LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 7 August 1984

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

PETITIONS: FIREARMS LEGISLATION

Petitions signed by 304 electors of South Australia praying that the Council will defeat any firearms legislation which is further restrictive; consider the effectiveness of present legislation; refuse further unwarranted increases in fees; and apply a significant part of the revenue gained to promote and assist sporting activities associated with firearms, were presented by the Hons M.S. Feleppa and Diana Laidlaw.

Petitions received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Hon. C.J. Sumner):

Pursuant to Statute—

Trade Standards Act, 1979—Regulations—Care Labelling.

By the Minister of Health (Hon. J.R. Cornwall):

By Command—

Stony Point Environmental Consultative Group—Report, 1983.

Pursuant to Statute—

Health Act, 1935—Regulations—Nursing Homes.

Local Government Act, 1934, and Fees Regulation Act, 1927—Regulations—

Local Government Officers Qualifications.

Local Government Auditors' Certificates.

Local Government Act, 1934—Regulations—

By-law Offences Expiation Fees.

Prescribed Municipality.

Long Service Leave.

Members Allowances for Expenses.

Miscellaneous Revocations.

Proceedings of Councils.

Certificate of Legal Practitioner Certifying a By-law.

Planning Act, 1982—

Regulations—Development Control of Air Pollution.

Crown Development Reports by South Australian Planning Commission on—

Proposed erection of a single timber classroom at Gladstone High School.

Proposed construction of foot and vehicular bridges at Morialta Conservation Park.

Town of Thebarton—By-law No. 7—Vehicle Movement.

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Frank Blevins):

Pursuant to Statute—

Highways Act, 1926—Approvals to lease Highways Department properties, 1983-84.

South Australian College of Advanced Education—Report, 1983.

QUESTIONS

HAIRDRESSERS REGISTRATION BOARD

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the Hairdressers Registration Board.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: The Attorney-General will remember that I asked him a series of questions at the end of last session about problems with the Hairdressers Registration Board, and some of those questions remained unanswered and are still unanswered. I am certain that the Attorney will eventually provide answers to my questions, but I noticed that one hairdresser who was charged with the dreadful offence of cutting men's hair when he was registered only to cut women's hair has had the case dismissed. That is a big step forward, I would have thought, towards some sort of equality in the community. The reason why hairdressers have problems is that they do not have registration for both these major sections of the hairdressing industry.

Unfortunately, the dismissal of this case does not relieve the situation for those poor citizens who still happen to be the subject of a charge. In fact, it was made clear that this case was not a precedent because there were factors peculiar to this case which was completed; they had relevance to the charge being dismissed. These included whether or not the offending hairdresser caused an offending sign to be displayed or whether someone else did.

In view of the total confusion and the lack of support for the Hairdressers Registration Board within the industry and the confusion caused through people being charged in regard to this offence, what steps have been taken to resolve this anomaly? Has the inquiry into the hairdressing industry been completed? If so, when can we expect legislation, which will finally resolve the many difficulties and lack of confidence of hairdressers in the Board, to be introduced?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The inquiry is proceeding. There are clearly difficulties in this industry. There are differences of opinion amongst hairdressers as to what is the appropriate course of action in this matter. I point out, and emphasise again, that, under its Statute, the Hairdressers Registration Board is independent of Government—the Government cannot direct the Board in any way. The review will address the question of whether that is an appropriate situation for the industry to be in at the present time. The question of occupational licensing in other areas generally has been dealt with by a Board within the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs. It may be that, in future, the registration of hairdressers will come under the jurisdiction of the Commercial Tribunal, but for the moment there is legislation in place establishing the Hairdressers Registration Board, which includes an independent Chairman and representatives of hairdressers and workers in the industry. However, under the Statute it is independent of Government. I have asked the Department to expedite the review of this industry.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: It's taking a terribly long time.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member says that it is taking a terribly long time. The fact is that the resources of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs have been drastically reduced, and were reduced by some 50 or 60 people during the time of the previous Government.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I appreciate that, and we have. That situation is being remedied at the moment as a result of budgetary discussions which I have had and about which honourable members will be made aware when the Budget is brought down. Additional staff will be available in the policy section of the Department, but this has taken some time. These issues are not simple. However, the review is proceeding and will be expedited.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: It is all very well for the honourable member to say that. However, the Hon. Mr Burdett, when Minister, introduced the Commercial Tribunal legislation, but it was months and months after that before additional jurisdictions were brought within the purview of the Commercial Tribunal.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: We'll bring a Bill in for you.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That is entirely a matter for the honourable member. However, I doubt that it will receive

the support of everyone in the industry. This Government believes in consulting the industry and in implementing legislation that is satisfactory to it. As I have said already, there are a number of projects being dealt with by the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs and this is one of them. I understand the difficulties in the industry and have asked that a report be prepared about it as soon as possible. I received a deputation from the Hairdressers Registration Board which put its point of view to me, with the support of representatives of hairdressers on the Board. Its point of view is that the skills required for men's hairdressing are different in certain respects from those required for women's hairdressing. The automatic registration as a person capable of performing women's hairdressing is not necessarily applicable to men's hairdressing. That is the view taken by the Board and supported by the two hairdresser representatives on that Board. They pointed out to me that they asked the people who were to carry out men's hairdressing that they undergo a fairly simple test to see whether they were able to cut what I understand is known as the short back and sides haircut.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: That's fairly insulting.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That may be insulting to some people, but I am saying that it was the Board's view that that skill should be tested. That view was supported by the hairdressers' representatives on the Board.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: Is the Board member's father still in that situation? What have you done about that?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: It is all very well for the honourable member to ask what I have done about it. I wrote to the Board and indicated my concern about the appointment of the father of a member of the Board as the inspector. I could do nothing about that, as I have explained to the honourable member on previous occasions, because of the independence of the Board. I am merely saying now that there is a difference of opinion within the industry amongst hairdressers themselves on whether or not qualification as a women's hairdresser automatically qualifies someone to be a men's hairdresser. The Board put that point of view to me. That will be considered during the review, which should produce legislation later in this session. It is not something that can be resolved overnight. I hope that the review will assist in a resolution of the problems and may well produce a different system for the licensing of hairdressers in this State.

PICKETS

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the Roxby Downs vigil and the Mabarrack Bros. furniture picket.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: There seems to me to be a peculiar inconsistency about the Government's attitude to South Australian citizens who were involved in a vigil at Roxby Downs when compared to its attitude to other South Australians who were involved in the picketing of a furniture company at Marion. In the first case, at Roxby Downs, people who had not been obstructing or in any way interfering with any traffic or the operations of Western Mining Company were forcefully removed against their will and without being charged with any offence to Andamooka, several kilometres away where presumably they would not be breaking any law with which they had not even been charged.

In the second case, at Marion, people representing the Federal Furnishing Trades Society (that is, the employees' union) obstructed the traffic and operations of Mabarrack Bros., furniture manufacturers, to a significant degree for several weeks. Members of the picket line ignored a Supreme Court injunction and, in the face of all this, there was no police or Government intervention. I am not arguing for or against such measures; I am simply seeking information from the Attorney-General on what appears to be a stark inconsistency in the reaction from the Government and the police. My questions are as follows:

1. Is it illegal to compel employees to join a registered association (that is, a union), which was the avowed intention of the pickets at Marion in July this year?

2. Are secondary boycotts, such as refusing delivery of mail by the postal workers to Mabarrack Bros. at Marion in July this year, illegal?

3. Were the people involved in the vigil at Roxby Downs interfering with other people going about their lawful business?

4. Were the people in the picket line at Mabarrack Bros. furniture manufacturers interfering with other people going about their lawful business?

5. Was the refusal of the pickets at Marion to comply with a Supreme Court injunction an illegal act?

6. What is the explanation for direct police intervention at Roxby Downs, where no infringement of others' rights were involved, while at Mabarrack Bros. where there was considerable infringement of others' rights no direct police or Government action took place?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: A large number of questions are involved in that, and I will have to obtain information about the factual situation in relation to each one. However, in general terms the Mabarrack situation was a civil matter. The honourable member used the word 'illegal'. What happened at Mabarrack gave rise to civil proceedings in the Supreme Court taken by the company. The matter was eventually resolved by a Supreme Court judge making a decision that the boycott and the pickets should not have been in place. Subsequently, of course, that matter was settled: it did not proceed beyond that. There was no need to take or to enforce proceedings for what would have been contempt of court. All I am saying to the honourable member is that there is a distinction between civil and criminal proceedings, and I believe that that is the case in relation to the Mabarrack situation, whereas it might not have been the case in relation to the Roxby Downs situation.

