LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday 5 August 1981

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

The PRESIDENT: Before calling on notices and questions, I would like to make the following announcement: I regret that I did not hear the objectionable words expressed yesterday during Question Time by the Hon. Mr Dunford that the Hon. the Attorney-General asked him to withdraw. I apologise to the Council: I did not hear the words. On reading *Hansard* this morning, I considered that the words used by the Hon. Mr Dunford were highly disorderly, and it is in the interests of the dignity of this Chamber that I should take the first opportunity to inform the Council that such expressions will not be tolerated in the future.

QUESTIONS

HOSPITAL CHARGES

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a question about public hospital charges.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: On 8 July, the Minister of Health announced a new scale of charges to operate from 1 September in all public and recognised hospitals in South Australia. These were presented publicly as if final agreement had been reached with the Commonwealth. The daily bed charge, for example, was to be $85.

The announcement was made because of intense public pressure, from both the South Australian public at large and the health funds but, from information that has been given to me only this week, it would now seem that that announcement was premature, because three weeks later, on 28 July (only last week) a meeting of the South Australian Hospitals Association was told that the South Australian hospital charges had not yet been approved by the Commonwealth. Of course, it is not possible under the legislation or the cost-sharing agreement (that is, either the interim agreement to which the Minister has referred or the existing or previous agreement) for public hospital charges to be finalised by South Australia without the approval of the Federal Minister.

It seems that at least three extraordinary possibilities arise from this situation. First, there is the possibility that a completely new set of public hospital charges will be announced soon. Secondly, there is the possibility that the Minister, Mrs Adamson, was having such difficulty in negotiations with the Federal Government that she decided to call its bluff in an extraordinarily irresponsible manner. Thirdly, there is the possibility that she simply did not know or was not told by her senior officers what her legal and constitutional obligations were.

Why did she announce details of the new hospital charges before they had been approved by the Federal Government? Have they now been approved? Will she make a full, frank and detailed statement concerning the present state of negotiations and agreements with the Federal Government? This will help to clear up at least some of the vast confusion in the community regarding health funding and insurance.

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

HOSPITAL FUNDING

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a question on hospital funding.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Yesterday's *Advertiser* reported that the South Australian and Commonwealth Governments have prepared a draft agreement on hospital funding to enable the new hospital arrangements to be introduced from 1 September. It was described as 'essentially an interim agreement until South Australia completes negotiations with the Commnonwealth over cost sharing'. The Minister of Health, Mrs Adamson, was reported as saying:

> The Commonwealth legislation and the new agreement provide for South Australia to terminate the [present] cost sharing agreement at any time before the due date in 1985.

The Minister made clear that the agreement had been renegotiated so that South Australia will be obliged to impose public hospital charges. This is a complete turnaround from the Minister's previous statements. In the *News* of April 4 this year she said, 'This Government has no intention of moving that way.' In the *Advertiser* of 9 May she said:

> The Commonwealth could not force South Australia to abandon the present agreement, which could remain in force until 1985.

It is clear that there has been a devious and somewhat dubious political conditioning programme going on over the past four months. There seems to have been a deliberate ploy to present the South Australian Government as the protector of the cost-sharing agreement. This was done with the clear knowledge that the Minister always intended to go along with the Fraser Government. It was done publicly by the Minister, while in private she had conceded months ago that South Australia was going to tear up the contract which bound the Commonwealth to fund half the cost of public hospital beds. It was done quite deliberately because this Government endorsed the policy of forcing low and lower middle income earners into buying expensive, flat-rate health insurance.

The Minister is literally giving away hundreds of millions of dollars of direct Commonwealth hospital funding over the next four years. She is doing it on the basis of a blinkered, conservative, ideological commitment to the Fraser Government.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I rise on a point of order. Why the Minister is doing it is a matter of opinion.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Dr Cornwall will proceed to ask the question, if he has not already done so.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: My questions are as follows: Why will the Minister not make public the details of the so-called interim agreement? What is the total estimated amount of direct Commonwealth hospital funding being given up over the next four years? Will the Minister confirm that it is in excess of $400 000 000? Will she confirm that most of this will be replaced by what is in practice a flat rate private tax for health cover? Can we expect to be given public details of the repudiation of the cost sharing agreement contract before 1 September. If not, why not? Why is the Minister of Community Welfare so extraordinarily sensitive about the issue?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: In regard to the last question, I am not extraordinarily sensitive. When the honourable member refers to ideological matters and says that that is why the Minister of Health has done this, that is quite improper and I will take a point of order, and continue to take a point of order, when that happens.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: You're getting a bit thin skinned, you blokes.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am not; I am answering the question.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I rise on a point of order. The Minister is obviously reflecting on the Chair.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable Minister of Community Welfare.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am not reflecting on the Chair, because you, Sir, acted when I took the point of order. In respect of the last question, I will say that the statement made was not only expressing an opinion but was also debating the issue, and I will continue to take points of order when that sort of thing is said. That deals with the last part of the question. Regarding the rest of the question, I will refer that to my colleague and bring back a reply.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I wish to ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, about the fact that there is a vast differential in benefit terms and in monetary terms—

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: You can't make a statement.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I am not making a statement. Rise to your feet. I have had enough of you. If I can land on you, I will do so later today.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: In view of the fact that there should not be such a differential, will the Minister of Community Welfare draw the attention of the Minister of Health to section 99 of the Commonwealth Constitution with respect to preference to one State over another? I refer to preference to Queensland over all other States. Further, will the Minister draw the attention of the Minister of Health to page 119 of the report of the Joint Committee of Constitutional Review? I refer to the latter paragraph commencing with the words 'In 1938' and ending with the words 'persist with the measure'.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Yes, I will refer the question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

DRUG LAWS

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I seek leave to make an explanation before directing a question to the Attorney-General on the matter of the new Victorian drug laws.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Members will doubtless have seen the main headline in this morning's *Advertiser* which read 'Tough Victorian Drug Laws'. Among other things, these new drug laws that it is intended to bring in in the next session of the Victorian Parliament will include tougher penalties ranging up to 25 years gaol and $200 000 fines for growers, traffickers and users of narcotics and barbiturates. For trafficking in cannabis, whether the plant or resin, the penalty will be 10 years gaol and/or a fine of $50 000.

This compares with the penalties in South Australia of a fine of $100 000 or 25 years gaol, or both, for the supply of a drug other than cannabis. For the supply of cannabis, the maximum fine is $4 000 or 10 years gaol, or both. I am sure that all members will agree that the South Australian penalties are fairly severe; I cannot remember the courts ever imposing those maximum sentences anyway. The real point of interest is that Victorian courts will be given power to confiscate the assets of drug dealers and they also will be able to freeze the assets of people charged with drug offences to prevent attempts to dispose of the assets. This is a completely new type of legislation in Australia at least.

In announcing the new laws, the Victorian Acting Premier (Mr Borthwick) said he would approach other State Governments and ask them to enact similar laws and that this would enable courts to seize assets held in other States. My question is: has such an approach been made and, if it has been or will be made at some time in the future, what will be the Government's attitude towards the confiscation of the assets of drug dealers?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: As the member has said, the monetary penalties imposed by South Australian legislation and the maximum imprisonment periods in South Australian legislation are already quite substantial. The Victorian announcement indicates that that State is really bringing its legislation into line with the type of penalties that have been applicable here for several years. In relation to the confiscation of assets, that is a matter which is currently being looked at by the Government, no decisions having been made. Although there are some practical and reasonable difficulties that we are endeavouring to come to grips with, we are certainly examining that possibility conscientiously.

I have no knowledge of a direct request from the Victorian Government to legislate in the same way as the Victorian Government has announced that it will legislate. If a request is received, the Victorian Government will receive the information that we are closely examining the matter and that we would hope to be able to make some decision in the foreseeable future.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I desire to ask a supplementary question. In this conscientious and diligent search of the legislation, has the Attorney been made aware that the powers to confiscate broad-acre property already exists in relation to perpetual leasehold land in South Australia?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The question of leasehold land is somewhat different from what applies in relation to freehold land because of the conditions tied to perpetual leasehold miscellaneous leases and irrigation leases.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Most of the broad-acres are outside zoning or are perpetual leases.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Hon. Dr Cornwall did not refer to broad-acres in a specific area. There is an extensive area of freehold land in broad-acre holdings. I have not closely examined the conditions in relation to pastoral and irrigation leases. I do not think that it is as clear as the honourable member indicates that it is, but it is certainly one of the areas that is also being examined, as the Premier indicated the week before last when he was asked specific questions in relation to irrigation leases.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I desire to ask a further supplementary question in relation to those people who come before the Australian courts and who have short residency in Australia under visas, permits, and so on. Some people in these circumstances are convicted of the most diabolical crimes in relation to the worst of the hard drugs, drugs which are not available from any agricultural or commercial source in Australia but have their source overseas. Has the Government, in its consideration of the seizure of assets, turned its mind to the seizure of the assets of those multi-national companies which are engaged in the illicit drug scene which affects this country today?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I have indicated that the Government is looking at the confiscation of assets of those who are convicted of offences. Any other form of confiscation, I would imagine, would raise the greatest furore from the Opposition, if it was ever contemplated that property should be confiscated otherwise than as a result of court proceedings.

VINDANA WINERY

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking the Attorney-General a

question about the Vindana Winery.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Last year the Attorney-General received a deputation of growers from the Riverland who were affected by the collapse of the Vindana Winery and who were owed considerable amounts of money. During discussions with that deputation, the Attorney-General promised the growers that there would be a full inquiry into the affairs of the Morgan group of companies, which owns the Vindana Winery. Growers in the Riverland are concerned that there seems to be no progress with that inquiry into the Morgan group of companies. One grower telephoned the Corporate Affairs Commission to see whether he could get an indication when the inquiry would be completed. An officer of the department told him that the Attorney-General had said that there was no hurry with the inquiry now that the political heat was off.

Will the Attorney-General say whether he did give such a cynical instruction to the Corporate Affairs Commission or whether, in fact, the inquiry is being pursued at full speed? If it is being pursued, can the Attorney indicate when the inquiry will be completed and when the results will be announced?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I did not at any stage give such a direction. If the honourable member has genuine information (and I stress 'genuine') which would lead to a conclusion that that information had come from the commission, I would want to hear from him and the person he alleges has communicated with him details of the person with whom his correspondent has communicated in the commission so that the matter can be investigated. I have not given any such direction at any stage; in fact, to the contrary, I have always indicated that this matter of Vindana is a matter of importance. I have constantly sought progress reports from the commission as to the progress of the inquiry. In the light of the honourable member's question, I will obtain an up-date of the information available and bring back a reply.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I wish to ask a supplementary question. I also asked the Attorney whether he could indicate when the inquiry would be completed and when the results would be announced.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I am not able to give an indication, but I will consult with my investigating officers and bring back a reply.

PROGRAMME PERFORMANCE BUDGETING

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Attorney-General a question about programme performance budgeting.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Council is indebted to the Premier for tabling in this Chamber a document dealing with the introduction in South Australia of programme performance budgeting. It is not necessary to refer to all the document, but I will quote the beginning paragraphs in the foreword, as follows:

> The Government has stated on many occasions its commitment to improving budgeting approaches and financial management throughout the State Public Service. A key element in achieving this objective is the introduction of programme performance budgeting. The aim of this book is to explain to a wide audience, in straight-forward terms, the purposes of programme performance budgeting and the direction that the development effort is taking. In essence, programme performance budgeting will increase accountability to the public, by specifying not only the areas of public expenditure but also the purposes, the achievements sought and the results of that expenditure.

My questions to the Attorney are as follows: Does the Government intend presenting the 1981-82 Budget to Parliament in programme form? Does the Government intend any changes to the Parliamentary procedures and structures to give a better ability to Parliament—to both Houses—to scrutinise the Budget and Supplementary Estimates in programme form? Can the Attorney inform me of the procedures adopted to allow measurement of performance in any programme, particularly in programmes such as welfare, health, education and the service departments? Finally, has the Government adopted any procedures for the assessment of performance and personal efficiency in the Public Service, as this is an essential part of programme budgeting?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: As those questions are essentially questions for the Treasurer, I will refer them to him and bring back a reply. So far as programme performance budgeting information is concerned in relation to the next Budget, I understand that material in that form will be available to honourable members but, for a more expansive reply, I will refer the question to the Premier and bring back the reply.

LIBRARY SERVICES

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about library services for the disabled.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: On Tuesday 14 July this year, I attended an open house that was organised by the South Australian Advisory Committee on Library Services for the Handicapped at the public library division at Norwood. The Attorney-General was also present at that function. The advisory committee is concerned to draw attention to the problems that disabled people have with library services and has, I believe, put certain proposals to the Government for action in that area, particularly in this International Year of the Disabled Person. The committee points out that many of South Australia's disabled cannot make use of library services in this State, because they are not catered for. Access is often hindered by stairs, heavy narrow doors, lack of space between shelving rows, lack of special toilet facilities and difficult shelving heights. Print resources generally serve only the adept reader. A special book collection of high-interest and low vocabulary with the accent on pictures could serve the poor reader.

The audio tape collections could offer far more in quantity, quality and range of interest. Freer regulations are needed for the borrowing of hear-a-book tape material, which is limited to the medically unfit. At present, very few libraries have tape recorders on loan as part of their service, and, if they do, it generally relates only to the blind, whereas print handicap can extend into areas of mental retardation, the aged, poor readers and those with no ability to handle books, such as the arthritic or spastic sufferer. Many of the difficulties, such as reading catalogues, locating books and using special areas, could be overcome by staff training and attitude. Awareness of the needs of some people and the willingness to give one-to-one customer service could open up the present collections to many a disabled user.

Will the Attorney, as the Minister responsible in the International Year of the Disabled Person, say whether the Government has taken any action to ensure that the disabled have greater access to library services, as advocated by the South Australian Advisory Committee on Library Services for the Handicapped and, if so, what action has been taken?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Libraries specifically are not within my area of responsibility: the question of access attitude in respect of the International Year of the Disabled Person is my responsibility. I will make inquiries and bring back a reply.

HANDICAPPED PERSONS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I direct a question to the Attorney-General, as the Minister responsible for the International Year of the Disabled Person, about the handicapped persons training scheme. Why was an allocation of $43 000 for a handicapped persons training scheme to provide vocational training for disabled persons not spent in the financial year 1980-81? Was this because of the Government's financial difficulties in the financial year just ended? Was the handicapped persons training scheme mere tokenism proposed by the Government in view of the 1981 International Year of the Disabled Person? Will the scheme be implemented at some future time?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: There is no mere tokenism in the Government's efforts in this International Year of the Disabled Person. A number of Government departments and authorities, as part of their programme of activity this year, have included activity that involves those who are disabled in some way or another. The specific programme to which the honourable member refers is but one of many that involves Government departments. For that reason, I will make inquiries and bring back a reply.

