to 660 000 people of non-English speaking backgrounds aged over 60 years. This rapid increase, greater than that of the Australian born population, will have been brought about as a result of our post-war labour recruitment policies which saw many people in the 20-40 year age group arrive in Australia from non-English speaking backgrounds.

Another contributing factor has been the increase in the family reunion intake which often involves older family members joining their younger relatives in Australia. The end result will be a very large group of aged persons from non-English speaking backgrounds who will have a number of specific problems which will need to be addressed in the future.

Many of the problems facing older people are similar, regardless of ethnic background. However, there are a number of quite obvious difficulties for people not born in Australia. The most obvious problem which is common to many members of Parliament, of course, is the problem of language for older people.

There can be no better example of Government failure to plan for the future than the failure of successive Australian Governments in the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s, to provide appropriate English language programs for newly arrived migrants. What has happened is that there is a very large group of elderly ethnic people, a group that will continue to grow, that have very poor communication skills outside of their first language. This is especially so for ethnic women who often were unable even to obtain basic rudimentary 'factory floor' English.

It is a fact that across all older age groups women greatly outnumber men. An example of this is that in 1981, of all people aged 60 years and above living alone, over 74 per cent were women. It is generally, therefore, ethnic women who are often the most isolated of the ethnic aged. The isolation felt by the aged in the ethnic communities is often compounded by the absence of other family members. By this, I do not mean spouses or children but rather other family members such as brothers, sisters, cousins and the like. It is often thought that extended family support among ethnic groups precludes the need for the provision of specialised services for the ethnic aged. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The fact is that the simple experience of migration itself often severs family ties. Also the ability of family members to care for elderly relatives is severely restricted by economic factors, and often other family members are facing the stresses associated with being from a non-English speaking background and are not necessarily in the best position to provide care.

While these factors work against many families providing support and services for elderly relatives, the fact remains, as I explained earlier, that people from non-English backgrounds generally receive more support from their immediate families than do Australian-born aged people. This should not, however, provide an excuse for the Government to ignore its obligations to the ethnic aged in the provision of services and facilities.

Also, providers of services and facilities for the aged should be more sensitive to the needs of the ethnic aged. Simple examples of insensitivity to the needs of the ethnic aged include the provision of meals in nursing homes, often with little thought being given to the likes or dislikes of ethnic people. The same can be said in regard to the provision of social and recreational facilities in nursing homes. Often the providers of these services fail to take into account the social and recreational mores of people from non-English speaking backgrounds. Government cannot, of course, legislate to ensure that social and recreational mores are adhered to in the aged care situation. It is up to individual aged care establishments to ensure that its clients' group is provided with as fulfilling a range of activities as is possible, but this particular instance is a good example of how we, as a society, need to be more responsive to the needs of

particular groups within the aged community, rather than treating all aged people as a homogenous group.

It is particularly pleasing for me to note that the needs of the ethnic aged have been recognised by the Federal Government and, in his announcement of the national agenda for a multicultural Australia on Wednesday 26 July, the Prime Minister (Mr Hawke) released details of a number of new initiatives for the ethnic aged. The agenda recognises that the ethnic aged are more dependent than most on the support services provided by Government, but are often unable to fully take advantage of their entitlements because of language and cultural barriers. The agenda also recognises that many aged immigrants do not have a broad family network in Australia and are heavily reliant on the services provided under the home and community care program.

One of the major initiatives announced in relation to the ethnic aged is the commissioning of a major study by the Australian Institute of Health into the health status and needs of Australians from non-English speaking backgrounds. This survey will fill a major gap in existing knowledge and will aid the design and implementation of future policies for the ethnic aged in our community.

The Federal Government will also undertake a targeted campaign to promote awareness of and encourage the use of programs provided by the Department of Community Services and Health. These initiatives, amongst others, will assist the ethnic aged to fully take advantage of their entitlements as citizens of Australia. As in all areas of human endeavour, there can always be more done to improve the lot of society. We are finally realising our obligations as a nation to the aged in our community, both the Australian-born aged and the ethnic aged.

The selfish political agenda being pushed by some of lower and lower taxes and diminishing services and benefits for the community must not be allowed to succeed. The

invisible hand and the trickle down theory are simply voodoo or medical magic manipulation economic propositions that have no place in contemporary Australian society, yet they seem to have become the dominant theory in the Liberal Party and in some sections of the media.

Today I have spoken briefly about the young in our community and of their need for education and training so that they can take their place in our society as full and active members. I have spoken of the success that both the State and Federal Labor Governments have had in combating youth unemployment. I have also spoken of the needs of an ageing Australia and of some of the demands placed before the Government by some sections of the aged community. The needs and demands of our youth and the needs and demands of our ageing population cannot be ignored.

There is, and will continue to be, a need for increasing Government involvement in the provision of income support and services for these two groups in our community. It is no good trying to pass responsibility for the provision of these services to others in the community—they are governmental responsibilities that require continued Government support. I believe that only the Australian Labor Party offers hope to these two groups in our society—hope that they can continue to receive equality of opportunity in all aspects of their life. The alternative is a return to the 'survival of the fittest' mentality, which I believe should have no place in a modern Australia.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.37 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 9 August at 2.15 p.m.