I will obtain information with respect to the precise facts that the honourable member has raised and I will let him have a report. However, I believe that the confusion that exists in his mind is between what are civil matters (that is, matters between individuals in the community which are redressable by civil proceedings) and what are matters or actions that come within the jurisdiction and authority of the Police Force. The honourable member has attempted to place on the Government some responsibility for what has happened, and all I would say is that civil proceedings are dealt with by the courts, criminal proceedings are dealt with by the courts, and in respect of civil proceedings it is a matter for individuals to take proceedings before the courts. With respect to—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: With criminal offences—

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: With respect to criminal offences—

The Hon. C.M. Hill interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! One interjection is out of order; two interjections are completely out of order.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The situation at Mabarrack was resolved as a result of civil action taken through the Supreme Court. Offences against the law of the land are a matter for the police, and the honourable member knows that. He also knows that he would object to the suggestion that the Government should interfere with the policing of the criminal law. I imagine that, if the Government attempted

to intervene and to say to the police, 'You should or you should not prosecute in this particular case' the honourable member would object. If the honourable member was picked up for drink driving, if he rang me up and said 'Come on mate; fix it up' and if I got in touch with the police, do members think that the Hon. Martin Cameron would bring that matter into the Council and claim political interference with the operations of the police? Of course he would.

Procedures for directing the police are laid down in the Police Regulation Act and they are to become public. It is the convention in our system that the discretion to proceed with prosecutions for criminal offences resides with the police. If the Government wants to override that discretion, then it has a means of doing it, I believe, but that means must be public, and instructions to the Police Commissioner must be tabled in the Parliament in accordance with section 20 of the Police Regulation Act. So, criminal matters are for the police to determine, but matters that gave rise to the civil proceedings were dealt with by private litigants in the Supreme Court.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I have a supplementary question. Will the Attorney-General check with his colleague, the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. Dr Hopgood) as he is quoted as saying, 'We chose not to lay charges', which, in my opinion, indicates that the Minister for Environment and Planning was responsible in directing police action in this case. Am I correct in interpreting the Attorney's remarks that he is implying that there had been a criminal offence in the Roxby vigil case and that, in those circumstances, the police were entitled to move in and take action without laying any charges?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I said to the honourable member that I would obtain the information that he requested in his six separate questions, which involved quite different factual situations.

The Hon. I. Gilfillan: You were making statements that were rather dubious.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I said to the honourable member that I would obtain the information that he had requested in his questions. I was concerned to point out that I believed there was some confusion in what the honourable member said about civil and criminal proceedings, because he mentioned the police and the Government. All I am saying is that the Mabarrack situation was dealt with by a justice of the Supreme Court and was eventually resolved by civil proceedings through that court.

As far as breaches of the criminal law—the law of the land—are concerned, whether it be at Mabarrack, Roxby Downs or anywhere else, I merely pointed out to the honourable member that that is a matter for the police to take action on, and I indicated the conventions that apply as far as the Government is concerned and the legislative procedures that exist to regulate the role of the Government and the police in relation to those matters.

That is all I have said. I have said that I will investigate the specific questions that the honourable member asked, because they raise different factual situations, and bring back a reply. I was concerned that the honourable member did not remain confused about the different law and the respective roles of private individuals and the police in this area.

SCHOOL DENTAL CARE

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question about dental care for schoolchildren.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: In the Speech that His Excellency the Governor made to open this session of Parliament we find reference to the fact that the Government proposes the extension of dental care for schoolchildren. As part of this phased extension of dental care to secondary students the Government will extend care to all year 8 students by the end of 1985 and all year 9 students by the end of 1986. So, it is not just a question of what has been talked about before regarding disadvantaged children (children on the free book list) but of all year 8 and year 9 students.

Who is to provide this care? Will it be provided by therapists under some sort of supervision from dentists employed by the School Dental Service, or will it be provided by dentists in private practice, either on a modified fee for service basis or on a sessional basis?

My questions are: when the extension of dental care to secondary students takes place (namely, to year 8 students by the end of 1985 and to year 9 students by the end of 1986) how will that dental care be provided? Will it be provided exclusively by therapists operating under the supervision of dentists employed by the School Dental Service? Will it be provided exclusively by dentists in private practice on either a modified fee-for-service basis or a sessional basis, or will it be provided by some sort of mix of these two and, if so, what sort of mix?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: These matters were canvassed at great length and in great depth during the passage of the Dentists Act in the dying stages of the last session of this Parliament. None of this should really be news to anybody who has been doing their homework or following current events in South Australia. The fact is quite clear: we have stated many times that the School Dental Service will be extended to all secondary school students up to and including the year in which they turn 16. It was promised; a firm commitment was given prior to the last State election. It was said at that time that it would be implemented over two Parliamentary terms. I am pleased to say that we are on target.

The first blow was struck in 1983, very early after we came into Government, when all secondary school children who are so-called Government assisted (in other words, those who are on the free book list and therefore whose parents were subject to a fairly stringent means test) were offered treatment through the existing school dental clinics. From about the middle of this year we have already started to provide dental services to year 8 school children. That will be extended to all year 8 school children next year (1985). It will be extended to all year 9 school children in 1986 and from there on, if one does one's sums, very simple arithmetic suggests that year 10 students would come in in 1987 and year 11 students—that is the year in which students normally turn 16—will come in in 1988. I am pleased to say that we are spot on at this point and that there is no reason to think, barring some sort of calamity, that we will not be able to implement those specific promises. By the time that is fully implemented we will have the best school dental service in the world.

The service will be provided by the unique mix of dentists and therapists which was introduced in this State more than a decade ago, and which has served us remarkably well. There will be no modified fee for service in this or in any other area of public dentistry. There will be no fee for service, modified or otherwise. Where it is appropriate and cost effective to do so we will use private dentists on a sessional basis, both in the School Dental Service and in the expanding community dental health services area generally.

VICTOR KUZNIK

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Correctional Services a question about Kuznik.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: On 24 May this year one Victor Kuznik, who was a murderer convicted in August 1979 of the crime of murder with a sawn-off rifle, escaped from the Cadell Minimum Security Training Centre. The time frame was this: he was sentenced in August 1979 to life imprisonment. He was transferred to Cadell in January 1984, four years after sentence. He escaped in May 1984, four months after transfer to Cadell. He was recaptured on 9 July after shooting at police with a submachine gun, and it is reported that during his time away from Cadell he was wanted for questioning with respect to several bank robberies in Adelaide. At the time when the shadow Minister of Correctional Services took the Minister to task over the security rating system the Minister is reported to have said that he was satisfied with the system and that if a prisoner maintained a good record and showed that he could be trusted his rating changed. He is also reported to have said that Kuznik had earned the respect of the prison management and as a result had been sent to Cadell in January. Four years in a life sentence is not such a long time to behave in order to get a crack at freedom.

The Minister also said that he was undertaking an inquiry into Kuznik's escape. The matter is one of considerable public concern: that someone of this sort can apparently so easily be transferred to a minimum security area and then escape and be free for six or seven weeks. My questions to the Minister are:

1. What were the criteria that allowed a convicted murderer, whom police describe as dangerous, to be transferred to a minimum security centre for trusty prisoners?

2. Have those criteria changed since May 1984 and, if they have, how have they been changed?

3. Who conducted the inquiry into the transfer of Kuznik to Cadell, and has a report been received?

4. If a report has been received, will it be released publicly and, if it has not been received, when is it likely to be received?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The facts, rather than the opinions, are substantially correct as the Hon. Mr Griffin outlined. I have very little to add to what I have stated publicly about Kuznik or any other prisoner. I will be quite happy to let the Hon. Mr Griffin have the departmental instruction on which prisoner assessments are made.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: That can be made public, too?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will think about that.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: It is a matter of concern. People should have some knowledge of how these sorts of decisions are made.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Let me say this about making things public in correctional services: I am very happy to make any material that I have about correctional services available to the Opposition. I have already demonstrated that in giving the Hon. Mr Wotton a full briefing on the recent escape from Yatala. The reason why I have some hesitation in responding to the Hon. Mr Griffin as regards whether I will make this, that or the other public is that I would like a little time to think about whether there are any security implications in making those documents public. It may well be that there are none, in which case it is a public document and anyone can have it; I have no objection to that. Certainly, any documents that we have that I would not like to make public for security or legal reasons the Opposition is very welcome to have.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: We abide by the request.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have never suggested otherwise. When the honourable member interjected as I was answering, that was why I had some doubts. It may well be that there is no security or legal reason why this departmental instruction should not be made public, but I will look at it before I do that. The fact is that if there is not any it will already be public anyway. I will give the honourable member a copy.

I am satisfied that the procedures were gone through to the best of the ability of the Department of Correctional Services. There was one further factor in respect of Kuznik and a number of people at the time when Kuznik was transferred to Cadell. That was the demolition of C Division at Yatala, which was necessary to implement the Yatala master plan for the building programme. Everyone will agree that that had to proceed as soon as possible.