PARLIAMENTARY HANDBOOK

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking you, Mr President, a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The day before yesterday I was at the Clare High School for some time, talking to the students about politics and procedures of the House, correcting an illusion that had been given to them by a member of the Liberal Party who visited the school in that district just a few weeks ago. An astute student drew my attention to page 13 of the booklet entitled *The Parliament of South Australia,* over which you, Mr President, and the Speaker of the House of Assembly, would have some jurisdiction and in relation to which you would perhaps exercise some care. This booklet is a history of the State Parliament. I notice that I stood in the guard of honour in front of this place in April 1939, but that is not relevant. At page 13, this booklet states:

> Black Rod is an ancient office with great traditions associated primarily with the Sovereign and subsequently with the Imperial Parliament. Black Rod is a central figure in ceremonial at the Opening of Parliament each session; in South Australia where his duties are combined with those at the table, he wears evening dress, wig and gown and carries the traditional black rod surmounted with the Crown Royal Arms and State Emblem. By direction of the President, Black Rod maintains order and decorum within the Chamber and its precincts. The rod or staff is the symbol of his authority.

My question is obvious. The phraseology of that particular paragraph should meet the requirements of present-day thinking in relation to discrimination, and I ask you, Sir, to bring that about. I thought that this booklet might have been printed well before the present holder of that high office accepted her duties, but I noticed that it was reprinted in 1980.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the honourable member for drawing this matter to my attention and to the attention of the Chamber. We will certainly see that the reprint is corrected.

HANDICAPPED PERSONS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I direct a further question to the Attorney-General. Did the Attorney, as the Minister responsible for the International Year of the Disabled Person, make representation to the Premier about the failure of the Government to spend the $43 000 allocated for the handicapped persons training scheme?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The honourable member seems to think that I have responsibility for the handicapped persons training scheme. I do not have the responsibility, and therefore, as I have indicated, I will obtain information for the honourable member and bring back a reply.

MOCATTA PLACE YOUTH HOSTEL

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Has the Minister of Community Welfare a reply to the question I asked on 22 July about the Mocatta Place Youth Hostel?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: In January this year, the department was informed of irregularities in the conduct of Nidlandi Hostel. This facility, located in the city, had for the past several years provided accommodation for homeless boys. It was administered by an independent community organisation. Immediate action was initiated by officers of the department to verify the allegations. It was found that the allegations contained some substance of truth and the Nidlandi Management Committee took immediate action to close the hostel and wind up its affairs effective from 31 March 1981. This was considsered to be appropriate action at the time.

Because of the need for youth shelter facilities to be maintained, especially in the city area, the Residential Child Care Advisory Committee, which reports to me on all matters related to residential child care services, notified a number of welfare agencies of Nidlandi's closure and of the availability of the property for the purposes of youth accommodation services. The Offenders Aid and Rehabilitation Services, which operates several community hostels including a youth shelter funded by the department, was considered to have the experience and expertise to provide youth accommodation services at the former Nidlandi location. This service is now operational. Management of the shelter is the responsibility of the association's executive and an advisory committee to the shelter's staff is currently being set up and the Department will be represented on the advisory committee by a senior officer. I have taken the opportunity to show the honourable member who asked the question departmental reports on the matter.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: By way of supplementary question, I understand that there will be training programmes for people undertaking such care. Will the Minister say when these training programmes are likely to begin and whether he would consider including staff members at such hostels within a training programme as well as management committees? Will he say whether there is any other action that he considers would be possible for his department to take to ensure the highest standards of care in organisations like this which provide voluntary assistance?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Training programmes would obviously be concerned with the shelter staff as well as or perhaps rather than the management committee. In regard to the Offenders Aid and Rehabilitation Service, as I stated in the reply, this organisation has already proved itself able to conduct such shelters. The department does not have any doubts about its ability to do so.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES OFFICERS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Education, a question on staff for equal opportunities officers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Honourable members may recall that 12 months ago there was a considerable furore regarding the appointment of equal opportunity officers in the Education Department and the Further Education Department. At that time when appointments were made the Government promised that adequate staff would be provided for these positions, particularly in view of the fact that in the Education Department the previous position of women's adviser was changed to that of equal opportunities officer and the position would consequently have a greatly increased work load. In a press release dated 27 August 1980, the Minister of Education stated:

> The Government will provide additional assistance if it is proved to be justified.

In a press release of the same day the Premier stated:

> Additional skilled staff would be appointed as necessary to cope with the increased work load.

As I understand it, there has been no increased staff provided for either equal opportunities officer. In fact, the equal opportunities officer in the Further Education Department, I believe, put in a submission several months ago for extra staff which, in May of this year, was rejected. It was for staff on secondment and was not an extra position which could be affected by the freeze in the Public Service. The submission was for a professional assistant on secondment for two years. A few weeks ago she was informed that she could have a half professional officer for one year only. There has been a recent review of the position in the Further Education Department and it has been made abundantly clear that her work is severely hampered by the lack of professional help. She urgently needs a full-time professional assistant to oversee projects as they are initiated and to ensure continuity of her work when she is absent from the department.

In addition, five or six projects of immediate priority which have been planned depend on research, curriculum and training personnel. These personnel are not available from within the department. The other .5 appointment from the curriculum development area has not been filled. I further understand that there are rumours that in the Education Department the equal opportunities officer apparently has a staff of four, with three of the officers being seconded teachers and the other a professional assistant. It has been suggested that this staff is to be cut by one, that is, by 25 per cent, rather than increased.

In view of the promises made less than 12 months ago by the Premier and the Minister of Education that the additional skilled staff would be appointed to cope with the increased work load, will the Government ensure that the additional staff as required by these equal opportunities officers to carry out their work are in fact provided as promised and that cuts to such staff will not be contemplated but that the staff will be increased as promised when the positions were created initially?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will obtain the comments and explanations of the Minister of Education on those matters and bring down a reply for the honourable member.

PROGRAMME PERFORMANCE BUDGETING

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Will the Attorney-General say whether, in introducing the Budget this year in programme form, modified programme form or with programme information, it is the Government's intention to continue introducing yearly budgets, or has the Government any intention to increase it to five-yearly budgets?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the question to the Treasurer and bring back a reply.

HANDICAPPED PERSONS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: As Minister responsible in connection with the International Year of the Disabled Person, does the Attorney-General support the vocational training scheme for the physically disabled and does he believe that that scheme should have commenced in the previous financial year and indeed should commence now? Is the Attorney-General concerned that that scheme did not commence in the 1980-81 financial year, despite the fact that $43 000 was allocated towards it? If that is the case, what action does the Attorney-General intend to take?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: There are a number of vocational training schemes for disabled persons run by both the Commonwealth and the State. So far as the specific question is concerned, I reiterate what I said before; that is, that I will obtain details of the specific instance to which the Leader refers, and I will bring down a reply.

DEREGISTRATION OF DOCTORS

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a question on deregistration of doctors.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: From time to time (it appears to be with increasing frequency) we read in the newspapers of doctors being convicted of offences against the Commonwealth and the Health Act for misrepresentation and, in effect, theft. I will not ask for the Minister's opinion on this matter. I am sure that the Minister would deplore it, as I would.

Another problem arises out of this, namely, that once a doctor is convicted in a court for offences under the various Acts that are supposed to keep his fingers out of the till, there is quite often a large time gap before that doctor is brought before a State deregistration board and, if the board sees fit, is deregistered. The problem is therefore obvious. In that interim period the doctor who has been convicted is free to treat, over-treat, and make as much money as the doctor can until dealt with by the board.

The Federal Department of Health has expressed some concern about this matter and I wondered what our Minister of Health thought of the problem, if she had thought anything of it at all. My questions are: is the Minister of Health aware of the Federal Health Department's concern about the time that elapses between a court conviction of a doctor and the time the doctor appears before State Medical Boards and is dealt with under deregistration procedures? Secondly, what is the period of delay between a doctor's being convicted by a court and that doctor's appearing before the appropriate deregistration board of this State? Thirdly, is the Minister satisfied with the period of delay and, if not, has she taken any steps to reduce it to an absolute minimum?

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

VINDANA WINERY

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a short explanation before directing a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs on the matter of Vindana Winery.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: During the last session of Parliament we passed an amendment to the Prices Act that provided that a winery was not able to take grapes if it had not paid for previous vintages, and, of course, this applied to Vindana Winery, which at that stage was, and still is, in a state of bankruptcy. Earlier this year I asked the Minister whether he would investigate complaints that had been made to me that grapes were being delivered to Vindana Winery despite the new legislation and the fact that the Minister had not given an exemption, which he is entitled to do under the Act. I think that question was asked in February, during the first part of the session this year.

Since then, I have had information from people in the Riverland that grapes have been delivered to Vindana Winery, and one grower has estimated that as much as 300 tonnes might be delivered to that operation. My questions to the Minister are: first, did he instruct his department to investigate the complaints I made earlier this year and, if he did ask for that investigation, what were the results of the investigation of Vindana on the allegation that grapes were being taken despite the legislation? Thirdly, if he did not take steps at that time, would he launch an immediate investigation to see whether grapes had been taken by Vindana Winery and would he also take the appropriate action if those allegations proved to be correct?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The answer to the first question is 'Yes'. The answer to the second question is that the inquiry is not yet complete, and the answer to the third question is 'Not applicable.'

HANDICAPPED PERSONS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Attorney-General on the matter of training schemes for the physically disabled.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Attorney-General, as Minister responsible for the International Year of the Disabled Person, has shown a distinct reluctance to answer questions that I have put to him in this Council about the Government's obvious inaction in the matter of the establishment of a vocational or employment training scheme for the physically disabled that has been proposed by the Public Service Board.

I put to the Attorney that some $43 000 allocated last financial year for the scheme was not spent. I put to him whether he supported the scheme, and on all these quite specific questions he said that it was not his responsibility, despite the fact that he is the Minister responsible for the International Year of the Disabled Person. Indeed, I think it is true that the Attorney gave the Council the impression that he knew nothing about this scheme, and I interjected, saying that the Attorney was being deliberately evasive. I have before me what appears to be a memo signed by the Attorney to the Premier in the following terms:

Last month Ms Mary Beasley, Ms Jan Lowe and Mr Jeff Heath called to see me about the Vocational Training Scheme for the Physically Disabled which is on this year's Budget for the Public Service Board. A copy of the proposal is attached.

The delegation called to see me because it was concerned about the follow-up over a full period of 12 months. They wanted to have an intake of the equivalent of 8 full-time trainees for 12 months then another 4 equivalent full-time trainees in mid-year for 12 months to flow into 1982. They put to me the need to ensure some flow over beyond the International Year of the Disabled Person to identify that the training scheme was not perceived to be mere tokenism.

Apparently there is some concern about the funding, although in the 1981-82 Budget Estimates the Public Service Board is making provision for the continuation of the scheme into 1982.

I think the scheme is a good one. There is no reason why the Board should not commence the project now, because there are sufficient funds available for the current year. It could probably safely presume that it will have sufficient funds in the 1981-82 Budget to continue through to the end of 1981 and in the Budget Review process the request for extra funds to enable the project to coninue into the first half of 1982 can be reviewed sympathetically without further commitments being given at this stage.

If you agree with this course of action, I would appreciate it if you could let me know, and also inform the Board of that proposal.

It is quite clear that the Attorney has been apprised of the situation on the question that we are concerned with, had full knowledge of the matters, and was fully briefed on the proposal of the Public Service Board, but just declined to provide the Council with answers to the questions. The fact is that the Government has been quite incompetent in this area.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I rise on a point of order. This is quite out of order. The honourable member is making an explanation prior to asking a question and under Standing Order 109 this is a matter of opinion.

The PRESIDENT: Yes, I uphold that point of order.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I can understand the Attorney's agitation about the matter, because he has simply been caught out and has been less than frank with the Council when questions have been directed to him about a specific matter. I consider that it is quite obvious to the Council that he knew about the scheme, knew the details of it, just as he should, as the Minister responsible for the International Year of the Disabled Person, and failed to provide the Council with answers to the questions. In view of the minute that the Attorney sent to the Premier about this matter, will he now answer the question I put to him earlier in Question Time?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will not answer in any more detail the questions that the Leader put.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Why do you say—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Mr President, I rise on a point of order. My point of order is not necessarily under any specific rule. Underlying most of the rules of this Council is the act of provocation. I think that the Attorney-General was being more than unduly provocative when he said that he would not answer—just like a defiant child. He is a very small-minded person.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Attorney-General.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I have consistently indicated that this specific programme is not within my area of responsibility. I indicated to the Leader of the Opposition that I will have some inquiries made and that I will bring him back a detailed response. The first time he mentioned the department was in the explanatory statement to the question he just asked, when for the first time he referred to the Public Service Board. Honourable members will know that it is the Premier who is responsible for the Public Service Board and not me. Therefore, it is appropriate for the Premier to be given an opportunity to consider the matters that have been raised by the Leader of the Opposition.

The Leader of the Opposition said that $43 000 has not been spent. I do not have any information as to whether it has or has not been spent. I prefer to check my facts before I rely on what the Leader of the Opposition has said. The Leader of the Opposition purported to quote from a minute from me to the Premier. I guess that is typical of what we

have seen from the Opposition in the last week in that it has constantly alleged that it has access to minutes passing between Ministers and passing between public servants. Obviously, the Opposition could not have come by them legitimately, and therefore one can only presume that they are prepared to rely on those who are prepared to breach the Public Service Act and commit offences by delivering into hands, other than those for which the minutes and documents are intended, material which certainly belongs to the Government. I think the Opposition's behaviour is quite despicable and it should think very carefully before resorting to this low level in the future.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I desire to make a very brief statement before asking the Attorney-General a supplementary question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: A few months ago a film was shown in aid of the International Year of the Disabled Person and I understand that it made a profit. I am also given to understand that the profit from that film is being paid into the Law Department of this State and hence into Consolidated Revenue. I also understand that a conference is soon to be held as part of the International Year of the Disabled Person on the law and persons with handicaps. Once again, any profit made from this conference will be paid to the Law Department, and hence into Consolidated Revenue.