That left us with a shortage of accommodation at Yatala at that time. As all honourable members know, Adelaide Gaol is full and, until such time as we get our building programme in place, we will have these difficulties. The main difficulty was that C Division had to come down to provide space for rebuilding and the like. That was the further complicating factor in respect of Kuznik. But Kuznik's behaviour while he has been in prison has been exemplary. He never brought attention to himself at all and, as we do daily in Correctional Services, we make an assessment of people. The human beings who are making assessments of human beings can never be 100 per cent correct. I suppose the only real answer if one does not want any incidents or escapes is to classify everyone as requiring 'high security' accommodation, and so we have to build something better than Yatala to keep them in. We would have to build something better than Alcatraz to keep them in as well. That is the only thing one can do.

We do not select people on the basis that they are likely to escape and embarrass us. Obviously, we err where we can on the side of conservatism, but where one has people assessing other people one will not get one 100 per cent success. That applies equally in the Correctional Services area as it does in any other area of human contact. It is aiming too high to expect perfection in every case.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Except in relation to murderers like this.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is your opinion, and the honourable member is perfectly entitled to his opinion. All murderers with one or two exceptions, who die in custody, will be coming out one day: they will all be released one day. The factors that one has to consider and the programmes that one has to instigate to ensure that such people will be better when they come out of gaol than when they went in are very complex.

How anyone, whether it be the Hon. Mr Griffin or anyone else, can guarantee that the assessment made by a team of human beings about another human being will always be 100 per cent correct (whether they are murderers or not) is very difficult. If I wanted to be political I could refer to one person who was convicted for murder and about whom the Hon. Mr Griffin had a fair bit to do with his staying in gaol. Would the honourable member have classified that person as requiring high, medium or low security? It would be a difficult decision. I can only say that we do our best. I am sure that the previous Government did its best. I have no reason to believe otherwise. The previous Government had escapes during its period of office by some highly notorious prisoners. This Government has encountered other escapes and I am sure that Ministers of Correctional Services, if this Council is still going in 50 years, will still be answering the same questions from the Opposition and giving similar answers.

I am not sure of the material that the Hon. Mr Griffin wants. If he wants to see me at the end of Question Time, any material that I have I will be delighted to provide to him and Mr Wotton to examine as to the assessments made.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I desire to ask a supplementary question. I asked two other questions. Who conducted the inquiry into the transfer of Kuznik to Cadell? Has the report been received? If it has not been received, when is it expected? Will the report be released publicly?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The inquiry was conducted by the Department at my request. Yes, I have received a report. In regard to making it public, I will certainly make it available to the Opposition but I will take the questions on notice about making the report public and have a think about it.

MEDICARE

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Health a question on the schedule fees.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I have been approached by a number of constituents who have expressed concern that when they sent an account from a doctor to Medicare the amount they received back from Medicare was much less than 85 per cent of the account from the doctor. I have tried to explain to them that the 85 per cent rebate on Medicare is 85 per cent of the schedule fee, which is a fee derived by independent arbitration at the Commonwealth level.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: What about gap insurance?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Gap insurance would not go above 100 per cent of the scheduled fee, and it never did. Of course, there is no legislation or other means of preventing medical practitioners from charging above the schedule fee should they wish to do so. Can the Minister of Health provide the Council with any information about the impact of Medicare since its introduction on the hospital system and, in particular, can he advise the Council if any significant trends have emerged in relation to this compliance or non-compliance by doctors with the schedule fees?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The honourable member was kind enough, as she often is, to mention to me a few moments before Question Time that she would be seeking information along the lines suggested, and since my memory, as I move into incipient middle age is not always perfect, I took the trouble to have a little prompt sheet prepared with some of the statistics on it.

We have had preliminary figures from Medicare which indicate broad trends in billing practices and hospital usage. I would like to emphasise to the Council that we need more figures over a longer period and more detailed analysis of those figures before we can draw concrete conclusions. Subject to that condition I am happy to outline some of the information that we have been given. First, let me detail the figures relating to the rate of compliance with the schedule fee and the extent of direct billing in the five months from 1 February 1984 to 30 June 1984.

The figures show that 43.2 per cent of the 2 455 000 services processed by Medicare in South Australia were direct billed. Another 32.9 per cent of services were charged at or below the schedule fee; that is, a total of 76.1 per cent were either bulk billed or charged at or below the schedule fee. Further, 23.9 per cent, that is, the remainder of the percentage of services, were charged above the schedule fee and 10.6 per cent of all accounts were charged at more than 10 per cent above that Commonwealth Medical Benefit schedule fee compared with a national average of 14.6 per cent. Of services that were not directly billed, the proportion of GP services that were at or below the schedule fee was 49 per cent in South Australia compared with 40 per cent as a national average.

The proportion of specialist services at or below the scheduled fee for private services which were not direct-billed was 76.3 per cent in South Australia, compared with a 69.7 per cent national average. We have also received figures for that period on the number of occupied bed days in South Australia's recognised (public) hospitals. These indicate that overall levels of activity—comparing June 1984 with June 1983—are not significantly changed. However, private patient admissions to the State's recognised hospital system fell from 30.5 per cent in June 1983 to 20.7 per cent in June 1984.

The advent of Medicare brought an immediate and reasonably dramatic fall in private patient admissions in the non-metropolitan recognised hospitals. In January 1984, the month immediately prior to the introduction of Medicare, private patient admissions to these non-metropolitan hospitals accounted for 48.3 per cent of the total, but in February, the first month after the introduction of Medicare, the figure had dropped to 21.7 per cent (in other words, from 48.3 per cent to 21.7 per cent). The fall-off in private patient admission and private occupied bed days in metropolitan recognised hospitals (that is, our major teaching and public hospitals) was not as large or as immediate, but at June 1984 the proportions for both metropolitan and non-metropolitan recognised hospitals were approximately the same.

Regarding private health insurance, which I know is also a matter of concern, the preliminary advice supplied by Mutual/N.H.S.A. indicates that there has been a drop of 12 per cent in what are called hospital contributor units in South Australia since 1 February 1984. 'Hospital contributor units' are the basic hospital insurance cover, so there was a 12 per cent drop there. On the other hand, the drop in contributor units for extras has been only 1.5 per cent. This would appear to confirm what many of us believed (and what I said consistently prior to the introduction of Medicare), that Medicare has brought very real benefits to Australians and South Australians at the lower end of the pay scale who were having an enormous struggle to purchase basic hospital insurance. In other words, I contend that that 12 per cent is those people who were being forced by the previous scheme to buy private hospital insurance that they could not afford. However, of those who were fortunate enough to be in the higher income brackets (in other words, those who take the full package, including extras) have only dropped by 1.5 per cent, which is very marginal. By and large, those people have retained private insurance cover over and above their basic Medicare cover.

CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the Church of Scientology.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: Before asking my question I will read a letter from a constituent and then proceed by way of a short explanation to my question. I have disguised the identity of the victim in this matter. The letter reads as follows:

> I wish to draw your attention to the activities, in Adelaide, of the cult known as the Church of Scientology. Last Sunday, at approximate 4 p.m., my relative 'X' was accosted in King William Street by a member of this organisation pretending that he was carrying out a survey. This man (Mr Pat Molloy, by name) subsequently conducted X to the Scientology headquarters in

Waymouth Street where X was questioned and counselled for a period of six hours.

By 10 p.m. X had been influenced into signing a contract for a 'course' in Scientology. Members of the cult demanded immediate payment of $400 for the course and $257 for books and thereupon drove X home, where X handed over a bank withdrawal form for the amount, which was paid to the Scientology organisation when banking business opened on Monday.

Fortunately, X telephoned me and I was able to point out the inherent danger in the situation. X returned on the Monday to the Scientology office and informed a Mr Stuart Payne—the Financial Director—of the fact that X did not wish to proceed with the business. X had a very upsetting two hours with Mr Payne, even though X was accompanied by one of X's friends. The $400 was recovered, but Scientology will not accept the books for return; a net loss of $257.

The letter goes on to express great displeasure at what happened. There is no doubt that the Hubbard Scientology/Dianetics organisation has a history of exploitation. I have previously described its use of advertisements in the employment columns of newspapers to attract vulnerable people to sign contracts for wierd psychological treatments. It has used handbills offering free intelligence testing to lure people to its membership. It has been sued in many countries of the world. It has been prohibited for a time in South Australia. It has been labelled as dangerous to mental health. It has attracted the attention of the Department of Labour because of the miserable wages paid to some of its victims. It has persistently enriched those people at its very head. My questions are:

1. Is there any area of law—

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: I know that you are their friend, Frank, but just wait a minute.

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

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: My questions are as follows:

1. Is there any area of law or any by-law to prevent citizens being accosted in the city streets by people pretending to conduct surveys or distributing handbills, etc.?

2. Is there a cooling off period or any way of providing a 'cooling off period' in relation to contracts signed or goods purchased where the original contact was an unsolicited contact in the street?

3. If and when the Minister of Health gives the Psychological Practices Act some teeth, will the Government either fund the Psychological Board to enable it to afford to conduct prosecutions or, alternatively, conduct prosecutions at Government expense using Crown Law resources?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: As the honourable member knows, the Church of Scientology is not a prohibited organisation in South Australia. The activities of this organisation, or any other organisation practising in a similar way, that may be considered to offend the law, should be reported. There is the Psychological Practices Act, which was passed in the late 1960s, to which recourse can be made. If those reports are found to be justified, presumably action can be taken.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: No, it can't. They can't afford counsel and can't use the Crown Law Department.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member says that they cannot use the Crown Law Department and cannot afford counsel. However, the question is whether or not they believe that a prosecution is justified on the facts that are given to them. I would be very surprised if the Board had received information that it felt it should act on and then found that it was unable to do so purely because of financial constraints.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: It is toothless.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That is a different argument.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: If it had teeth it could not afford counsel.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member asked his question and must now listen to the answer.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: If the Psychological Practices Board believed that a complaint was justified and that action should be taken under the Act, I feel sure that resources would be made available to enable a prosecution to be taken. The honourable member's constituent may care to raise this matter with that Board. There are local council by-laws dealing with the handing out of handbills, but I am not completely *au fait* with all the details in relation to that matter. I know that people have been prosecuted in the past for this sort of activity. As to the matter of a cooling off period, there is a cooling off period in relation to door to door sales, but I doubt whether it would apply in the situation that the honourable member has outlined.

There are two questions that come to mind as a result of the honourable member's contribution: first, was there any activity which would contravene the Psychological Practices Act? In that respect I suggest that the honourable member place the information before the Psychological Practices Board; alternatively, he can refer it to the Minister of Health. The second question is whether or not from a consumer's point of view there is any cause for concern as a result of the activities of the Church of Scientology. From time to time, the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs receives complaints, which are investigated, about the activities of the Church of Scientology. I will ascertain for the honourable member the level of complaint, and I will also refer this question to the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs for a report.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: HON. Dr RITSON'S REMARK

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Agriculture): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: During the explanation of a question asked by the Hon. Dr Ritson a moment ago about the Church of Scientology, I interjected, quite out of order, and that is very unusual for me. When the Hon. Dr Ritson was listing the alleged atrocities perpetrated by the Church of Scientology, I said that it had received a favourable report from the High Court.

I am quite sure that the Hon. Dr Ritson did not hear what I said, but his response was 'We know, Frank, you are a friend of them' or 'You are one of their friends'. I find that to be quite an astonishing remark. As far as I know, in my life I have never met a member of the Church of Scientology but, if I have, it was inadvertently and I certainly have no memory of it—none whatsoever.

I have no idea how the Hon. Dr Ritson came to make such a remark. I can only believe that the religion to which he belongs has perhaps done something to his mind, just as he claims that the religion to which these other people belong does something to their minds. I have no doubt that if I was in the least bit interested to examine the Hon. Dr Ritson's religion and the religion of the Church of Scientology I may find both of them equally bizarre.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER

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

That, for this session, Standing Order No. 14 be suspended.

I remind the Council that Standing Order No. 14 prohibits anything, except matters of a formal nature, being dealt

with prior to the conclusion of the Address in Reply debate. It has been customary over the past few years at least to move that this Standing Order be suspended. I indicate that it is being done again to enable the introduction of some legislation and possibly some debate on that legislation but, more importantly, to enable honourable members to be advised of the legislation as soon as possible so that when the debate on the Address in Reply is concluded honourable members will be ready to proceed with the debate on the Bills that are introduced. I anticipate that the usual priority will be given to the Address in Reply debate, although it may be possible to deal with some of those Bills prior to the conclusion of the Address in Reply debate.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

1. We, the members of the Legislative Council, thank Your Excellency for the Speech with which you have been pleased to open Parliament.
2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to all matters placed before us.
3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I move:

That the Address in Reply as read be adopted.

It is a privilege to be able to move the motion in this Address in Reply debate as we open the third session of the Forty-fifth Parliament. I am sure in this session we shall continue to give wise and careful deliberation to the important legislation brought before us by the Government. Like any Labor Government, this current Government considers the best interests of the people of this State, and it has an excellent record of legislating for their benefit. The working people of South Australia have indeed gained enormously from the actions, both legislative and executive, of this Government. I am sure that all South Australians are glad that they elected this Government in November 1982. I am confident that they will recognise the many achievements on their behalf and will return the Bannon team at the next election in about 18 months time.

During his Speech, His Excellency the Governor mentioned the deaths of four past members of the House of Assembly since he last addressed us. I am sure that all members will join with me in expressing sympathy to their families and friends. Two of those members I knew well, having sat in the same Party Caucus with them for many years. It is indeed a reminder of our own advancing age and our mortality when erstwhile colleagues are remembered in this place on the occasion of their deaths. I am sure that we all sometimes wonder about how the news of our own deaths will be received in this Chamber.

While I certainly hope that all present today will live to a ripe old age, it has occurred to me that those who die relatively young are likely to have contemporaries still sitting here, who will remember their odd quirks and characteristics, hopefully with fondness; whereas those who live to be octagenarians or nonagenarians will have no acquaintances left here, and their passing will be recorded with dignity but with no personal touches.

Since the Parliament rose in May I had the opportunity of travelling overseas on a six week study tour. Apparently, my absence from Adelaide was not noticed by Stephen Middleton, as he failed to add my name to those he listed in the *News* last week as having been out of Australia. I do not know whether I should be offended or pleased that I was not included in his list. I am certainly grateful to the Government for the opportunity to undertake the study tour, as I learnt a great deal which I hope will be of benefit to the people of this State.

I do not wish to bore honourable members with a detailed travelogue and I certainly shall not pass my photos around, but I should like to share with my colleagues in this place the information that I acquired regarding specific programmes for women in a number of European countries. It is true that I visited only six countries in Europe, and in one of them I had no official visits so I did not glean any information on the matters I was examining. However, I think I can say with confidence that all five of the other countries are way ahead of Australia in matters of great concern to women, such as child care and maternity leave. The United Kingdom is lagging badly behind its partners in the EEC, and Scandinavia could teach the EEC a thing or two.

Not surprisingly, the one Communist country about which I have information, Bulgaria, is very forward thinking and progressive in its programmes. But even the United Kingdom is advanced compared to Australia. Although no further forward steps are being taken under the dead hand of Thatcherism in the United Kingdom, previous Governments in that country achieved much that is not even dreamt of in this country, and most of these gains have not been dissipated by the Thatcher Government. I think it is time that we realised what is happening in other countries in the developed world and ceased taking the attitude, to misquote Pangloss, that 'All is the best in this best of possible countries.'

To be more specific, let me quote a few facts. In Sweden 75 per cent of women between the ages of 16 and 65 are in the workforce. This is the highest proportion of women working in Europe. Many of them, it is true, work part time, although the part-time jobs are usually at least half time. The average number of hours worked per week is about 30 for women compared to 40 for men. There are child care places for 40 per cent of the children from birth to school age, divided roughly equally between day care centres and a type of family day care. There is an urgent need for more child care places, as a recent survey revealed a demand for 90 000 more places than are currently available. So a high priority is being given by the Social Democrat Government to providing these places.

When a child is born, the parents are entitled to 12 months leave, which can be taken by either parent to look after the child. For the first nine months, the parent who stays home receives 90 per cent of his or her usual salary or wage and the remaining three months are paid at a standard basic rate. This payment is made by the State from the general social security insurance, which also covers pensions, sick leave, redundancy payments, and so on. This insurance fund is contributed to by every employer as a pay-roll tax and is apparently very much in credit at present. The 12 months parental leave can be shared by the parents, though employers can object if either parent wishes to take more than two separate periods, and of course the two parents cannot take leave simultaneously.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: With or without pay?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I have just said that it is with 90 per cent of usual pay for nine months. I need hardly add that every employee is by law guaranteed his or her job back at the end of any period of parental leave. This system of parental leave started as maternity leave only, back in 1935 and initially it was for only three months, though even then with 90 per cent of the usual salary or wages. The time was extended to six months in 1955, then nine months, and finally 12 months. In 1974 the scheme was extended to

fathers, becoming a true parental leave to look after young children, and to this day it is, I think, one of the few parental as opposed to maternity leave schemes operating in the world. Certainly, the Communist countries with their excellent maternity leave provisions have no scheme of parental leave.