It is well known that this revenue will have been raised in such a way and particularly in the name of many handicapped persons. Therefore, it would seem to many people that it is totally inappropriate that these profits should end up in Consolidated Revenue and not be used for a specific programme for disabled persons. Can the Minister confirm whether these profits are being paid to the Law Department, and so into Consolidated Revenue, rather than being used for the benefit of handicapped people?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I do not believe that that is correct. Incidentally, the department concerned is the Attorney-General's Department, and within that department is the International Year of the Disabled Person Secretariat. The honourable member should recognise that, out of Government funds in the last year, provision was made for expenditure of, I think, $150 000. Up to the present time grants from State funds totalling, I think, in excess of $50 000 have been made for projects for the International Year of the Disabled Person direct from the International Year of the Disabled Person Secretariat; that means out of revenue allocated to the Attorney-General's Department.

Further, another $50 000 has been received from the Commonwealth and that, too, has been allocated through the Attorney-General's Department upon the advice of the Advisory Council for the International Year of the Disabled Person. Further funds will be made available in the current year. I am certainly not aware that any profit is paid into the Attorney-General's Department. I believe it to be erroneous if the honourable member believes herself that that is so. So far as the seminar on the law and persons with handicaps is concerned, I cannot believe that there will be any profit from it, because it is essentially being convened to enable all people in the community to contribute in the consideration of the second report, and for that reason it is not a profit-making venture.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 4 August. Page 217.)

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: Along with my Parliamentary colleagues, I congratulate His Excellency on his handling of yet another successful opening of Parliament ceremony. Not everyone agrees with the retention of the ceremonial, with a certain amount of pomp, but we must be careful that we have something else of value to replace it. Soon after Mr Clement Attlee had led his Labor Party to office in Britain, some of his colleagues suggested that some or all of the ancient and historic pomp and ceremony surrounding the Westminster Parliaments should be abolished. Mr Attlee's simple reply was, 'For God's sake don't make politics dull.'

I notice that the Government has announced that it has a programme promoting the prevention of ill-health, preventive medicine, and so on. I wonder what it means by that? I wonder whether it means the promotion of natural healing, because up to now any health programme has always been monopolised by traditional medicine. In fact, the South Australian Health Commission is controlled by traditional medical practitioners, while the ill-health of the nation increases. I would like to know what encouragement will be given to chiropractors now that they are registered. How will they be consulted? Where do chiropractors and osteopaths come into the health plans of preventive health care? Where do naturopaths come into the picture as well? Will chiropractors, now that they are registered, be included as practitioners in the Friendly Societies Act and the Workers Compensation Act?

When will the Government have the knowledge, the courage, and the interests of the people in mind to break this terrible medical/drug company/chemist/university medical school monopoly? What is the new legislation foreshadowed in the Governor's Speech regarding food standards, labelling and hygiene? Does this herald another attack on the natural healing practitioners in favour of medical practitioners and the drug companies? Does it mean that shops selling natural foods will be interfered with and controlled by the medical profession when the general public would very much prefer that they were not? I have heard that it may even be necessary for people to get a prescription from a medical practitioner in order to obtain health food. Have honourable members ever heard anything so ridiculous?

The Hon. R. J. Ritson: That has never been suggested.

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: An old Chinese proverb says that a man does not scratch where he does not itch! I suggest to the Hon. Dr Ritson that he take it easy. I fear that with this Government in office we are likely to see yet another injustice to the minority in the healing arts as we have seen, regrettably, over the centuries.

I wish to refer to the problems of the Murray/Darling/Murrumbidgee river complex and its tributaries. The sad fact is that, in spite of all that has been said and done over the past 100 years, the political situation remains the same as it was in 1881. Meanwhile, the commercial, environmental, navigational and health situation has become immeasurably worse. Looking back, it is easy to see that this is a case of federalism gone mad. The problem has not yet been solved because there has never been an appropriate authority appointed, with the unanimous intention of solving it and with the power to do so. That can only be deliberate. The States involved have, between them, managed to avoid the only solution, to the detriment of us all.

Our founding fathers missed the opportunity to do that in 1901, at Federation, which was most unfortunate, as it has turned out.

The River Murray Waters Agreement of 1914 was signed by the Commonwealth, South Australia, New South Wales and Victoria; it was a major step forward and looked very

hopeful. But it was due for review, and negotiations started in 1973. Now, eight years later, agreement has not been reached. How can that ever be a workable agreement? One of the difficulties is that section 100 of the Commonwealth Constitution makes it clear that the Commonwealth Government shall not abridge or lessen the rights of the riparian States in relation to conservation and irrigation. Section 100 provides:

> The Commonwealth shall not, by any law or regulation of trade or commerce, abridge the right of a State or of the residents therein to the reasonable use of the waters of rivers for conservation or irrigation.

I point out to honourable members that the word 'conservation' was used in that section of the Constitution developed in 1900, and that is remarkable indeed, although it has taken us a long time to do anything about it. However, section 98 gives the Commonwealth power over navigation on inter-State rivers, so it is all very complicated and complex.

The River Murray Commission has proved inadequate, entirely due to the fact that its functions and powers were deliberately and strictly limited. The voluntary bodies, such as the River Murray League and the Sunraysia and Riverland Committee on Salinity (known as SARCOS), have been relatively ineffective, despite doing their best. The Save the River Murray Council could be the same, although it has worked hard and while $400 000 000 schemes such as proposed by the South Australian Government are wonderful in theory, one still must have the proper authority to co-ordinate them and set down priorities. Mr Ralph Jacobi, M.H.R., has introduced a Bill to create a Fresh Water Research Institute, which is a good idea. But who will tell the institute what research to carry out and who will finance it?

We can gain much help from North American experience. Indeed, we can gain a great feal of guidance from the tremendous success of the Snowy Mountains Authority which, incidentally, still exists, although contracting overseas. We have many examples: the Delaware River Basin Commission, the Susquehanna Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority (magnificent, but with some criticism, of course, because it goes through six or eight States), to name but three authorities in the U.S. which have produced the answers—or more answers than we have produced. My plea is that the States involved—N.S.W., Victoria, South Australia, and possibly Queensland, with the Commonwealth—have the courage to appoint an authority capable of administering the whole Murray/Darling/Murrumbidgee river system, with the powers necessary to do it and let them get on with it. States' rights would then cease to be an obstruction.

My choice would be to revive the Snowy Mountains Authority. I am quite sure that Australians would back it and be proud of it, just as they were when the mighty Snowy River scheme was under construction. In other words, let us do it again.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: In regard to water, are you also interested in underground water so far as the Commonwealth is concerned?

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: I will do everthing possible to answer that question immediately: my next topic is headed 'Underground waters, artesian basin and aquifers'. I will deal briefly with these points and I hope this will satisfy everyone. In Australia we have a huge underground sea or lake, in Central Australia, which many hydrologists believe to be as big as the Mediterranean Sea. We talk glibly about the Great Artesian Basin, but nobody has really studied it in depth or detail.

The Hon. R. J. Ritson: Who controls navigation on it?

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: I hope that interjection is recorded. I understand that some work has been done and that a lot of work has been done on computers in Canberra and that more information will be soon available. The important thing is that here we have a fresh water sea about the same size as the Mediterranean Sea, but with a lid on, so that the water is not evaporating. This is the most likely area for expansion in Australia if we can get water.

We know that almost the whole of the centre is taken up with mining exploration leases and that, if workable deposits are found, there will be towns like Mount Isa, for example, but we cannot have towns without water, and we cannot take any more water from the Murray. We cannot take water in vast quantities from underground supplies unless we know what we are doing, unless we know, for example, the rate and the source of replenishment. The great shortage of underground water in southern United States should be a lesson to us, because they are worried about it and, two towns may have to be moved because the water table is running out altogether. Indeed, our own experience in South Australia at Virginia should teach us a lesson. The Great Artesian Basin lies under parts of Queensland, New South Wales, the Northern Territory, South Australia and Western Australia. That means that, if we all take as much as we want, we will end up with a situation similar to the Murray River situation. Therefore, we should act now.

The essential difference between this situation and the Murray River situation is that the Commonwealth Constitution is silent on underground water, and therefore it is reasonably certain that the Commonwealth Government would have greater power in that case to control and regulate. New South Wales is already using a considerable amount of underground water to irrigate cotton crops, so there is no time to lose. Sir Barton Pope, who is something of an expert in these matters (and has been for many years) has already approached the Prime Minister, Mr Anthony and other Ministers, both State and Federal, about this matter, and very intelligently too. I know what he has said. He told me that he has received a very positive response, and I only hope that he is right and that those who have responded mean what they say.

I believe that the Commonwealth Government should act as soon as possible by taking the initiative to gain the co-operation of the State Governments to legislate for the control, regulation and preservation of the nation's underground water supply, not only in the Red Centre (or the dead centre) but also in the South-East. This is really a national matter and the people and politicians of Australia should regard it from a national outlook. Surely that is not too much to ask, and I ask it of them now.

I refer now to unemployment, or employment and more jobs. The issue of unemployment does not appear to be exercising the minds of the people of Australia and their elected representatives to the same extent as it did a few years ago (perhaps only one or two years ago, for that matter). Yet unemployment, and youth unemployment in particular, is still a very grave problem. It has gradually grown worse. I believe that many people are frightened to discuss unemployment either because they cannot see a solution to it or because they are afraid that a solution will involve the more fortunate in some kind of sacrifice that, frankly, they are not prepared to make. What would happen if we found minerals, oil and gas in the dead centre and if there was plenty of water? Development would be enormous and could create tens of thousands of jobs—very good jobs at that.

Anyone who has been in the outback desert country (and I have been through much of it) would know what a transformation takes place where there is water. Homesteads in those areas, which may be surrounded by a 30-

mile radius of desert, very often have productive fruit and vegetable gardens if there is plenty of water. Properly planned and with some really positive thinking, thousands of square kilometres of land could gradually be converted from desert to civilised country. What a wonderful future Australia would have then! If Israel can do it, we can do it.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: What about the salinity problem?

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: I do not know about that, but I should not think that the situation there could be any worse than our situation will be if we take more water from the Murray River to feed those towns.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: That wasn't really the point.

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: What I have suggested could be considered as an alternative by those who regard unemployment as inevitable and who try to sweep the whole problem under the carpet. Such an attitude is very short-sighted and selfish and will eventually lead to the unrest that is now being experienced in Britain. I am certain about that—and so it should.

I refer now to the mining boom, about which we hear so much and which is espoused by the Premier and others as something that will do everyone so much good. The Australian Democrats have been saying, and continue to say, that we need a mineral boom like we need a hole in the head. In addressing the 1981 Agricultural Outlook Conference (and I direct most of these remarks to agriculture only), the Director of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Mr Geoff Miller, referred to the real effective exchange rate and its effects on agriculture—that is, the exchange rate calculated after taking account of changes in other currencies and in inflation rates, or the net changes between exchange rates of two or more countries trading with each other, not only the change in our own exchange rate. Mr Miller suggested that a 2 per cent a year growth in the real effective exchange rate induced by a mining boom (and that is what mining booms induce) would reduce the real value of rural production by about $180 000 000 a year, and that is in rural production alone.

The Hon. R. J. Ritson: It would improve the real value of the remaining rural income: it would apply more.

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: It does not, actually. He continued to say that, if these developments occurred, there would be no way in which the Australian economy could do anything other than trying to accommodate them. The issue is how to accommodate them. Mr Miller further suggested that a 5 per cent reduction in tariffs would offset only about one-third of the effect of a 2 per cent real effective appreciation in the Australian dollar, so tariffs would have to be reduced by about 15 per cent to cope with that 2 per cent increase. He stated:

> Even if tariffs were reduced, the rural sector would still have to improve its performance substantially if it were to neutralise the effects of the rise in exchange rates.

That was in January this year. We now know that the capital inflow which was predicted in the last Federal Budget as about $1.5 billion and likely to produce an appreciation of the dollar of a little over 1 per cent has in fact escalated to an inflow of $5 billion to $6 billion and created a real effective exchange rate appreciation of 4 per cent to 5 per cent. This situation is estimated to be costing rural industries in Australia at least $400 000 000 a year.

What on earth is the sense in that? It is uncontrolled greed by one relatively small but powerful and wealthy section of the community without any care for other sections. Cereal growers are suffering an effective loss of $13 per tonne, while wool growers have lost 40c per kilo of clean wool. So much for the mining boom in the eyes of the farmers! No wonder the National Farmers Federation and its South Australian counterpart, the United Farmers and Stockowners Association, are concerned and are angry at the Federal and State Governments because of their headlong rush to mine everything in sight. Our Governments are thinking in 1881 terms, not in 1981 terms. One hundred years of experience has done very little or nothing for them or for us. They should be thinking of the year 2030, or of a time further in the future than that.

The so-called mining boom, as the Australian Democrats have been pointing out since it was first mooted and held out as the solution to the ills of the Australian economic situation, must be thoroughly considered and very carefully instituted, if at all, especially if the State Government is to spend funds in providing an expensive infrastructure at discount prices as a carrot for the mining companies. Let me make clear that the Australian Democrats are not against all mining *per se*.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: One could be forgiven for thinking that.

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: However, we are against mining development that has harmful effects on the Australian society in the economic manner referred to earlier or, as in the case of uranium mining, where there is a direct danger to survival, with the certainty that uranium will be used for the production of nuclear weapons. It is being used for that purpose right now, and all honourable members know it.

In regard to the earlier interjection, we are saying that we are not against mining itself but against the speed with which minerals are being taken out of the ground and which cannot be replaced. We are asking who owns them. Are people rectifying the economic situation for themselves or the future? That is the difference between you and us. Let us make that clear.

The Hon. R. J. Ritson: Is that Party policy or is it your opinion? Does your Party have a policy?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Milne does not need to answer all the interjections.

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: It is written down, if members want to look at it. It is helpful to have that sort of interjection on record. We believe that mining of other resources should not be supported by large infrastructure gifts to the organisations concerned. Any such facilities provided by the Government should be charged at a rate calculated to recoup the cost in the expected lifetime of the facility or the mine. In other words, we want to know who is going to share in the profits—big wealthy investors, the people of today (you and me) or our children and grandchildren. Which do you want? We want it to be for people in the future—I hope you do not want it for yourselves. We believe that there has to be a better mix than in the past—there just has to be.

Having dealt with the question of unemployment and the dangers of the mining industry if allowed to proceed in its own way, I now come to the function of trade unions. In these comments, I will possibly be considered critical, but I hope I am positive. One must remember that for some years I was auditor and financial adviser to four trade unions, so I claim to understand them and what they are aiming at. I strongly support their basic objective and always have done. Paul Johnson, writing in the *New Statesman* (that is the socialist English newspaper), stated in an article headed 'A brotherhood of national misery':

> People often assume that trade unionism and socialism are roughly the same thing and that the trade unionist is a socialist and vice versa and that trade union and socialist activities are designed to secure the same objects. I would like to show that these assumptions have always been dubious and are now demonstrably and flagrantly false.