When fathers first became eligible to share this parental leave with mothers in 1974, only 2 per cent of new fathers availed themselves of the opportunity, but now, nine years later, figures show that 25 per cent of new fathers are using at least some part of the nine months at 90 per cent salary to stay at home and mind their children. They average 30 days at home each at present. It is certainly expected that as time passes the proportion of fathers being thus involved in caring for their young children will rise markedly, particularly as statistics show that the younger the father the more likely he is to avail himself of the scheme. The people to whom I spoke in Sweden were delighted with this trend as showing a great strengthening of the family unit and a true sharing of the joys and responsibilities of parenthood. I should add that three of the nine months at 90 per cent of salary can be postponed and taken by either parent at any time before the child turns eight but that in practice this very rarely occurs.

Another Swedish innovation that we could well emulate is a system of sick leave for working parents to look after a sick child. This leave can also be taken by either parent on 90 per cent pay for up to 60 days per child per year and it applies to any child of the couple up to the age of 17 years. There was a fair degree of trepidation on the part of employers particularly when this scheme was introduced a few years ago in 1977, but these fears have now abated as statistics are emerging on its use. About 50 per cent of families make use of this children's sick leave. The other 50 per cent never avail themselves of this scheme. The families that use this children's sick leave average five days per year, divided roughly equally between the mother and father, and there has been a concomitant decline in the number of days of sick leave taken by workers generally. This suggests very strongly that many parents previously were taking a sickie for themselves when their child was sick and that they can now be honest about their reasons for having a day or two at home. There is certainly no suggestion of abuse of this scheme, and the costs to employers through the social security insurance have not risen since its introduction.

One other matter that I wish to consider when discussing Swedish programmes to benefit women is that of maintenance for children of separated or divorced parents. Maintenance is set by law and is indexed regularly. It is currently set at 700 kroner a month per child, which is equivalent to about $A100 a month per child. If the parent who does not have custody cannot afford to pay this sum because of either low wages or other family responsibilities, the State pays the difference between what he or she can afford and the statutory sum. If the parent without custody does not pay at all, as unfortunately happens all too often in this country, the State pays the entire sum and then chases up the errant spouse to reclaim the money from him or her. This seems to me an admirable system in that, first, the maintenance is set at a level that realistically reflects the cost of maintaining a child and, secondly, that the spouse with the child does not have to take steps to chase up the other spouse in the case of non-payment. The resources of an individual are far less than those of the State in searching for a defaulter, and the State obviously is more able to recover moneys owed than is an individual. As the moneys are owed to the State and not to the other parent, the State has a real incentive to be efficient in the search for the defaulter.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: Did someone write this for you? It is not your style.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I wrote every word of it myself. I turn now to Norway, another Scandinavian country, but with less than half the population of Sweden. I certainly mean no offence to anyone when I say that it appeared to me that the relationship between Norway and Sweden resembled, in many respects, the relationship between New Zealand and Australia. I was told that in Norway 51 per cent of women between the ages of 16 years and 74 years are in the workforce. Without knowing the age distribution of the population I cannot compare this figure with the 75 per cent of women between the ages of 16 years and 65 years in Sweden who are in the workforce as the age range quoted is different. One can at least make meaningful comparisons with Australia when we know that in Norway 60 per cent of all married women are in the workforce, whereas the corresponding figure for Australia is 47 per cent.

The average time worked per week by women in Norway is 29 hours, which is slightly less than in Sweden. As in Sweden, Norway has an extensive child care system, having places for 26 per cent of all children under school age in what are called kindergartens. These kindergartens are different from our kindergartens as they provide care and education for children from 8 o'clock in the morning to 5 o'clock in the evening if required and also provide after school care for any child in grades 1 to 3 of school. Family day care arrangements are also available, although these are not Government sponsored or supervised as in Sweden. These extensive kindergarten arrangements are surely a sign that the Scandinavian countries take seriously the needs of the mothers and children in their countries and accept the responsibility for providing for those needs.

It is not a question of arguing endlessly about what mothers should or should not do but an acceptance of the reality of the social situation in these countries and a willingness to provide what the people want without moral judgments on the part of the politicians. I should add that the kindergartens are not free, although they are heavily subsidised by both central and local governments. Payments by parents can be quite high but are means tested so that only the very wealthy pay the full amount and those on low wages pay nothing at all. However, parents' contributions are tax deductible up to a quite generous ceiling, which compares more than favourably with this country, where education expenses are tax deductible but child care expenses are not. Such a distinction seems to me to be quite absurd, particularly as anyone who has ever had anything to do with small children knows that the difference between care and education is quite unreal and artificial anyway.

Looking now at maternity leave, the Norwegian system is not as extensive or generous as the Swedish system, although the birth rate is the same in the two countries. In Norway there is maternity leave only and fathers cannot stay home to look after their children although, as in Sweden, all the women's groups are pressing for a change to parental leave. Norwegian mothers are paid their full salary or wages—not the 90 per cent that applies in Sweden—for only 18 weeks, which is half the time for which Swedish parents receive pay. Mothers can stay home for a total of 12 months and be guaranteed their job back, payments being made by the State through a social security insurance scheme identical to that of Sweden.

There is also a provision for children's sick leave in Norway, but only for 10 days per parent per year; that is, it does not vary with the number of children in the family and each parent cannot take more than 10 days per year. I was told that this was done so that parents with many children would not be disadvantaged in the job market and,

by insisting that neither parent can take more than a certain number of days, women will not be disadvantaged in the job market—a point of some validity it seems to me.

I should add, however, that sole parents can take up to 20 days per year so that their children are not disadvantaged compared with those children with two parents. Whether this results in discrimination against sole parents in getting jobs, I do not know. I have no figures on what use is made of this children's sick leave provision in Norway as it is fairly recent and no statistics are yet available. However, those to whom I spoke felt that its use was probably much the same as in Sweden, that is, about five days a year for the 50 per cent of families who avail themselves of the provision. One extra refinement in Norway is that a parent can take children's sick leave if the usual carer of the child is ill, rather than the child itself. This is a thoughtful addition to the scheme that will not add to the cost as the total number of days available remains the same.

I turn now to the situation in France, the leader in the EEC countries in matters of concern to women. I was told that in France 67 per cent of women between the ages of 25 years and 55 years are in the workforce. This statistic is hard to compare with that of Scandinavia because of the different age range that is used. The French do not feel that this is a high percentage compared with other countries, but where they differ is that only 23 per cent of women in the workforce are part-time workers—77 per cent of them being full-time workers. This is certainly unusual in European and Australian terms. Those concerned with women's status in France are glad of this high proportion of full-time women workers, as it reduces the traditional concern of unions about part-time workers undermining established rights achieved by unions, it enables a very high percentage of unionisation of women workers to be achieved and it also makes it easier to achieve promotional opportunities and other aspects of equal opportunity for women in the workforce.

With regard to child care provisions, France has a system of Ecoles Maternelles, which are similar to our kindergartens, but they operate, as in Sweden, from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. each day. In France these centres take children from the age of three years and currently the Ecoles Maternelles have sufficient places to cater for 86 per cent of the three to five year old population. This is a remarkable achievement and compares more than favourably with our system of kindergartens, which cater admittedly for over 90 per cent of children, but of four year olds only, and for only 2½ to three hours per day—not for up to nine hours per day.

This French system certainly removes any fears of parents regarding the provision of care for their children from the age of three years upwards and it is considered that the demands of this age group are fully satisfied. These centres are entirely free to parents, as is the public school system to which the children transfer at the age of six years.

The Ecoles Maternelles will accept two to three year olds also but they currently have places for only about a third of all such children in the country, and it is felt that more places are required for this age group. For the nought to two year olds there is an extensive system of creches and family day care centres, which cater for about 20 per cent of children of this age group. Payment is required for this care but on a means tested basis. The carers are all paid by the State or local government, which contributes far more than it receives back from the parents. The French are very proud of their creche and family day care systems where the carers are all trained and supervised and given regular in-service training and help with their important job, although they admit that more are required for the younger age groups as the demand exceeds the supply.

With regard to maternity leave in France, all women get a maximum of 20 weeks leave on the birth of a child and they must take a minimum of eight weeks leave, all on full pay. The 20 weeks on full pay will be extended if the birth is a multiple one or if it is the third child in a family, although I am not sure by how much. The payments are made from the social security insurance scheme, which resembles that of the Scandinavian countries. After this 20 weeks paid leave comes parental leave of up to two years, which can be taken by either parent or shared between them, but which is unpaid. However, job security is assured to any parent who stays at home with a child up to the age of two years. I might add that this system of parental leave was instituted in 1978 by the then conservative Government in France; so it is hardly a nasty Socialist plot.

Furthermore, as the leave is unpaid beyond 20 weeks, a compensatory payment is made to all families for three years after the birth of a child of 650 francs per month, which is about $A93 per month, or about $A23 per week. This latter payment is tax free and is continued beyond the three years if the child is a third child, as statistics show that only 30 per cent of mothers with three or more children are in the workforce. If the mother was in the workforce before the child was born—and this applies to all children—the payment made is about 20 per cent greater, to compensate for the lack of earnings while a parent stays home with the child. I should add that these payments are additional to the generous child endowment payments made for all dependent children in France and that for some poorer families up to 50 per cent of their total income comes from these various forms of financial assistance for children.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: There must be a lot of affluence over there for them to be able to afford that.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I do not think that they are as prosperous as we are in Australia, but they have a good system of social priorities. There is no general provision for leave for parents who have sick children in France, although many awards include such a provision for up to 12 days a year for parents, but I was not able to find out what proportion of the workforce has this kind of leave available.

Finally, I turn to the situation in the United Kingdom, which is not as generous as the rest of the EEC. Women who are pregnant get a maternity allowance of 26 pounds a week for 18 weeks, provided that they have worked in the past three years. All pregnant women get a lump sum of 25 pounds as a contribution to layette expenses which, for those in necessitous circumstances, can be increased up to 150 pounds. As well, women in the workforce who are full-time employees or part-time employees who work more than 16 hours a week, provided that they have been two years with the same employer, are entitled to 90 per cent of their salary or wages for six weeks only after the birth of a child.

Part-time employees who work less than 16 hours a week and who have been with the same employer for five years are also entitled to this six weeks paid maternity leave at 90 per cent of earnings. These payments come from a fund run by the central Government and contributed to by all employers on a pay-roll basis; it also finances redundancy payments to workers throughout the country. I was told that the maternity side of this fund is well in credit, though the redundancy accounts are well in debit at the moment. Last year the maternity leave scheme paid out 62 million pounds for 130 000 births.

As well as this short, paid maternity leave, any woman who has qualified for the six weeks paid leave can have unpaid leave for up to six months after the birth of a child and be guaranteed her job back or a similar one with the same employer. I compare this six months in the United

Kingdom with the 12 months in Scandinavia and two years in France.

A new twist was introduced recently by the Thatcher Government in that the employer can write to the woman seven weeks after the birth of her child, inquiring whether she intends returning to work. If she does not reply in the affirmative in a specified time she forfeits the right to have her job back. What I have quoted are the minimum maternity leave provisions in the United Kingdom. Some employers—and this includes the Civil Service—provide more generous provisions, such as eight weeks paid leave instead of six weeks; or 12 weeks paid leave if a commitment is given beforehand to return to work. The unpaid leave can be extended from 26 weeks to 44 weeks for civil servants, and Civil Service employees at any level can opt at any time to change to part-time work and equally to opt back into full-time work at their convenience. I was told that only 14 per cent of mothers returned to work within six months of the birth of a child, but in view of the more generous provisions of unpaid leave for an unknown proportion of the workforce this figure has very little meaning.

There is no provision for leave to look after sick children in the United Kingdom; nor is general parental leave available that enables a father to share in the care of his child. However, there is considerable pressure from the rest of the European community for the United Kingdom to turn its maternity leave scheme into a parental leave scheme, as the EEC is attempting to achieve social as well as economic uniformity, and it may not be long before it is introduced in the United Kingdom. I understand that it depends very largely on the outcome of a case that is currently being conducted before the European Court; it may have been decided by now, but I have not heard its result.

Child care services in the United Kingdom seem minimal and disorganised. Surveys show that most parents rely on grandmothers, friends or neighbours or, to a large extent, husbands on shift work. Some day nurseries are provided by public authorities, but they are very strongly means tested and it would be rare for the average two-parent family to qualify for acceptance. The fact that the very few public centres cater mainly for disadvantaged children means that most middle class parents disparage such centres and turn to the private sector or make private arrangements. Those to whom I spoke feared that this would lead to a two-tiered system in the United Kingdom, with consequent social segregation and class snobberies involved, and I hope that we will never see the emergence of such a class segregation in child care in this country.

Honourable members may wonder why I have given such a lengthy discourse on the maternity leave and child care provisions of some of the countries that I have recently visited. I have done so because these countries have not only adopted a policy of equal opportunity for women but are determined to achieve equal opportunity in the workforce. The first and most fundamental measure of equal opportunity is to ensure that women are not disadvantaged in the labour market compared to men by the biological fact that they alone give birth to children or by the social situation of women being the main providers of care for their young children. Generous maternity leave provisions do not discourage women from having children or from having to choose between working and having a family, which is a choice that no man ever has to make. The extension of maternity leave to general parental leave again is a measure of equal opportunity. In this case, it is equal opportunity for fathers to care for their children, thus strengthening family life and allowing far greater equality between fathers and mothers both in the workforce and in the home.

The provision of quality child care facilities, which are generally available to all who want them, is again an essential measure to give women equal opportunity in the work force. I need hardly add that here in Australia we have nothing like the maternity leave, parental leave or child care facilities operating in most of Western Europe. I expect the cry will arise that we cannot afford them. It has already. However, it seems to me that we cannot afford not to provide such services if we are serious about equal opportunities for women.

Other countries far less prosperous than Australia, including all the countries of Eastern Europe, manage to implement such measures to help the women of their communities, and we should do so here as speedily as possible. I challenge all who say that they believe in equal opportunity for women to say how that can be achieved in the absence of proper child care, and proper maternity and parental leave.

I would like to give a brief summary of some of the Government organisations set up in the countries I visited to deal with women's concerns. In Sweden there is a Secretariat for Equal Opportunity, which is part of the bureaucracy. There is also an Equality Council with representatives from 23 different organisations, including a number of politicians, who advise the Secretariat on programmes and policy to be followed. Currently, the Secretariat is implementing a programme for equality in industry and it has a budget of 10 million kroner (about $1.3 million). This programme has five main components. First, 3 million kroner is available to technical colleges to encourage women into technical subjects and to revise the curricula to make them more relevant to women. Secondly, 1 million kroner is allocated to train women already in technical jobs to go into schools to talk to girls in the eighth grade to encourage them to choose more technical streams in their subsequent education.

Thirdly, 600 000 kroner is allocated to provide special computer education for women in low levels of industry, particularly those whose jobs are being threatened by automation. Fourthly, 2 million kroner is provided for special courses in mathematics, physics and welding for women with low levels of skills. This group includes a two-year theoretical and practical course in the aeroplane industry for unemployed women. Fifthly, 3 million kroner is allocated for projects initiated by community groups, and apparently applications have poured in. Further, 1 million kroner was allocated for evaluation of the effects of the programme, and this evaluation should be completed and available by the end of this year. My guess is that it will be published in English as well as Swedish, as most Swedish Government publications are available in both languages, or indeed in many languages. If one goes to the Swedish Information Centre in the centre of Stockholm one will find that this is the case. Further, 28 per cent of the politicians in Sweden are women and, in the ruling Social Democratic Party, 32 per cent of the members of Parliament are women, and five out of 20 Ministers—25 per cent—are also women.

In Norway, the Equality Act was passed in 1980 and a plan of action for equality between the sexes was then set up. A report is expected soon on the progress of this plan and I would expect it to be available in English. I hope that I will be able to receive it in due course.

The United Kingdom has an Equal Opportunities Commission that administers the Sex Discrimination and Equal Pay Acts in a similar manner to that of our Commissioner for Equal Opportunity for South Australia. However, that Commission has the duty to comment on all Government proposals as to their effect on women. It recommends changes to the law and bureaucratic procedures to increase opportunities for women. Currently, it is implementing special training courses for women in non-traditional employ-

ment areas as well as providing courses for women who wish to return to the labour force after a period at home.

This Equal Opportunities Commission is also running a campaign for women in science and engineering aimed at both employers and girls still at school. The Chairperson of the Commission is an engineer herself. Sex discrimination in superannuation provisions is presently permitted in the United Kingdom, as it is here, but pressure from both the Equal Opportunities Commission and the European community is expected to lead to a change in this situation before long.

Finally, in France the Mitterand Government has set up a Ministry for the Rights of Women—Le Ministere des Droits de la Femme. This has an annual budget of about 100 million francs ($15 million) and it has over 100 employees. The Ministry has run numerous campaigns since being created three years ago. It started with making contraception readily available to all French women. For that campaign the Ministry published 12 million leaflets and ran advertisements on prime time television, in the Metro, on the buses and so on. The Ministry then ensured that abortion was made free under the health system.

Under the previous conservative Government women had the right to abortion on demand in the first trimester of pregnancy, but it was not paid for as part of the national health system. It now is. Furthermore, the Mitterand Government found that, despite the liberal law on abortion, many hospitals were refusing to perform the operation, so limiting its availability. The Government then stated that no hospital—public or private—would get a cent of public funding unless it offered both contraception and abortion facilities in its services. Surprise, surprise! In no time at all, all the hospitals fell into line and these services are now readily available. Perhaps there is a lesson here for the Australian and State Governments. The Ministry in France has also set up 200 information centres for women throughout the country similar to our Women's Information Switchboard. They help women by supplying information about women's rights.