Paul Johnson was the editor of the *New Statesman* for many years and is an ardent and sincere socialist—a democratic socialist I suspect.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: He is a lapsed socialist.

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: Is he? When we mention socialism, people conjure up awful visions of communism, so I would go further and say that trade unionism, socialism and communism are not meant to be the same thing. Yet, I believe it was the communist movement attempting to merge with and indeed take over the trade union movement soon after the Russian revolution in 1917-18 that confused the plans (if there ever were any) of the early idealist trade unionists. The trade unions seem to have taken on the role of representing one class of people in the community against all the rest of the community. Yet, true socialism is something not for any particular group of people and is not meant to be a programme for the so-called working class. That attitude causes a division in any community and has done so in Australia. Socialists do not believe in classes and they are against sectional interests, particularly sectional interests which become powerful enough to exploit the rest of the community. The true socialist or social democrat, or anyone who really believes in democracy in its full sense, must be prepared, as Paul Johnson said:

> ... to work through a Government responsible to a universally elected assembly. That is where all the essential decisions which affect the life of the community must be taken and nowhere else.

While the trade unions in Australia and elsewhere have a tremendous influence on the Labor Party, the unions as such have very little interest in political morality or Parliament. They grew up within the capitalist system and were designed to enable their members to protect themselves from the tremendous exploitation that they found intolerable. So would we. The peasants began by rioting, burning, looting and even killing, and later designed the strike weapon. Yet, the strike weapon when used has brought only temporary relief to those engaged in it, and frequently a great deal of hardship. If one looks carefully, one will find that the division in the community is much the same as it was when the British Labour Party was founded in 1900 and even before that. Not only that, but these people have unfortunately failed to solve the problems of those whose cause they claim to espouse and who are now again resorting to rioting, looting, burning and killing. Do not any of us, in this country, or in any other, underestimate the strength and power of the prolatariat in the near future.

I was delighted to see the rally by university students in the central hall of Parliament House today. They made a tremendous noise. They were collecting money to help sufferers of multiple sclerosis. One would have thought that it was a revolution. Nobody knew what to do but somebody said, 'I will keep this door shut.' We might look at how they got there in the first place. I conducted it for a while and gave them some money; I hope we all did.

The trade union movement in Australia and its political wing have not been able to redistribute wealth more evenly among the community. Indeed, the manner of their intervention has been to bring about almost the reverse situation, certainly in Australia. One can go up and down the east coast, and see the Rolls Royces. How many millionaires have we now compared to the number we had before? Do not tell me that the community is getting together, although it was once. Australia once had the best distribution of wealth in the world, but that would not be so now. The unions have not solved the problem that they have always been trying to fight. Yet they now find themselves very powerful, having smashed or embarrassed Governments (for example, in Britain), embarrassed industry, and the forces of law and order; they are rather bewildered at their success.

However, the trade union movement has continued to bargain for more money, as if it could not think of any other role to play. The greater the success against the wealthy and the employers, the more the unions seem to be casting around to keep the old system of hatred and bitterness alive. I believe that it is time they found a different policy. Bob Hawke made a statement something along those lines before he left his job as President of the A.C.T.U.

Unions need something in which they can take a different sort of pride. They have nearly won the former battle and they need a new policy that their own members can enjoy and take part in without all this bitterness and threats of reprisals. What would it be like to be a member of the Painters and Dockers Union in Victoria? What sort of life would the average member of that union (those who are still alive) and his wife be leading? Paul Johnson goes on:

> British trade unionism has thus become a formula for national misery. For, mark you, trade unionists have no means of enjoying the spoils they secure.

This is certainly true in Britain, as those who have lived there know, and it appears to me that it is going to be true in Australia before long, if it is not true already. It is a strange side of the trade union movement that has rather taken them by surprise, in that the movement is apparently quite disunited and we now see the strange phenomenon of one union becoming the opponent of other unions. One powerful union will ask for a rise because another powerful union got one. That is the norm in Britain, but it is much more foolish here in Australia, where we have this ridiculous system of 'flow on' that we are about to see yet again when the metal workers get their $25 increase, which, compared with some other awards, they undoubtedly deserve, in my view.

Just because one group has justified an increase in wages, usually the metal workers, it is assumed that everyone else should have a rise, leaving the metal workers in the same position as they were in before. I fail to understand why they cannot see this. Clyde Cameron can see it. His withering attack on the Public Service in the *Bulletin* on 11 November and 2 December 1980 demonstrates that. He can see how foolish the unions are in allowing another set of unions to get away with murder. If members have not read those articles, I commend them to them. They represent some of the most powerful writing that I have read.

Some of the smaller unions that have comparatively little muscle have fared very badly in this rule of the trade union jungle. It is a great disappointment to me that the trade unions and the powerful employer groups have gained so much momentum in their quest for the share of the cake they want. One has to remember (and neither the trade unions nor the employers appear to remember it, or they deliberately overlook it) that there are large sections of society who are not organised and can never be organised. These must suffer while the extremists prosper.

Rapid inflation inflicts great suffering on the very poor, the old, the very young, the sick, the helpless, the physically and mentally handicapped, the unemployed, and other casualties of our materialistic and utterly selfish society. I ask you all to pause and consider where this is leading. You know as well as I do that, if this lemming-like rush is not halted, the system must break down and anarchy must take its place, while communism becomes established as our political alternative. That is what some people want. It is not what I want but that is what we will get, if something, or someone, does not arise to prevent it.

I wish that this Government had not destroyed the Industrial Democracy Committee which was established by the previous Government and on which I had the privilege to serve. I do not think we have ever before experienced anything like that committee, on which the three sides

debated happily and capably together and gave a report that would have been of benefit to the whole of Australia. Admittedly, the tragedy was that the then Premier tried to go too fast. He frightened everyone. I ask this Government again to consider a policy on industrial democracy, worker participation, or whatever else we call it, because there has to be a link between the three sides, namely, the unions, the Public Service and the private sector.

This is a plea to the trade unions to rethink what they are trying to do, and to try to understand the social and economic framework in which they have to operate a little better and a little more deeply. It is a plea to the employers to please try to understand the point of view of the wage and salary earner a little better and a little more deeply. This is a plea to politicians, and senior members of the Public Service who advise them, to lead this nation, in a new, positive campaign, to what a real democracy should be. There is no-one else to do it. I support the motion.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I support the motion. First, I offer sympathy to Lady Playford on the recent death of Sir Thomas Playford, who was a stalwart in this State for many years.

I would like to talk on some aspects of handicapped persons' problems, and generally I will not be referring to those whose problems are well known and whose problems are completely visible. Because of the obviousness of the problem, these people receive a great deal of sympathy and a deserved, even if only superficial, understanding. By 'superficial', I mean the ability to place a coin in a box or receive a sticker as a receipt for a donation made.

There are many handicapped persons organisations, sometimes two or three for the one kind of complaint, such as the blind, who have three organisations chasing those hard-to-get dollars, but, while governments may be niggardly in their support to such bodies, the people generally, provided they can see the complaint (and it has to be obvious and something they understand), will give quite generously.

It is easy for people to see the blind, the crippled, and those with mental afflictions, but no-one 'sees' the diabetic, the epileptic, and the deaf, and no-one sees those children in our schools who have problems, sometimes very serious problems, that really have nothing to do with the state of physical health of their body. Sometimes this is born in the children and medicine and medical technology is not advanced enough as yet to detect these complaints, even though the parent knows there is something wrong. Sometimes the parents do not realise there is anything wrong with their children until it is brought to their attention by teachers. There are times when the parents know there is something wrong and the doctors are aware of the fact that the child is suffering from an unusual, even obscure, complaint, but teachers are unable to accept that it is a medical or mental problem, and fall back on their most common plea (Johnny or Mary is not trying hard enough). Mind you, though, there are times when the medical profession is unable to detect what is wrong.

There are no doubt a number of schools about that have a large proportion of their student population disadvantaged in some way, and one such school is the Munno Para school. Here we have a small area completely isolated, with a train line on the western boundary, the Main North Road on the eastern boundary, the E.T.S.A. high power line on the northern boundary, and on the southern boundary an open space or park-like area separating it from the old town of Smithfield. There are some 600 houses, including about 250 for rental accommodation, but, apart from roads and a small shop (I think it describes itself as a mini mart), there appears to be no other amenity whatsoever available to the residents.

The Housing Trust, which built every house in the area, does not accept responsibility for providing amenities (or even helping to provide them) to its rentpayers. I will read part of the evidence taken by the Public Works Committee regarding the building of a school oval in this area. The General Manager of the South Australian Housing Trust, Paul Bernard Edwards, stated:

> First, I will give a brief history of the trust's involvement in this area. In mid-1970 the trust built 620 houses, about 60 per cent of which were sold and 40 per cent are rental. Traditionally, the trust has regarded its role as being more than simply the provision of shelter. The trust not only provides shelter but stimulates the community in other areas particularly in new areas such as Munno Para. The trust has assisted community development in many ways in the past in different locations.
>
> The trust recognises the need for shopping facilities at Munno Para which could be a community centre for the purpose of acquiring necessary provisions as well as providing a social role. The trust was anxious to ensure that there were appropriate methods of internal movement in the Munno Para subdivision that were attractive and helped knit the community together, so money was invested in the provision of a cycle-way and path-way. We also wanted to avoid the creation of a desolate atmosphere, therefore substantial investment was made to provide trees, and a contribution was also made towards the provision of playground equipment. The trust's total financial commitment in this area, over and above housing costs, is about $350 000.
>
> The trust recognises the very significant contribution the school has played in stimulating the community, helping to knit it together, and in providing a real focus for community activity. Occasional visits to this area by my staff and myself have shown us that the school in its present form provides an essential function in the community. When the concept of an activity hall was introduced the trust was asked whether it could contribute towards its cost, and we gave the matter long and careful consideration. However, finally, we regretfully concluded that it was not possible to make a further investment as a special grant, not because we did not appreciate the value of such a hall, but because of concern about pressure on the trust's available resources. However, the trust strongly supports the erection of an activity hall at this school.

The Air Force occupies nearly 100 houses in this area, but it accepts no responsibility to assist its own employees. The District Council of Munno Para, which permitted the Housing Trust to build in this area, last year received rates of $87 000, but refuses to offer any aid to its ratepayers.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Mr President, I draw your attention to the state of the Council:

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I now turn to some of the evidence given by the Planning Officer for the District Council of Munno Para, Mr Parsons, who stated:

> When the school originally approached the council in relation to funding for a larger than usual activity hall, the council was very enthusiastic for a number of reasons that I will outline in a moment. Unfortunately, the council found itself in a situation where although it wished to encourage the project in every possible way, because of budgetary constraints and other financial priorities, it was unable to help the school with finance.
>
> However, because the council was so enthusiastic about the project it offered the school assistance in the conduct of its negotiations and in other ways. The council has been involved in the Munno Para subdivision for quite some time and is aware of its specific problems. In particular, as Mr Edwards mentioned, the subdivision is an unusual shape in that it is fairly long and narrow, which causes special public transport problems for the residents. As the Committee may be aware, the subdivision is served by only one form of public transport; the train line which runs north-south along the western boundary. The subdivision has only one station situated in the middle of Munno Para.
>
> The council has approached the State Transport Authority on a number of occasions about the inadequacy of public transport in this area. The train is largely an inflexible means of public transport because it runs only in a straight line. From investigations most residents in the subdivision live an excessive distance from the railway station, but unfortunately there is no public transport alternative. During the recent train strike we discovered just how reliant this subdivision is on the train service. The citizens of Munno Para, because most of them are on low incomes or are unemployed, do not have access to private transport in many cases. The public transport system is inadequate, consequently these people have virtually no access to outside recreational facilities. It is very difficult for them to get to the beach, to the movies and to

other things that people in other areas can gain access to quite easily.

The council also believes that this subdivision is deprived of many community facilities. There is a lack of public meeting places where clubs and sporting bodies could meet. That, combined with the immobility of the population, means that there is a definite need for a large activity hall in this area—not only for the school, but for the general community. Therefore, the council vigorously supports the school in its application. We believe it is essential for this community. The Munno Para subdivision is a special case that warrants special consideration by this committee.

I point out that from 1978 to 1981 the council received over $300 000 in rates, but it is not prepared to spend very much money to assist these people. The council spends very little money on fire protection, health services and so on. In fact, the money that it spends in this area is quite minimal when compared to the money that it has extracted in rates.

Mr Parsons also sent a letter, on behalf of the Munno Para council, to the Public Works Standing Committee, which states:

Council's financial system is such that its expenditures are recorded on an overall district basis. Therefore our Financial Controller has had to extract what obvious information he could from our records to give you at least a broad picture of receipts and expenditure for the subdivision over the last three years.

It should be kept in mind that the information is only a general statement and that no attempt has been made to apportion some of council's general expenditures such as administrative costs, engineering supervision, planning, etc. which should rightly be shared by all sections of the district.

That is quite true—it should be shared by all sections of the district. What he does not say is that the Housing Trust supplied all the houses, prepared all the footpaths and the oval and did the roadworks and practically everything else in this area, while the Munno Para council has simply extracted the rates. I do not believe that the council has the right to put people out on a limb by not providing facilities for them. Before the Housing Trust built the subdivision it should have made at least some attempt to supply some other form of public transport, because these people are served by nothing more than a train system.

The Education Department has at least done something. It has established a school known as a 'holding school'. It has been in operation now for two or three years. For those honourable members who do not know what a holding school is, let me tell them. It is a collection of old wooden buildings brought together, and I must say in this case arranged and upgraded in a very pleasant manner. It was the first of four that have been erected in the metropolitan area in the past two or three years. It was announced at its inception that it would commence phasing out after three years use in favour of more solid construction. The Public Works Committee dealt with the first phase (a general use hall for use by both children and community) about 12 months ago. The community, on hearing two or three months ago that the Government had renegued on the hall, called a public meeting and, much to the shame of the Government, not one Government member or one Minister appeared at the meeting.

The Government, acting in a quite cowardly manner, dispatched gladiators in the form of public servants to face the wrath of the people: very embarrassed public servants, who did a good job under the circumstances. I would hope the Government would not again stoop so low as to expect paid employees of the Government to take punishment that rightly should be administered to its Party members. At this school we have a first-class teaching staff and a very enthusiastic parent community more than willing to throw its weight behind the teachers of their children, and I think they are justified in expecting the Government to do its share.