The Ministry also has run a large campaign about desegregating the workforce and encouraging girls to go into non-traditional careers. This campaign also used television extensively, and one of the television spots won the award as the best advertisement of the year. I have a poster from this campaign hanging on the wall in my room upstairs and I would be delighted to show it to any honourable members who might be interested.

After three years of existence the Ministry had a survey conducted throughout France to determine the impact it was having. It was delighted to find that 76 per cent of women believed that the Ministry was absolutely indispensable and that the contraception campaign had an 82 per cent approval rating. That is a result even Bob Hawke would envy. In 1983 the French Parliament passed a law on professional equality between men and women—in effect, an affirmative action law for all areas of employment. Under this law all firms or institutions with more than 300 employees must prepare an equal opportunity management plan and make that plan available to the State and make it public. The State will meet any costs in establishing and implementing the plan, and there will be extra financial help to firms which employ women in non-traditional areas.

Within two years the affirmative action procedures will be extended to all firms with at least 50 employees, and a special tripartite committee of Government, unions and employers has been set up to monitor the implementation of the law. Those I spoke to expect to see marked changes in the distribution of the sexes in the workforce within about five years. The Civil Service in France began such a programme several years ago and, for example, the French Police Force has already changed from 2 per cent to 25 per cent women members.

I have spoken at some length on a few of the matters I managed to investigate while on my recent study tour. I have by no means mentioned all I learnt while overseas, but I do not wish to try the patience of members too far on this occasion. Furthermore, much of the material and documentation that I collected has not yet arrived back in Australia, as it was too voluminous to carry with me, and I did not wish to use the diplomatic bag for my material. I posted it back to Australia. It has not yet arrived here.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett: It could have come as unaccompanied baggage.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: It is coming as unaccompanied postage. When, or should I say 'if', it reaches me I shall be happy to expand on the topics mentioned, and others also, should any members be interested. I can certainly say with confidence that I learnt a great deal, and feel I profited enormously from my study tour. I hope that the Parliament and people of South Australia will also benefit as a result.

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: Mr President, it is my privilege to second the motion moved by the Hon. Ms Levy in support of His Excellency's Speech. In so doing, I wish, first, to refer to the initial part of His Excellency's address in which he expressed regret at the death of four former members of this Parliament: Mr Harold Welbourne King; Mr Harold Howard O'Neil; Mr Ernest Claude Allen, and Mr Charles John Wells. I join His Excellency in expressing my deepest sympathy to their families in their sad loss.

I will take this opportunity, Sir, with your indulgence and that of honourable members, to devote myself to a subject of great interest that has created considerable concern among the community at large and, in particular, to minority groups. In recent months Australia has taken part in public discussions on one of the ugliest of themes, that of racism. Whether it is based on colour, on physical differences, or even more simply on country of origin, the topic has the ability to appeal to the crudest instincts of human passion and to provoke the most vitriolic reaction within our community. It does not matter that the discussion was, regrettably, generated by a prominent academic, that it was so shamefully picked up by a certain politician, or that it is claimed to have some popular support. All of these elements are certainly not new: they have always been present whenever groups of people have lorded it over others. The most recent expression is 'Hitler's Nazism'. Nazism has been the most violent example of the many forms of racism that have appeared in the past.

Australia, like many other countries, has its own unsavoury story to tell, a story that is not yet completely written, as recent events have shown. It is a history which, if not ended soon, will continue to stain Australia's character and to divide future generations. In the short years since the official dropping of the 'White Australia Policy' we have been able to build with pride a high level of goodwill within the Australian community and with the rest of the world. Migrants to this country from all over the world can claim their share of merit for this happening. They have supported the movement away from racism and have educated their own countries of origin about the new face of the great Australia. The history of the past few months has not only delayed this process but also has raised some doubts about Australia's real position in the eyes of the world and has caused the inevitable fear and nervousness to return. I immensely regret, but believe, that the subject of this unfortunate issue is worthy of inclusion in an Address in Reply debate and of being brought to the attention of this Parliament.

It should be no longer conceivable that in our modern society of 1984 the issue of the relative merits of races is still open to debate. The discussion on racism should be no longer open to discriminatory attitudes, and any doubt about this will bring our community to a disgraceful social division. Racism must be exposed so that it may be buried forever. During this Address in Reply debate I intend to examine the question of racism in contemporary Australia under the following headings: the issues involved; the history of racism in Australia; the views of immigrants; and, its implications.

The recent discussion on this matter was sparked off by a speech made by Professor Geoffrey Blainey in which in a quiet way he pointed to what he perceived as community concern about the large number of Asian refugees and other settlers in Australia. In his commentary Professor Blainey pointed to the danger of having a high level of racially different groups in a society. He was obviously drawing on the experience of the Brixton riots in England. The theme was taken up by the Federal Liberal Opposition, and suddenly the more racist groups found it respectable to come out in his support.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: I am sure that you will continue to protect me from interjections, Mr President. It has been said that the restriction on Asian immigration should be based on achieving the right 'mix' or the right 'balance'. The comparison is between immigrants from England, Europe and Asia. The statement assumes that the Government has set up a deliberate policy of discrimination against the British and Europeans in favour of Asians, or that the numbers of Asians in the community has greatly increased since the coming into office of the Labor Party; further, that perhaps the number of British and European migrants has decreased to a marked extent because of Government policy. The fact is that all these reasons are untrue. The policy governing the entry of migrants to Australia is applied equally to all potential entrants into Australia—in every category of entry to Australia the same criteria are used for the selection of immigrants.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Apart from refugees.

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: I will come to that later. The change in the relative number of immigrants accepted in Australia for each of the categories reflects policies and needs as perceived at the time. Indeed, if there is discrimination exercised in the application of the criteria, it is not in favour but rather against resident Indo-Chinese refugees.

In their case, the option for family reunion can be exercised only on behalf of the children, parents or spouses, but it excludes brothers and sisters. In the case of any other resident, the option of family reunion includes brothers and sisters. Therefore, it is surprising in the accusation raised by the Federal Opposition spokesman for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, Mr Hodgman, that the Federal Government was taking an anti-British attitude, he did not deem it right to point to this difference. The exclusion of brothers and sisters from the family reunion category for Indo-Chinese refugees is due, incidentally, not to reasons of discrimination but simply because of administrative difficulties, that is, the very long time consumed in finding them and negotiating their release from their current country of residence.

The question of the relative increase or decrease of Asians, compared to British and European immigrants, can be easily resolved by referring to the statistics available, as presented by the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, Mr West.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: I will mention briefly the statistics for three years. In 1980-81, 22.47 per cent of our settlers came from Asia, 18.4 per cent came from Europe, and 28.4 per cent from the United Kingdom and Ireland. In 1981-82, there were 22.4 per cent from Asia, 21 per cent from Europe, and 32.7 per cent from the United Kingdom and Ireland. In 1982-83, there were 26.3 per cent from Asia, 21.2 per cent from Europe, and 29.2 per cent from the United Kingdom and Ireland. The rest of the immigrants came from many other countries. The figures for 1983-84 are not yet available, but the preliminary statistics show that there is no significant departure from the figures that I have just quoted.

In spite of the evidence borne out in the statistics that I have quoted, the Federal shadow spokesman for immigration and ethnic affairs accused the Federal Government of having tilted the balance in favour of Asians. At that time Mr Hodgman formally requested statistics from the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, and those figures were supplied to him for the first half of the year. Mr Hodgman then promptly committed the most simplistic mistake by doubling the figures and regarding this as the annual figure. He found that by using this trick he was able to prove his point. Of course, the full statistics show that quite the opposite is the case. The full discussion on this matter is contained in the transcript of *Hansard* for the House of Representatives, and includes an explanatory note from the Secretary to the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs along with full statistical data. Given the importance of providing correct information on this matter, I seek leave to have these tables and the comments by the Secretary to the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, Mr McKinnon, incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Does the honourable member assure the Council that they are purely statistical?

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: Yes, Mr Acting President, on my interpretation. There is also a brief comment on the statistics.

Leave granted.

IMMIGRATION

The Secretary to the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, Mr McKinnon, has also provided the Minister with statistical and other material which clarifies the factual basis on family reunion and the trend in Australia's immigration programme. Furthermore, it sets out in some detail the highly dubious fashion in which these incorrect statistics were used by the Opposition.