Now that I have brought the Council up to date on the history of the school, I can return to my original intention of discussing the deprived, particularly deprived children at this school. In support of my argument I refer again to the evidence taken by the Public Works Committee. The evidence was taken from Roy Thomas Williams, School Principal, Munno Para Primary School, and the transcript of evidence is as follows:

As school principal my first duty is towards the children of this area. I see nothing in this area to occupy the children apart from the school. My first job was to develop a school playground that could be used virtually 24 hours a day. It is open to parents and their children before school, during school and after school. To date $7 500 has been donated to the school by various organisations, most of them outside the Munno Para area. From surveys we have conducted we have discovered that there is a definite need in this community for an activity hall of the type proposed for children and adults.

Attempts were made to get money from the South Australian Housing Trust, R.A.A.F., the Department of Community Welfare, the Munno Para District Council, the Department of Recreation and Sport, and from service clubs in and around Elizabeth. We also approached the Lutheran Church which is also using the school's facilities. Our efforts were in vain, despite the fact that two or three letters were sent to each organisation, along with follow-up visits, talks with me, and efforts by the Education Department.

We have concentrated our efforts largely towards the Munno Para District Council, and not just in relation to funding assistance for the activity hall. We also asked the council for assistance in developing the school playground, mowing the oval, and the provision of soil for the playground, but every approach has been rejected. We have requested funding from every organisation in and around this area which, if necessary, could be spread over two or three years. We asked the Munno Para council whether it would reconsider the school's position in two or three years time and give us something in writing that it would be able to provide us with money in the future. The school council received correspondence from the council stating that the council would be in no financial position to help out.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. M. B. Dawkins): Order! Honourable members will keep quiet and allow the Hon. Mr Creedon to be heard.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: The transcript of evidence continues:

The school oval was prepared by the council which charged full labour costs and the full cost of hiring machinery. I do not believe the school has received any help from the council whatsoever, and I do not think we will in the future. I now turn to the children of Munno Para diagnosed as having specific problems. Where possible, standardised tests have been used to determine problem areas in maths, spelling, language and reading areas. The medical problems I will refer to relate to those known children who are receiving help or those diagnosed and referred by our school nurse as children with problems. First, I will concentrate on the academic area.

First, I refer to children who are two or more years below average in the following subjects: 32 in written language; 73 in reading; 49 in maths; 62 in spelling; 4 known dyslexic; and 36 with severe emotional and social problems. This evidence will be backed up by nursing sisters. In the preparation of these figures we have used school records, other schools' records, parental help, general teacher observations, and help from the Education Department Guidance Section. There are also 53 children attending this school with excessive and/or constant behaviour problems.

The following children have been referred to the School Guidance Section via P.B. 1 forms, which is a referral form: 13 on behaviour; 9 on general slowness; 9 on speech. In comparison there are 29 children who are above average to exceptional in their ability to do school work. The following children have known medical problems: 13 with vision problems; 35 with hearing problems; 18 with medical problems; 8 with surgical problems; 9 with speech problems; 5 with suspected neglect; and 14 suffering from stress related conditions.

Slightly in excess of 25 per cent of the school's enrolment suffer from known medical problems. I disagree entirely with what Mr Edwards said about the Munno Para area. The children of 23 single supporting families attend this school; 38 unemployed families; and 67 families receive free books, and that number is growing rapidly. That means about 115 children have pure social problems. The school receives new enrolments weekly and nearly all of them receive free books.

In relation to the Munno Para estate itself, there are 99 R.A.A.F. families in residence; they would be classed as transient. There are

132 flats on either side of the school and in a small section at the end of Maltarra Road, which gives the school a very large turnover of children. There are also 262 rental dwellings in Munno Para.

I now turn to the children living in Munno Para as at August 1980. The figures I am about to cite were gathered on a 'door knock' basis. There are 407 children living in this area under five years of age; 47 children attend private schools; 438 children attend this school; and about 96 children attend high school. Therefore, 988 children live in Munno Para, plus children who have already left school whom we know nothing about. There are also 160 families who do not have any children at this stage. Of the children attending the lower primary school, 19 per cent do not or have not attended a kindergarten. Over the next five years there will be a large number of pre-schoolers in this area, but the kindergarten will not be able to cater for the large number of enrolments it will receive. Munno Para has a potential and an existing problem. Personally I do not want to see a repetition of what has happened at Elizabeth. Unless we can provide proper facilities for these children we face tremendous problems in relation to discipline and delinquency.

The Chairman: You mentioned a problem at Elizabeth; could you elaborate?—I live at Elizabeth and I have come to the conclusion that there is a serious problem with the youth of today. They appear to have a sense of meaningless, wandering aimlessly with very little to do. That problem is starting to develop at Munno Para. We should provide children with leisure hour recreational facilities.

Are the disabilities you have referred to significantly high in relation to other areas?—They are alarmingly high. Most other schools would average about 12 per cent, but at Munno Para 25 per cent have known medical problems.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Will the school council continue to pressure the council for financial assistance?—Definitely. The Munno Para Community Action Group is also working to have some of the funds collected in this area returned through the provision of community facilities.

Given that the Housing Trust provided the houses and roads in this area, would it be true to say that the council has expended very little money in relation to the rates that it receives?—I understand that one area of the estate has not been officially handed over to the council. The other was handed over early this year. The first 24 months of rates went to the council, but work in the area was being done by the Housing Trust.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Would it be true to say that the rates received by council from this area have not been used in this area at all?—That is correct.

In questioning Mr Williams, I asked a question relating to how many special teachers are employed at the school and the answer was:

One. Unfortunately, she only has time to deal with the more severe cases.

As the Principal said, his case was supported by teachers and nurses later on, and when it came to the question of a special teacher and it was asked what time the special teacher spent in the school, it was found that she spent six-tenths time a week at the school, so she could deal with only severe problems. She could deal with only a few children: the others had to take pot luck.

I asked a question about this in February, and the answer I received through the Hon. Mr Hill was as follows:

Munno Para does have rather more children with learning difficulties than many schools. The Central Northern Regional Guidance Office is aware of these difficulties and is liaising closely with the school. A small number of children with the greatest level of difficulty have been referred to the Smithfield Plains special class. The region has provided 0.6 time staff above the school entitlement specifically to help with an adaptive education programme within the school. This is in addition to a further 0.5 staff allocation for community liaison and recreation programmes. The total staff allocation for a beginning enrolment of 393 is 20.7 staff including the principal and a 0.8 time librarian. This is rather more generous than most schools receive in the region.

This does not answer the question I raised and the Government is making no attempt to help out in an area that is undoubtedly the Government's responsibility. There is little doubt that the majority of children start their school life reasonably healthy in every respect, and the Munno Para school is no exception, but I am not concerned about the healthy children. It is those who have difficulties such as I mentioned earlier that need special attention, for often, if it is not given in early school years, those are the young people who grow up into most difficult adults.

We live in a world that is most critical of the teenager and justly so in some cases, but I think we should dwell on how many fewer cases there could have been had we given them the correct attention and special help in their early school years. I do not believe that there is any way in which we can justify the withdrawing or the withholding of the special services of qualified people who can cure or arrest the problems that are found in young people in their early years. Surely the evidence given to the Public Works Committee is a condemnation of the attitude of this Government in refusing to employ qualified people to assist in the improvement of the education and the mental health of our community.

I now refer to our community's most prevalent handicap—deafness—which is also the least noticed. Deafness is a hidden handicap. We cannot see deafness and we tend to ignore it. To most of the community, deafness is not even a problem. I believe that 7 per cent of the Australian population over the age of 15 is handicapped to some degree by hearing loss. That represents over 750 000 Australians. However, unless these people are wearing obvious hearing aids and one sees them hand signing, one does not guess that they are deaf or hard of hearing. This is the cruel irony of deafness: unless there is outward physical evidence that a person has loss of hearing, people with normal hearing tend to be completely unaware of the problem.

In the most extreme cases, there is a total withdrawal from all forms of social activity, simply because the person involved can no longer make sense of what is being said by others. The problem is compounded by widespread community ignorance of deafness and a general lack of interest by people in finding out about deafness and the problems that follow it. There are numerous types of hearing loss. Some people cannot hear high sounds and some cannot hear low sounds, but shouting does not help solve either problem and can even cause pain to those who are extra sensitive to loud sounds.

The degrees of deafness are total, profound, severe, moderate and slight. Totally deaf people are in the minority. The majority of deaf people have some residual hearing. The most common defect is in the inner ear, the cochlea, where 30 000-plus nerve ends are housed. Groups of nerve ends respond to different sounds, like the notes of a piano. For some unknown reason, nerves that control the high frequency sounds break down, which means that the person concerned may be hearing low frequency speech sounds, such as the vowel sounds, but missing the high frequency sounds of some consonants that give speech its meaning. There is at present no universal remedy for this type of nerve deafness, although research is constantly being carried out world wide.

I have referred so far to deafness in general, but I really intended to talk about deafness in children, those who are born deaf and those who contract the handicap whilst still very young or have what is often described as pre-lingual deafness. Older people who go deaf always have the power of speech, even though the delivery may tend to flatten as years go by. The deaf cannot hear or use the telephone: they cannot hear an alarm clock, a door bell, or the television. Deaf parents cannot hear their children cry and call out. They live in a very silent world.

One of their greatest frustrations would be wanting to explain to someone, perhaps a doctor, a lawyer, a shop assistant, a bus conductor, or even a Government departmental officer, their needs and their problems and not having sufficient language to communicate easily. They cannot hear the spoken word and, although most of the young attend oral school these days, they can be very hard

to understand and have a very limited knowledge of language. That, in itself, may be sufficient reason for the deaf to be educated both orally and in sign language. Oral speech gives those people who can absorb it some chance of conversing with those who can hear and sign language gives them a greater command of the written language.

I now turn to a pamphlet put out by the Royal Deaf Society on the problems of deafness. This pamphlet should be widely distributed as it is in the interests of the deaf that they should make sure that people are able to come across these things very easily. It specifically deals with education and states:

A deaf person may have lost his hearing through illness or accident, or may be pre-lingually deaf. The pre-lingual deaf are those who are born deaf or lose their hearing in the first two years of life. Children are born deaf for a variety of reasons and they have particular problems. Sound is something abstract and it can't be demonstrated.

While the hearing impaired have speech-reading ability and use normal speech in the main, and the deafened can speak at the level obtained at the time of the onset of their deafness, only 5 per cent of the pre-lingual deaf achieve the goal of speaking and lipreading so that they can communicate freely with others.

When a deaf child at, say, the age of three is introduced to some type of schooling he is also introduced to a written form of this mystery. Having not quite understood what it is all about anyway he also has a written form to learn. From the word 'go' deaf people are struggling to understand what it is that they are supposed to do. Most children born deaf have all they need to be able to speak—in other words, they have their lungs, the larynx, the tongue, etc. in good order. Along comes a teacher and they have to learn to say the sound 0000000 and the teacher demonstrates how they must hold all the pieces which allow us to make a sound. You hold your head this way, you make your lips do this, etc. When you've got all that ready you blow from your lungs and make the sound. When the child does it the teacher claps and says 'good' but the child must remember that he has to remember the things he has to do to make that sound.

When you and I read a book we 'say' what we are reading in our heads but if you've never learned to speak you don't have this silent voice inside your head, so how can deaf people read? They have to recognise the shape of letters and the shape of words. The words they read regularly they can pick up quickly but there are a lot of words to try to remember the shape of individual words. It makes reading a real task. Which is why most profoundly deaf people are poor readers.

Also the main problem of deaf people is to be understood by hearing people because of their lack of vocabulary and their lack of the structure of the English language. They find it so difficult to learn what speaking and what sound is all about and what words are about that they don't get very far. So it is quite common to find a person of 16 in school with a vocabulary of 200-300 words, if that. We have 8 000 to 10 000 words for common use. But they have a very low vocabulary and they don't know many words. They don't know how to string the words together to make good sense. So when they do write, as they must, as it is the only way they can contact the hearing world, they are thrown onto their weakness as what they write looks very strange.

If you can hear you can get an education but if you are deaf you are denied a lot of things because of the isolation. You are cut off from so many things, so many meaningful things in life.

In 1978 the Government commissioned a report on the rights of the handicapped—the Bright Report. It has been available since December 1978 and makes some pertinent points about the deaf. I draw honourable members attention to it and will refer to some conclusions made in the report. In the introduction, it states:

If the general public fails to appreciate the nature and depth of the problems facing persons who are deaf or have hearing impairments, it is understandable that Government policy reflects this failure. A blind person receives means-free allowances, and a person with limited mobility may qualify for parking privileges or sales tax exemptions on motor vehicles. Government response to the needs of the deaf or hearing impaired, until recent years, seems itself to have been deafeningly silent. Yet, it has been argued that pre-lingual deafness affects the development of personality to a greater extent than any other single physical handicap. Western Australia has recognised this problem by providing a special psychiatric service for deaf patients within existing Mental Health Services.

If loss of mobility is the common disability for most persons with handicaps, it is the loss of communication with others that the deaf share. While some can articulate their problems clearly, the deaf have extreme difficulty in doing so. For this reason, policy-makers need to pay special alertness and attention to their problems.

The next section headed 'Statistics' states:

Failure to appreciate the problems of the deaf or hearing impaired is not aided by the lack of official statistics on such persons in Australia.

The most recent relevant survey was in May 1974. The Bureau of Statistics determined in that survey that approximately 3 669 persons, or 28 per cent of the population, suffered from one or more chronic illnesses, injuries or impairments. The survey showed the following statistics for South Australia and Australia:

	Australia	South Australia
Diseases of the ear and mastoid process	208 900	22 100
Deaf mutism and other deafness	190 200	20 600
Other ear and mastoid diseases	18 700	No clear indication
	417 800	

It is doubtful whether these statistics take into account all persons with hearing impairments. The New South Wales Deaf Society, on the basis of comparisons with the United Kingdom and the United States, estimates that there are 650 000 persons in Australia with significant deafness or hearing impairments.

A census or survey concentrating only on the deaf and their problems is yet to be done in Australia. By comparison, the United States National Census of the Deaf Population in 1972, which indicated 13 400 000 deaf and hard of hearing persons in that country, has been the basis of considerable Government action since.

The call for a similar census in Australia has been made for many years. The Australian Association for Better Hearing has, for instance, asked for information to be sought regarding deafness and hearing deficiencies in the 1981 Census of Population and Housing. They see the information as valuable in encouraging research into severe deafness, legislation for noise reduction, increased availability of aids and better educational and medical facilities.

The Australian Bureau of Statistics also indicated last year that it was considering the possibility of undertaking a nation-wide survey of dental health, sight and hearing defects, which, if undertaken, could be of assistance.

Another section of the report deals with deaf interpreters. In 1977 the Government made available a number of these interpreters and they are available for use in places such as the courts. The report states:

Yet it seems that in Australia the training of hearing persons in the deaf language is largely fortuitous—either through the personal experience of a deaf member of the family, or through working with deaf persons in schools or other institutions.

A formal course at tertiary level in the deaf language seems essential. At a recent Standing Committee of Attorneys-General, it was suggested that the course could be post-graduate, so that the social workers, teachers, doctors or lawyers could use the expertise gained in their particular fields.

Again, the committee can simply stress its support for any initiatives to establish such a course. If in the United States there are special universities for the deaf, it seems little by comparison to seek the establishment of a course in their language at one or more of our tertiary institutions.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Has nothing been done about that in Australia?

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: No, not anywhere in Australia. The matter of hearing aids seems to be another problem and it is dealt with at length in the report. I will read only a small section, because it is easy to understand. That section states:

One specific area of complaint made to the committee by persons with hearing impairments is the cost of hearing aids, and the fact that the cost cannot be claimed under any medical benefit scheme. Hearing aids, including batteries, are available to children and eligible pensioners free of charge through the National Acoustic Laboratories in each State. They are not subject to sales tax or import duty.

It is worth noting that in New Zealand all persons requiring hearing aids can obtain them free of charge, or obtain financial assistance if they need or wish to obtain a hearing aid different from that provided. In England hearing aids are available free of charge to pensioners, children and all persons in employment or receiving education. In many other countries, hearing aids are

provided free of charge. The Woodhouse Report on Rehabilitation and Compensation in Australia saw the free supply of hearing aids as a necessary aspect of assistance to persons with handicaps.

The National Acoustic Laboratories fit some 30 000 aids each year—a commendable contribution. However, we consider that the Commonwealth Government should extend the services of the National Acoustic Laboratories to low-income earners. The cost of hearing aids, ear moulds and replacement parts remains considerable for the many hard-of-hearing people in the community. We have been advised that the average retail price of hearing aids is $400-$500.

There are 13 conclusions reached by the committee and one is as follows:

1. The problems of the deaf and hearing impaired need special attention, because their disabilities are hidden.

2. The Bureau of Census and Statistics should undertake a census or survey concentrating only on the deaf and their problems as a matter of urgency.

As I have explained, that has not been done yet. I know that it is a Federal Government matter but we should ask our State Government to take it up with the Commonwealth in the hope that statistics will become available as to the number of deaf in our community. Another conclusion is:

3. Since communication is a fundamental need, a special tertiary level course for deaf interpreters and a wider use of trained interpreters are necessary. The interpreter's oath taken in court proceedings should be amended to allow interpretation in an understandable manner.

I have explained that earlier the report stated that two interpreters had been employed with a Government service and were available for interpretation matters. I take it they are used in the courts. I believe that judges and prosecutors usually expect all questions to be put to the deaf person exactly as they are asked by the lawyers, and often it is difficult to get the question over to a deaf person. It seems to me that more of these interpreters are needed in our court system and in other parts of the Government service.

In regard to motor vehicle drivers' licences, deaf people must have great difficulty in answering the 20 or 30 questions. The questioner cannot understand the answer given, nor can the deaf person understand the question. I have read that it has been proved that the deaf person is a safer driver than the person who can hear, because the deaf person's attention cannot be diverted as can be the case with the person who can hear. On page 7, the report states:

Limited studies in the United States indicate that, as a class, deaf drivers are involved in fewer traffic accidents than their hearing counterparts. The reason for this, it is said, is that deaf drivers, realising that they have a disability, compensate for it (by using their rear-view mirror more often, for instance), are more sensitive to the development of potential accident producing situations and are especially motivated to avoid accidents.

For this reason, Illinois legislation defines as unfairly discriminatory vehicle insurance rates which require higher premiums for physically handicapped persons than for other licensed drivers.

In conclusion, premium loadings on insurance should not exist merely because of an impairment, such as deafness. Just as banks have changed their policies with respect to lending to single women, insurance companies seem to be drawing the distinction between impairment and risk. We do, however, think that legal clarification is desirable.

The conclusions continue:

4. The services of the National Acoustic Laboratories in providing full hearing aids should be extended to low-income earners. The availability of these services should be more widely publicised by the Commonwealth Government. The National Health Act should be amended to allow children to keep hearing aids as a matter of law when they turn 18. The cost, or at least part thereof, of hearing aids should be recoverable under Medibank Private.

I have read different figures of ages in regard to this matter, but the Federal Government has said that, when a young person becomes an adult, it will no longer provide hearing aids. Spectacles and teeth are provided through other insurance, but apparently the provision of hearing aids is not acceptable to Medibank and other health insurances.

I want to refer again to the cost of hearing aids. The report to which I have referred states that the cost was about $400 or $500 three years ago. The latest information on that is an article in *Choice* of about June 1980, which is reported in the *News* of 17 June of that year, as follows:

Deaf Australians are paying too much for their hearing aids. The aids cost up to $850 each, with a minimum quoted price of $285, yet they are imported at an average cost of $79.40. These findings are published in the latest issue of *Choice*, the Australian Consumers Association magazine.

The 25 000 hearing aids sold commercially each year are imported direct by retailers. *Choice* says that some retailers are making huge profits at the expense of people with impaired hearing. The association found differences of up to $110 in the price of the same product.

Choice reports a U.S. consumer group's finding that in more than 40 per cent of cases, dealers had recommended a hearing aid for patients when health-care professionals had determined that those patients could not benefit from one.

Colin Lamont, President of the Queensland branch of the Australian Deafness Council, said: 'I can no more give a deaf person a hearing aid and expect him to hear than I can give a blind man a stick and expect him to see.'

It is true that deaf people do not know whether another person is screaming at them or speaking in a low voice. They have no idea of what has been said.

Conclusion 5 was that insurance companies should be prohibited from charging higher premiums to persons with disabilities, including the deaf, unless it can be shown that the disability involved was caused by some degenerative disease. Some insurance companies deny imposing higher charges and others do not. However, it seems that some insurance companies have been imposing a loading because of deafness. Deafness is not likely to bring an early end to life, so the loading is hardly justified.

Conclusion 6 states that television stations should provide captions, and there are several alternatives that can assist the deaf and other people who have a hearing impairment. In fact, that is the law in the United States, especially in relation to news programmes. On channel 7 last night I noticed that in future an American show, *That's Incredible,* will provide special explanations for the deaf. The television stations in this State, and I believe there are four, are all looking at this area. They are all looking at decoder systems, but every channel is looking at a different system. Therefore, if a deaf person wanted to look at four different channels over a period of time, he would have to purchase four different decoders. I hope that the Government and Telecom ensure that only one decoder system is allowed, because deaf people will have to pay for these decoders, which are not complimentary.

The situation is similar in relation to Telecom and special telephones for the deaf. Telecom supplies two types of telephone for deaf people. A report in the *News* of 1 April 1980 states:

South Australia's 50 000 deaf people will soon be able to communicate by telephone . . . that is, if they can spare $750. A revolutionary telephone has been developed by a Sydney-based firm, Intercept Communications, which enables the deaf to communicate by typed messages.

That is, provided they have a telephone. This system allows messages to be typed on to a special printer. Another article which appeared in the *Australian* on 18 March 1981 states:

A revolutionary discovery which will allow deaf people to use telephones is being examined by Telecom as a potential 'deaf telephone' system for Australia. The breakthrough, the first major scientific contribution to the International Year of Disabled People, would enable deaf people to communicate with each other in sign language. The new telephone will remove the need for deaf people to type their messages as in the 'porta-printer' system used by Telecom.

Commercial development of the new instrument in the United States could be followed by a move to introduce it to Australia if Telecom found the machine competitive with its phone-printer. One problem in introducing the new device to Australia is that at least four types of sign language are used here.

Plans to devise a 'deaf telephone' had been previously considered impossible because it was assumed a picture of the language signs would have to be sent along an expensive television transmission line. Under the new system, signs made by a deaf user would be turned into electronic impulses, sent down a telephone line and converted into an image on a TV screen.

Whatever system deaf people choose, it will be very expensive. Conclusion 7 is that the Department of Transport should consider the lack of visual signs in public places, particularly at the Adelaide Railway Station.

Conclusion 8 states that sales tax and import duties should be removed from items useful to the deaf, such as equipment to alleviate deafness in public places and visual doorbells. Sales tax exemption should be clarified. Sales tax and import duties are exempt on many articles for handicapped people, but the deaf still have to pay. I believe that conclusion 9 is right that Telecom should not impose an extra charge for providing the installation of amplified telephones, particularly at places of work. The deaf maintain that some deaf people can use telephones, but they cannot afford the aid provided by Telecom.

Conclusion 10 is that the recommendation of the Committee on Education of Hearing Impaired Children in South Australia should be implemented. Conclusion 11 is that legislation relating to industrial safety and entry tests for the Public Service should allow the capacity of an individual to be assessed, and should not prevent a person, merely because of his impairment, from obtaining employment. Anti-discrimination legislation reflecting this emphasis may help the deaf in the same way as it may assist other disabled persons. Conclusion 12 is that the practicability of reducing permissible noise levels in noise control legislation should be considered. Conclusion 13 is that the Workmen's Compensation Act should be amended so as to remove barriers to employment of persons with hearing impairments, while still maintaining an equitable system of compensation for hearing loss sustained during employment.

Employers no longer object to employing deaf people for fear of costly legal battles over whether an employee became deaf at work or whether he was already deaf when he began employment.

Today in Question Time I heard the Attorney declare that there was no mere tokenism in relation to the Government's aid to the disabled. I hope that the research undertaken into the problems of the deaf by the committee has been well considered by this Government and that every effort will be made to obligate this State to extend extra assistance to these most severely handicapped people. I also hope that this Government will leave no stone unturned in seeking to have the Federal Government at least agree to act immediately on the recommendations in so far as they affect the Federal Government.

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: I thank His Excellency the Governor for opening Parliament, and I congratulate the Hon. Ren DeGaris for his recognition in the Queen's Birthday honours. Like my colleagues, and indeed all South Australians, I was saddened at the passing of Sir Thomas Playford whose unique contribution to this State will be forever remembered. I was pleased to note paragraph 7 in the Governor's Speech, as follows:

In line with my Government's move towards deregulation and improvements in public sector efficiency, it is proposed to repeal several obsolete Acts and to abolish the bodies established by those Acts. Legislation will also be introduced to establish a Parliamentary committee to examine the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of statutory authorities.

I look forward to the introduction of this legislation. However, today I wish to discuss the Government commitment to deregulation and to examine the role of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. In his book *Delegated legislation in Australia and in New Zealand*, D. C. Pearce defines 'delegated legislation' as:

Instruments that lay down general rules of conduct affecting the community at large which have been made by a non-Parliamentary body expressly acting pursuant to an Act of Parliament.

In South Australia, regulations are defined to include rules, orders and by-laws. They are usually made by the Governor on the advice of his Executive Council and, to a lesser extent, by Ministers or local government authorities or other bodies.

Delegated legislation is not a creature of recent origin. The earliest example in England is the Staple Act of 1385, which provided for delegated legislation. In 1539, the State of Proclamations was passed and provided:

The king for the time being, with the advice of his council, or the more part of them, may set forth proclamations under such penalties and pains as to him and them shall seem necessary, which shall be observed as though they were made by Act of Parliament.

This power to the king is analogous to the power to make regulations invested in the Governor-in-Council. The struggle between Parliament and the Crown in the seventeenth century reflected to a large extent the growing use of delegated legislation. However, following the establishment of the supremacy of Parliament there was an increased and growing acceptance of delegated legislation to the extent that, from the first colonisation of South Australia, delegated legislation was used. For example, the proclamations of the first Governors were examples of delegated legislation.

In South Australia, prior to 1937, the responsibility for scrutinising delegated or subordinate legislation rested with individual members of each House. Because there had been some dissatisfaction with this system, the Government of the day appointed an honorary committee to consider the matter of subordinate legislation. This committee was appointed in 1935, and in paragraph 11 of its report to Parliament it observed:

The greater part of subordinate legislation consists of regulations dealing with administrative matters with which the time of Parliament should not be taken up. Therefore, it must be accepted as inevitable that this method of legislation will be continued and, possibly, extended, but whilst accepting this fact, the committee realises that all practicable precautions should be provided against any improper exercise or abuse of these powers.

A further extract from paragraph 17 states:

At present, regulations are merely laid before Parliament, and it is then incumbent upon individual members of Parliament to take any steps necessary to challenge them. It is essentially the duty of Parliament to scrutinise regulations and to disallow any which are harsh or unnecessary. Under the present method, however, it is possible that some regulations could escape this scrutiny. The committee is of opinion that there should be some body entrusted with the duty of informing Parliament whether there are grounds for objection to any regulations. The committee considers that this body should be a joint committee of both Houses, with power to sit whether Parliament is in session or not, and with power to call and examine witnesses. The joint committee should report to both Houses as to the following matters in respect of any regulations:

The committee then recommended the establishment of a committee with the powers which are set out in Joint Standing Order 26, as follows:

The committee shall with respect to any regulations consider—

(a) whether the regulations are in accord with the general objects of the Act, pursuant to which they are made;

(b) whether the regulations unduly trespass on rights previously established by law;

(c) whether the regulations unduly make rights dependent upon administrative and not upon judicial decisions; and

(d) whether the regulations contain matter which, in the opinion of the committee, should properly be dealt with in an Act of Parliament.

In establishing the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation in 1937, the Constitution Act was amended and provided in section 55 (1):

The Legislative Council and House of Assembly from time to time as there shall be occasion, shall prepare and adopt such Standing Rules and Orders as appear to the Council and Assembly respectively best adapted for—

....

(g) the establishment of a Joint Standing Committee of both Houses to examine and report to the Council and the Assembly upon all regulations, rules, by-laws and orders (not being orders made in judicial proceedings) made pursuant to any Act of Parliament.

South Australia was the first State to establish such a committee, the Federal Parliament having established a Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation in 1932. In accordance with Joint Standing Order 29, copies of all regulations made, together with appropriate explanations by the regulation-making authority are forwarded to the committee. The regulations and explanatory notes are carefully scrutinised by the committee to ensure compliance with Joint Standing Order 26.

On occasions, the committee will hear witnesses and, in the case of regulations applying to particular areas, for example, council regulations, the committee will ensure that the local member of Parliament has been notified and has no objection. It should be noted that the committee, in considering regulations under the criteria set out in Joint Standing Order 26, specifically avoids considerations of policy. If the committee decides that the regulation is satisfactory, no further action is taken, and this is recorded in committee minutes which are tabled in this House.

However, if the committee believes that a regulation should be disallowed, it submits a written report accordingly to both Houses of Parliament and debate ensues. Disallowance by one House is sufficient. The power enabling Parliament to consider and, if necessary, to disallow subordinate legislation was contained in section 38 of the Acts Interpretation Act. Regulations must be laid before both Houses within 14 days after publication. If either House, after giving notice by resolution, disallows the regulation within 14 sitting days of the House after the regulation has been laid before it, the regulation ceases to have effect.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: It's not in that Act any more—it is the Subordinate Legislation Act.

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: The honourable member is right. Although there appears to have been varied opinion, the majority view suggests that the whole set of regulations must be disallowed, rather than just a part. Although any member of Parliament may move for disallowance, invariably successful motions for disallowance have come from the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation.

The justification for delegated legislation is commented on by Jaffe in an *Essay on Delegation of Legislative Power* (1947) Columbia Law Reports, page 361, when he said:

Power should be delegated where there is agreement that a task must be performed and it cannot be effectively be performed by the Legislature without the assistance of a delegate or without an expenditure of time so great as to lead to the neglect of equally important business.

Pearce refers to four situations where delegations can be considered both legitimate and desirable. The first is to save pressure on Parliamentary time; the second is in regard to legislation that is too technical or detailed to be suitable for Parliamentary consideration; the third concerns legislation dealing with rapidly changing or uncertain situations; and the fourth deals with legislative action in cases of emergency.

Obviously, while there are advantages attaching to the use of delegated legislation, it can be subject to abuse in such a way that Parliament is no longer supreme. For this reason this and other Parliaments have established a procedure of Parliamentary review of delegated legislation to ensure that such legislation is not *ultra vires*, that it does not impinge on individual rights already established by law or where it would be more appropriately the subject of an Act of Parliament, and also to afford persons who could be affected by the delegated legislation the opportunity to present evidence.

The drafting of regulations is carried out by the Crown Solicitor's office on the instruction of the responsible department. However, in the case of local government by-laws and delegated legislation made, for example, by statutory boards, this drafting will be done by legal practitioners and sometimes by departmental officers, although this work must be sent to the Crown Solicitor for his certificate, even if the Crown Solicitor does not redraft it. However, I suggest that the Federal approach to the drafting of delegated legislation is preferable. As I understand it, all Federal delegated legislation is drafted by a single authority, namely, the drafting section of the Attorney-General's Department. I hope that in time we will adopt a similar approach. The Parliament seeks a uniformly high standard of drafting for its Acts of Parliament. It is important, also, to ensure the same standards are demanded and achieved with delegated legislation.

In recent times, the committee has retained the services of an independent legal practitioner. Over the years, the committee has also generally been fortunate in having as a member a person with legal training or, at the very least, a good bush lawyer. I believe it is highly desirable for the committee to have access to a legal adviser, given the growth in complexity and the number of regulations that require perusal. Indeed, the time may not be far distant when this Parliament may see it as desirable to have a full-time member of the staff with legal qualifications who would provide advice to committees such as this.

There also seems to be a strong argument in favour of standardising the information that the departments, councils, boards and other authorities should provide when submitting details of subordinate legislation to the committee. It is important that, for example, community groups, commercial organisations and individuals concerned with new or amended regulations be given the opportunity to comment, although in the past two years, during the term of my membership at least, and to my knowledge, the committee has observed the practice of writing to bodies where it appears they have neglected to advise interested parties. A standard form should exist in making this practice much more automatic than it is now.

Regulations are printed in the *Government Gazette*. It is difficult to judge whether this step and the availability of printed regulations is adequate for the public. I hope that copies of important regulations or amendments to regulations are always available to interested parties.

The 1980 Commonwealth Conference of Delegated Legislation Committee held in September-October in Canberra concluded on an optimistic note. That committee saw 16 Commonwealth countries gathered together for the specific purpose of discussing delegated legislation. In the report of the conference, the following observation was made:

The general trend in most jurisdictions is towards more Parliamentary influence upon legislation and administration supported by a greater demand among the public and members of Parliament for accountability of Government and a sharper awareness of the rights of citizens.

It was also noted that a co-operative approach between the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation and the Government of the day was the best long-run approach in promoting smooth administrative operation, avoiding unnecessary political conflict and at the same time safeguarding the rights and liberties of citizens. I believe this approach matches the current attitude and *modus operandi* of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, and indeed the commitment by the present Government to greater

public accountability of Government actions and the recognition of the importance of the institution of Parliament.

In addition to the review of the delegated legislation by a joint committee of Parliament, the Government's commitment to small government and deregulation is known. In the 1970s, Hong Kong set up special boom zones in which regulations and restrictions were minimised, with the object of encouraging enterprise. I do not suggest that this Government should look at certain regions in South Australia to minimise regulations and restrictions; I would be happy to see an exhaustive review of regulations, rules and by-laws affecting the whole State and, in fact, this Government has already committed itself publicly to that course of action. Indeed, the present State Government is to be commended for what it has achieved in its first two years in office. First, in this area, it has a commitment to introduce legislation establishing a Statutory Authorities Review Committee. Secondly, comprehensive and very practical reports of the working party on small business licensing were brought down in May 1981. Thirdly, there is the Gayler Report.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What have you done about it?

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: Give us a chance. The honourable member's Government did nothing. The Gayler Report set out a plan of action to rationalise South Australian legislation. It was published in August 1980 and pointed out that we now have more than 500 Acts and over 2 000 gazetted regulations—in other words, an average of four sets of regulations for every Act of Parliament. Some of this legislation and delegated legislation is obsolete, ineffective, inappropriate, irrelevant, overlapping or badly drafted.

In addition, as the working party on small business licensing noted, an Australian Bureau of Statistics bulletin detailing costs to small businesses of Government paper work for the year ended 21 December 1978 concluded that the perceived cost to each small enterprise (and they are defined as manufacturing industries employing 100 or fewer and retail industries employing 20 or fewer) during 1978 was $604 per annum, of which $487 was attributable to the Commonwealth Government, $110 to the State Government and $7 to local government. Of the $110 payable to State Government, $38 was for State taxation and $31 for licensing and corporate affairs. Even businesses with fewer than 10 employees still have high paper work costs. In relation to small business licences and Government paper work, a total of $521 was the cost, according to the Bureau of Statistics survey.

This view was further reinforced by the Confederation of Australian Industry in a survey on the cost to business of complying with regulations. They claimed that $3 720 000 000 or $900 per household was spent by the private sector in complying with Federal and State business regulations in 1978-79, and that some 16 000 people were fully employed in that area dealing with the paper work required by Federal regulatory agencies. Australians, and more particularly South Australians, are suffering from regulation shock.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Why do you think there are regulations?

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: I will consider that in a moment. This shock is happening especially in the business sector. I remember the example in Victoria a few years ago of an employer who wished to employ women and proposed to establish a small creche so that any children could be properly cared for whilst their mothers were at work. He discovered that eight Government departments became involved. He had to employ two trained personnel, and even the Fire Brigade got into the act. Needless to say, the creche was not established.

Closer to home, the working party committee that examined small business licensing instanced several examples of unnecessary or overlapping delegated legislation. The committee noted that these regulations existed for one or more of three reasons: principally, they guaranteed public safety and wellbeing; secondly, they raised revenue either as a form of tax or as a means of defraying administrative costs associated with licensing controls; and, thirdly, they regulated an industry and provided a franchise for licence holders. Licensing requirements in relation to health and food, planning and building, industrial and business affairs and taxation and occupational licensing were examined. I do not question for one moment that there is a need for regulations in certain areas: it is the extent to which they overlap, duplicate unnecessarily or are obsolete that is objectionable.

I will examine one of these areas—health and food. Both local government and State Governments are involved in this area. Two principal Acts of Parliament apply, namely the Health Act, 1935-1980, and the Food and Drugs Act, 1908-1981, and their administration is divided among the Central Board of Health (that is, the South Australian Health Commission), the local boards of health formed by each council and, for food purposes, the Metropolitan County Board, which comprises the majority of metropolitan corporations.

The committee examined a number of licences. For example, retail milk vendors licences were first introduced in 1908, but they did not cover the sale of flavoured milk or yoghurt. The licensing requirement is established in section 27 (1) of the Food and Drugs Act and a vendor must be both licensed and registered by the local authority. The working party suggested there was no need for these requirements, given the uniform policy in regard to milk and cream in 1981. The control and quality of milk and cream would be more properly monitored by food and drugs regulations than by the Act. There was no need for the licence and registration by the local authority.

The report observed that a firm with a labour force of between 31 to 60 employees is required to fill in an average of 6.7 forms per annum for the Bureau of Census and Statistics. A small country store in South Australia not selling petrol will be required to have at least 10 to 15 licences or approvals relating to corporate affairs, State taxation, industrial affairs, employment, the Health Commission, local boards of health, local government, and the Commonwealth Government.

The working party recommended the reduction of 18 commonly required licences and approvals for food shops down to six. That was the recommendation and the State Government is currently looking at that recommendation which, after all, was made only in late May this year. Admittedly, the committee's proposals, if fully implemented, would result in a loss of revenue estimated at $650 000 for the State Government and $92 000 for local corporations—primarily the City of Adelaide. Quite obviously, there would be savings associated with these deregulation proposals.

On the recommendation of that working party, the Government is presently discussing with local government costs associated with the regulations, and is ascertaining local government reaction to these various proposals. I would hope that the Government implements, where practicable, these recommendations that I have instanced which would go a long way towards mitigating the regulation shock currently being experienced by small business in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: Both the working party and the deregulation report of Ms Gayler underlined the problems of excessive, irrelevant, time-wasting, inconsistent, overlapping, poorly co-ordinated and often costly regulations. In November 1979, the Hon. David Tonkin underlined the Government's view on regulations, as follows:

> First, it is a fundamental principle of democracy that whenever government is obliged to intrude upon individual liberty, the onus rests squarely with Government to justify that intrusion. Secondly, it is a paramount responsibility of democratic government to ensure that where regulation is necessary it should be effective in the most efficient, least intrusive and least destructive manner.

What I hope is going to flow from those two reports to which I have referred (both the working party report on small business licensing and the deregulation report by Ms Gayler) is that this Government will conduct a systematic and legislative review of regulations. The deregulation report of August 1980 observed that many of the 2 262 gazetted regulations required review. The reasons given in the report, as set out on page 21, are as follows:

> The regulatory failures include—
> Obsolete Acts and regulations;
> Outdated requirements and standards;
> Anomalies and gaps in regulation;
> Unenforceable provisions;
> Conflicts between requirements under various Acts and regulations and between agencies;
> Gaps and overlaps in the opportunities for citizens to have administrative decisions reviewed;
> Overlapping requirements under different pieces of legislation;
> Excessive delays, costs and paperwork arising from legislative requirements;
> The lack of a suitable information system to enable bureaucrats and citizens to cope; and
> The sheer complexity of a multiplicity of requirements for licences, registrations, approvals, conditions and inspections.

On page 22, the deregulation report proposes a legislative review scheme. I would hope that this Government, in its three-year programme, can at least make a start on the enormous task of reviewing legislation and discerning which Acts and which regulations are indeed obsolete, and progressively reviewing those Acts and regulations that are apparent problem areas. Over a period of time problems can be solved, not, as Mr Sumner would suggest, with instant solutions. We can at least make a start in this Parliamentary period. The Hon. Mr Sumner suggests that the Government has done nothing in this area. I would suggest that the setting up of a statutory authority review committee is indeed going to be a major step. In fact, the commissioning of those reports in itself is a major step.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I am saying that I suspect that at the end of the Liberal Government there will be more regulations than there were at the beginning of it, and the things mentioned in the Speech hardly impinge very much on the regulations. All I am trying to ask is what you are going to do about it.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: I would suggest to the Hon. Mr Sumner that the very fact that the Government has commissioned those reports shows that the Government is concerned about these measures and will in time do something about them.

I now move to an unrelated matter which was discussed in the Governor's Speech in paragraph 12 as follows:

> My Government believes that one of the great challenges facing health professionals in the 1980s is to create an awareness that individuals are responsible for their own health. To this end, the South Australian Health Commission will continue to pursue my Government's programme of expanding health promotion and preventive medicine.

Preventive medicine is important for people who are approaching retiring age or who have retired. The health costs in that area most certainly have increased. I want to refer first to some rather dramatic demographic movements in this area of people who are approaching retirement. In 1881 the median age was 20.1 years. (By 'median age', I mean that half the population is above and half below that age.) In 1947 it increased to 30.7 years and in 1976 it had fallen to 27.5 years, reflecting the impact of the immigration programme and the baby boom following World War II. The median age is now rising again, following a fall in birth rates, and it is estimated that by the year 2001 the median age in Australia will be 33 years.

There has been a dramatic change in four sets of statistics, one of which is life expectancy at birth. In the year 1400 the life expectancy was 35 years. It had risen to only 40 years by 1850, to 47 by 1881 and now, 100 years later, it is 73 years for an Australian male. Today a woman on average is going to live 77 years. Last year the New South Wales Health Commission study showed that in the past five years a 60-year old man has gained just less than one year extra to live. That is quite a dramatic improvement—an increase in expectancy of life of one year for a man aged 60. Therefore, in relation to planning for retirement, we know that a man aged 60 will live on average until the age of 76 years and a woman aged 60 will live on average to 80 years.

Secondly, Australian Bureau of Statistics figures show that, whereas in 1966, 79.5 per cent of 60 to 64-year-old men were still working, by August 1980 this figure had fallen dramatically to 50.1 per cent. In other words, whereas in 1966 (only 15 years ago) four out of every five men in the 60 to 64-year-old age group were still working, today that figure has fallen to one in two. Also, in 1966, 91.2 per cent of all males in the 55 to 59 years age range worked, but this declined to 83.3 per cent by August 1980.

The third statistic to which I want to draw the attention of the Council is the marked increase in the population over the age of 65 as a percentage of the total population. This demographic figure is known as the greying of Australia. In 1881 the figure was 4 per cent; in 1921 it was 4.5 per cent; and in 1976 it was 8.9 per cent. It is estimated that it will be 10 per cent by the year 2001 and 12.7 per cent by the year 2020.

However, this will be accompanied by a fall in the percentage of the population in the 0-14 age group, so the two groups (0-14 and over 65) are projected to remain relatively stable until 2020. Further, as was stated at an ANZAAS conference in Adelaide last year, it would be plainly an over-simplification to treat the old and young as equal burdens of dependency. Professor Keith Hancock observed in delivering the Presidential address, 'Whereas the young may be more expensive to maintain, it is an investment in human capital'. Professor Hancock also analysed population data and noted that Australia has one of the lowest aged dependency ratios in the developed world; that is, the ratio of aged population to the working age population. At the 1976 census there were 16.1 persons aged 65 or more for every 100 aged 20 to 64 years. Only Japan (13.1) and Canada (15.4) had a ratio lower than Australia's, whereas in the United States of America it is 19.4, in the United Kingdom and West Germany 25.5, and in Sweden 26.2. The ratio will increase to 18 by 2010 and to 21.5 by 2020, assuming a net immigration figure of 50 000 a year.

Although no studies have been done in Australia, studies in America suggest that the costs of an aged dependant are about three times greater than the cost of a young dependant. Therefore, in Australia an increase in aged dependency ratios can increase the burden to be borne by the taxpayers.

An Australian Bureau of Statistics prediction suggests that the number of people 65 years or over is expected to increase by about two-thirds by the end of the century,

while the number of persons over 75 is expected to roughly double. The absolute size of these groups affects social welfare planning, including the provision of pensions and special medical care and accommodation.

The age of retirement in Australia is 65 years for men and 60 years for women, notionally at least. In the pre-Industrial Revolution economies of Western Europe there were no inherent factors preventing the employment of the aged. The great proportion of the population were engaged in agriculture, and retirement more often than not came only as a close fore-runner to death. However the rapid growth of industry in the late eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries changed this. Charles Booth, one of the leaders in a campaign which led to the introduction of an old age pension in England said that 'men in town life are thrown early out of work. The old are comparatively at a disadvantage owing to the increased stress of industrial life'.

Pension and superannuation schemes had, however, been in operation for many years before this date. The age of 60 for retirement from the Civil Service in England was chosen in 1810. At that time the few people affected by the rule were on average unfit to continue doing their specialised job. This age of 60 was confirmed by the Superannuation Act of 1834 being decided upon 'as the normal minimum in the light of the experience then available'. This Act made civil servants subject to a means test before they were eligible for a pension.

When pensions were first introduced they were given to deserving employees who needed them. The first systematic scheme in England was introduced in 1809 and applied to 'superannuated and worn out officers of the Excise Department'. In 1925 a contributory pension payable at the age of 65 was introduced, with no retirement condition imposed, and in 1946 the National Insurance Scheme was implemented, conditional upon retirement at 65.

There is also evidence to suggest that arbitrary retirement at 65 became well established during the depression years when there was a substantial surplus of manpower. In Australia, the Commonwealth Public Service Act of 1902 laid down that a person could retire at 60 if he desired or stay until 65 when he must retire. The Act of 1956 reaffirmed that a public servant must retire at 65. The Invalid and Old Age Pensions Act of 1908 was the first Commonwealth welfare service of its kind. It was payable to all native born and naturalised British subjects who reached the age of 65.

Although this is a Commonwealth matter when it comes to pensions, the age of retirement becomes important when we discuss the demographic trends to which I have referred. A Gallup poll in June 1981 indicated that 45 per cent of all people believed that the compulsory retiring age for men should be 60 years, compared with only 24 per cent who held that view in April 1974. In 1981, 29 per cent of all people said the compulsory retiring age for women should be under 60 years (mainly 55), whereas only 17 per cent were of that view seven years ago.

Of all people, 34 per cent believed that the age of retirement for both men and women should be 60 years, whereas only 18 per cent and 26 per cent respectively favoured 60 as the appropriate age for men and women retiring in April 1974. In April 1974, 48 per cent believed that there should be no fixed age for retirement of men, but in June 1981 only 27 per cent held that view.

It may be that those views have been conditioned by higher unemployment levels that exist, greater superannuation benefits operating in the public and private sectors, greater awareness through the education of people in their pre-retirement years for retirement life, and greater mobility that enables people who have retired to move around. I should also observe that the Australian Labor Party voters favoured a lower retiring age to a greater extent than did Liberal National Country Party voters.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What is your view?

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: Well, it is a fashionable view now that people should retire early. That has merit, in that it enables more people to be employed, at least superficially.

Earlier this year, the Australian Council of Social Service called for the abolition of compulsory retirement at 65 and, rather, give people a choice of retiring between 55 and 75 years. However, why should people retire earlier is a question that some people ask. The European experience has been to encourage earlier retirement. The Swedish view is for phased retirement where workers gradually work fewer hours. I must admit that I am very much attracted to that view, because it enables people to adjust to a new phase of life and it assists those people working beside them in their jobs. On balance, one imagines that it would provide more employment. Therefore, there are two views on the retiring age. Governments, companies, and many employees want earlier retirement. Geiontologists, doctors, and some employers would like later retirement.

A poll has indicated that 40 per cent of retired Americans would still prefer to be working. If we are going to use the demographic trends which I have suggested are apparently in operation, obviously taxes will have to increase to support retired people. In fact, there has been some suggestions that social welfare will have to take up as much as double the current 10 per cent that is now provided in the Federal Budget. Another option would be for pension payments to fall in real terms; or the retirement age could be adjusted upwards. It is interesting to note that in America there have been suggestions that the pensionable age should be adjusted upwards from 65 to 68. That has not received widespread acceptance, but there have been suggestions that that should occur.

Recent trends in employment have been encouraging in providing greater flexibility for people who are approaching the age of retirement. Between 1970 and 1980 full-time employment in Australia grew by 9.2 per cent, whereas part-time employment grew by 80 per cent. Between 1978 and 1980 part-time employment grew at three times the rate of full-time employment. That suggests that, in addition to young people having part-time jobs and women in the work force having part-time jobs, there may well be some people nearing retiring age who are also working on a part-time basis. There has been some evidence from first-hand knowledge which suggests that this is the case, although I am not aware of any statistics which support that proposition.

I now turn to the attitude of people towards housing for the aged. With 500 people retiring every day in Australia, and 1 600 000 people of retiring age, housing for the aged can be a real problem. An American concept of the 1960's has now become fashionable in Australia, and I am referring to the retirement village. The Frankston Baptist Church in Victoria set up the first major retirement village in 1972, without Government support. It is now involved in a $25 000 000 project with another church group at Nerang in Queensland. That village was opened in June and I understand that it is the largest in Queensland. Retirement villages are appealing for many people who retire on large superannuation cheques and who have greater mobility.

People are now living longer and they are also retiring earlier. Government subsidies for nursing homes and aged accommodation were reduced in the mid-1970's. That has encouraged private sector development in this area. I would like to reflect on this trend and I wonder just whether the retirement village is necessarily always going to be the best thing. Obviously for people who do not have others around to support them a retirement village as a place to live in

their old age is excellent. I think the Government's approach to preventive medicine should be stressed and not forgotten.

Peter Laslett, a British historian, likes to look at life in four age groups. The first age is immaturity; the second, adulthood; the third, retirement; and the fourth is dependency and decrepitude, where intensive care and hospitalisation is required. It is the third age that I think we should try to extend. We tend to talk about the golden years of elderly citizens, but it is only recently we have come to realise that after people retire they can lead very full lives. I hope that through increasing our domiciliary care provisions and our community care centres, we can better provide for those people who have retired.

Health costs associated with looking after the aged are enormous. For instance, in America one estimate is that the elderly comprise 11 per cent of the population, but account for 29 per cent of the health costs. Evidence suggests that 25 per cent of patients in nursing homes and 10 to 33 per cent of patients in hospitals could be treated satisfactorily in their own homes if suitable domiciliary care services were available. I believe community-based rather than centrally-based services are what the Government is giving priority to, and I support that concept. Only last year the South Australian Health Commission inquiry into the area stated:

> The resource cost of home care is always much less than the cost of hospital care. It is less than the cost of nursing home care for virtually all clients who live with their family and whose disability is such as to require nursing home care if home care were not available.

Dr Boyd Russell, consultant in charge of the Geriatric Community Care Centre at Mount Royal Hospital, Parkville, was quoted as saying that at least one-quarter of the people in nursing homes did not need the type of medical care which the homes provided. She suggested the establishment of regional assessment services with general practitioners working closely with geriatricians and other support staff. She also supported an expansion of support services which would minimise the problem.

I am heartened to see the research that is now going on into the important area of gerontology. For instance, in May and June this year 2 000 suburban houses in Adelaide were visted to survey the physical, social and economic aspects of older people living at home. I understand that the survey concentrated on the needs of older migrants, especially those from non-English-speaking countries. The survey was undertaken by the Australian Council on the Ageing and the Department of Social Security with the co-operation of the South Australian Council on the Ageing.

Community attitudes are also important and I hope that employers will participate, as they have in more recent years, in assisting people to prepare for their retirement. I have been encouraged to see that has been the case and I think the unions are also more involved in preparing their members for retirement. In fact, it has reached a stage in England where Mars Limited (the U.K. subsidiary of the U.S. confectionery firm) conducts a hotline for its retired employees, to assist them in an emergency.

In conclusion, the demographic trends quite clearly show that there is going to be a substantial shift in the population spread in Australia over the next 30 years, if present trends continue. This will result in demands being made on the Government to look after people in these older age groups. Governments, and indeed the community at large, will have to appreciate that resources are not endless and that we have to allocate resources efficiently. By providing preventive medicine I believe that this Government is laying the foundation to allow this State to more properly care for those people in the fourth age that I described.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I support the motion and, in concert with other members, I congratulate the Governor on delivering his Speech, although I do not congratulate him on its content; of course, the Governor is not responsible for that. It is unfortunate that in all likelihood this is the last time that the Governor will deliver a Speech to us because of the clearly indicated policy of the Government to get rid of him. That is unfortunate, and I would like to thank the Governor for the services that he has rendered to this State.

Also, it is traditional to congratulate the Hon. Mr DeGaris on his receiving honours in the Queen's birthday honours list. My understanding of these matters is not great, but I understand that he received an Australian honour—one of Gough's gongs, as it were. For that reason I am particularly pleased that the Hon. Mr DeGaris accepted that award so graciously. I wish to express my condolences to Lady Playford and her family on the death of Sir Thomas. Any death in the community is something to be regretted, however much expected. Along with other members I would like to congratulate Sir Thomas Playford on the efforts he made in seeking to turn this State from a basically rural State to one heavily dependent on manufacturing industry.

In doing that, I have to point out who has paid the cost of turning this State into a State with a high manufacturing industry base—because it is the workers who have paid the cost. The manufacturers reap the benefits but the workers have paid the cost. South Australia had the lowest wages of any State; it had the worst education and health facilities of any State in Australia so, although great strides were made in industrialising South Australia, this was at the worker's expense for the benefit of manufacturers. It would be silly not to put that on record.

Like several other members on this side of the Council, I want to speak as briefly as I can on the resources boom. In doing so, I want to pay a tribute to those members on this side who have already spoken on this topic. It is not coincidence that so many honourable members on this side of the Council have chosen the Address in Reply debate to speak on this topic, because it is the topic which we on this side of the Council, including the Australian Democrats to some degree, are most concerned about. Certainly, I am surprised that not one Government member chose to debate this important issue, although there was one minor exception, the Hon. Mr Carnie, who in his contribution to the debate stated;

> Ironically, a matter that is vital to the economy of South Australia, and indeed to that of Australia generally, namely, resource development, has the potential to be damaging to the rural sector. As we sell our vast mineral resources on overseas markets, the value of the Australian dollar will increase. This will, unfortunately, have the effect of lowering the prices that primary products will command on overseas markets.

That is the only comment. There is no suggestion of any solutions, merely an indication that farmers had better look out because they are going to get lower prices. That is all that comes from a Party that supposedly represents, or claims to represent, rural interests. It is rather surprising.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese in her speech gave a detailed outline of what could happen to manufacturing industry in South Australia and employment prospects if the resources boom went ahead uncontrolled. I certainly congratulate the honourable member on her speech. It was something that the Parliament sorely needed, and I hope that it will take great notice of that speech. The Hon. Mr Dunford pointed out that little if any benefit had trickled down to the Australian not directly involved in the boom. I agree with that view completely.

The only thing that I have ever heard from members opposite is that the sooner we get into the resources boom

the better; that we should dig up and sell everything we can while the going is good and the results of that will be to the benefit of all Australians. I maintain that to continue to follow that kind of policy will be disastrous for Australia, particularly for South Australia. It will be disastrous in several areas and with benefits for very few. Before enlarging on that, I want to tell the Council my general attitude to the resources boom so that I am not to be misrepresented by members opposite as being in some way anti-development.

I believe that man has a right to develop, with good management, the resources of this earth for the ultimate good of everyone and everything upon it. I am not one of those persons who dislike development and technological change and would prefer us to stop right where we are on the assumption that we have gone far enough, and that any further development will affect the quality of life. I reject that action entirely. It is a selfish and 'Luddite' attitude which I feel is best summed up in the phrase, 'I'm all right Jack', because what in effect they are saying is that they are doing quite all right, thank you; they do not want any alteration to the *status quo*. That may be very nice for them but that type of attitude ignores the fact that billions of people throughout the world live in mean and miserable conditions. The only way to increase the general standard of living for everyone on earth is to use what resources and brains we have to increase the wealth available so that we may fulfill everyone's needs. I believe society is now at a stage of technical development where that can be achieved.

At this stage I would just like to comment on the Hon. Mr Milne's rather varied contribution to this debate this afternoon. If I understood him correctly, the Australian Democrats apparently feel that the mining boom should be contracted to a severe degree, if it proceeds at all. I think that is what he said, but that is typical of the rather waffly thinking of people who are associated with the Australian Democrats. They are mainly just a bunch of trendies or greenies (call them what one will) who are doing very nicely themselves. One usually finds them in positions attracting fat salaries or in the Houses of Parliament, and of course they have a high standard of living. I usually find that they are on the public pay-roll; that the people who are doing the work in the blast furnaces and production lines at G.M.H. do not get a quarter of their salaries, and cannot afford the luxury of this intellectual and romantic nonsense espoused by members of the Australian Democrats.

However, whilst I believe that society is at a stage in its technological development where abundance for all can be created, I do not believe it can ever be achieved in a world capitalist economy. Fundamental change to a socialist society is required for that. However, that is another story for possibly another Address in Reply debate. What I want to do is to explain, as briefly as I can, some of the problems that Australia will have caused by the resources boom and suggest some of the answers to those problems. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday 6 August at 2.15 p.m.