The figures are seasonal and should not be treated by doubling a half-year figure. Applications in European posts are seasonal. An example using U.K. figures for total number of persons covered by applications shows:

July-December 1980	46 504
January-June 1981	77 854
July-December 1981	43 883
January-June 1982	60 317
July-December 1982	29 357
January-June 1983	22 766

	1982-83		July-Dec. 1983	
Philippines	2 599	(2 380)	1 221	(1 488)
Portugal	178	(170)	82	(100)
Saudi Arabia	72	(56)	24	(15)
Singapore	450	(334)	174	(177)
Solomon Islands	9	(9)	6	(7)
South Africa	875	(710)	365	(377)
Spain	138	(133)	43	(56)
Sri Lanka	204	(192)	841	(868)
Sweden	112	(102)	65	(80)
Switzerland	154	(129)	48	(56)
Syria	809	(726)	580	(662)
Thailand	196	(183)	94	(139)
Tonga	7	(0)	5	(9)
Turkey	830	(676)	303	(366)
United Kingdom	6 254	(5 340)	2 541	(3 054)
USA	1 242	(1 122)	567	(784)
USSR	17	(8)	4	(4)

	1982-83		July-Dec. 1983	
Vanuatu	4	(4)	5	(5)
Vietnam	662	(654)	669	(1 003)
Warsaw	227	(206)	300	(362)
Western Samoa	21	(17)	9	(8)
Zambia	11	(9)	10	(10)

The following countries were omitted from the December table:

Laos	1	0
Tanzania	11	3

Footnotes:

(1) Preselected in = *prima facie* eligible applications only.

(2) Cases = applications. A single application may cover one or more members of the family unit.

ALL MIGRATION*—APPLICATIONS (M47) AND PERSONS VISAED BY REGION

Region	1980-81		1981-82		1982-83		1983-84 to 31.3.84	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
U.K. and Ireland								
Applications	137 112	(39.6)	105 011	(31.6)	53 057	(18.1)	13 202	(10.7)
Visas	35 602	(43.6)	39 711	(41.9)	25 822	(38.1)	8 794	(25.6)
Europe								
Applications	93 500	(27.0)	104 597	(31.5)	77 087	(26.3)	35 631	(28.8)
Visas	21 826	(26.7)	26 584	(28.1)	15 763	(23.2)	6 728	(19.6)
Asia								
Applications	54 242	(15.7)	47 963	(14.4)	67 827	(23.1)	35 301	(28.5)
Visas	10 970	(13.4)	13 155	(13.9)	12 882	(19.0)	10 970	(32.0)
Other								
Applications	61 124	(17.7)	74 524	(22.4)	95 580	(32.6)	39 711	(32.1)
Visas	13 225	(16.2)	15 319	(16.2)	13 366	(19.7)	7 807	(22.8)
Total								
Applications	345 978	(100.0)	332 095	(100.0)	293 551	(100.0)	123 845	(100.0)
Visas	81 623	(100.0)	94 769	(100.0)	67 833	(100.0)	34 299	(100.0)

*excluding refugees.

FAMILY MIGRATION*(a)*—APPLICATIONS PRESELECTED IN AND VISAS ISSUED BY REGION (PERSONS)

Region	1980-81		1981-82		1982-83		1983-84*(b)*	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
UK and Ireland								
Applications	n.a.		n.a.		13 534	24.9	6 591	18.5
Visaed	6 046	30.7	6 917	30.6	6 178	24.1	5 971	25.2
Europe								
Applications	n.a.		n.a.		8 627	15.9	5 440	15.3
Visaed	4 115	20.9	3 817	16.9	2 628	14.5	4 129	17.5
Asia								
Applications	n.a.		n.a.		17 220	31.7	14 533	40.8
Visaed	5 071	25.7	6 425	28.5	5 039	27.8	7 607	32.1
Other								
Applications	n.a.		n.a.		14 909	27.5	9 022	25.4
Visaed	4 480	22.7	5 411	24.0	4 276	23.6	5 955	25.2
Total								
Applications	n.a.		n.a.		54 290	100.0	35 586	100.0
Visaed	19 712	100.0	22 570	100.0	18 121	100.0	23 662	100.0

(a) The definition of Family Migration has changed during the period 1980-81 to 1983-84.
(b) 1 July 1983 to 31 March 1984.
n.a. = not available
Source: DIEA manual statistics for 1980-81 and 1981-82 and MPMS data from 1982-83 onwards. MPMS data are preliminary and subject to revision.

SETTLER ARRIVAL DATA
Source: DIEA Incoming Passenger Card Statistics
(1983-84 data is for July 1983 to December 1983)

	1978-79		1979-80		1980-81		1981-82		1982-83		1983-84	
		%		%		%		%		%		%
						Total Settlers						
UK and Ireland	13 107	19.0	16 397	20.2	31 590	28.4	38 863	32.7	27 249	29.2	8 477	23.9
Europe	9 538	13.9	13 918	17.1	20 424	18.4	24 981	21.0	19 731	21.2	5 964	16.8
Asia	20 214	29.4	23 183	28.5	24 914	22.4	26 528	22.4	24 486	26.3	11 773	33.2
Other	25 890	37.7	27 773	34.2	34 262	30.8	28 328	23.9	21 711	23.3	9 274	26.1
Total	68 749	100	81 271	100	111 190	100	118 700	100	93 177	100	35 488	100

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: The issue of community attitude was also raised by Professor Blainey and Mr Hodgman. The community has certainly reacted, and for a while the media also carried on a vigorous discussion. It is significant that the expression of public opinion has solidly condemned racism, has alerted the Federal Opposition to the danger of instigating this type of debate, and doubts the manner in which Professor Blainey has raised the issue. It has almost reached a point where to justify their stand these protagonists of free speech have moved around the country sustaining their views. In the face of so much opposition to their position, one would have expected them to retract. Instead, they set out not only to prove their point but also, it appeared, to increase the number of those supporting racist

attitudes. What a demoralising picture that paints!

In their effort to justify themselves, the people were actually aiding the cause of racism. This was evidenced by the blatant public reappearance of the most vitriolic groups—groups which after so many years of public education and legislation we as a community were hoping were reaching their dying days. However, they have now been given a new lease of life. Professor Blainey and Mr Hodgman want us to accept the legitimacy of a public discussion on the pros and cons of racism. There are no positives in racism: racism is totally bad, and a little racism is as bad as a lot. The fact that individuals within our society hold racist attitudes is not a sufficient reason to provide them with a forum for propaganda to brainwash others in our community. Would we allow a forum to those who believe in anarchy or slavery?

Australia has struggled long to come out of its white Australia attitude. We were slowly reaching a point where racist attitudes were being soundly condemned and beaten in Australia. An expectation was developing in this country that racism had become a part of the past history of Australia rather than a part of our modern times. Fortunately, this point was realised by many in the community, and people like Mr Hodgman and Professor Blainey were publicly rebuked by their own peers and their own friends.

The third issue surrounding the current discussion on Asian migration is the effect on employment. It was Professor Blainey who stated that Asian migration should be curtailed in times of high unemployment. Mr Hodgman, in his rather less than subtle manner, simply said that the British should be favoured.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Why can't you persuade your own Party?

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: I hope that we can all do that together. Research has shown that migration boosts employment and that the beneficiaries are the long standing residents rather than the new arrivals. I refer to an article in the *Economic Record*, volume 60, number 168, March 1984, entitled 'The Impact of Immigration on a Depressed Labour Market: the South Australian Experience', by David Harrison of the Flinders University. It concentrates on the years 1976-81. In his research, David Harrison asks all the questions asked by Professor Blainey and the Liberals. Given that the research to which I am referring is not the first of its type, it is rather surprising that they did not read the answers as well. The questions asked in the research included: 'Is the policy favouring high levels of immigration still appropriate when employment growth recedes and unemployment rates rise'; and, 'Do immigrants take jobs away from Australians, or do they create extra jobs for Australians?' David Harrison in his article, page 58 of the *Economic Record*, states:

> It should be stressed that it is the newly arrived migrants themselves who are most likely to be unemployed in this situation.

At page 59 it is stated:

> ... unemployment inevitably falls most heavily on new entrants to the labour force, in this case the newly arrived migrants.

Further at page 59 it is stated:

> Immigration not only supplements the workforce, it also stimulates demand for goods and services in the local economy.

David Harrison found that immigration does not alter the overall employment rate. However, because the newly arrived migrants maintain a high level of unemployment it follows that 'immigration must have an employment generating effect upon the residents', as is stated at page 59. A detailed analysis of the statistics of unemployment shows that the migrants are universally more likely to be unemployed than are the residents. David Harrison's figures for the years 1976 to 1981 were borne out rather dramatically by a more recent study on the Kampucheans in South Australia.

Entitled 'A review of Kampuchean refugee settlement in Adelaide'; the study was commissioned by the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs and conducted by Kathryn Traeger. It found that 78 per cent of the workforce of the Kampuchean community is unemployed. Similar results were also obtained in studies conducted among migrants in Sydney by Ian H. Burnely from the Department of Geography at the University of New South Wales. In commending to this Council the article by Mr Harrison and the report of Kathryn Traeger, I wish to complete this section with the conclusion from David Harrison's article (pages 66 and 67), as follows:

> The main findings of this paper can be summarised as follows. First, given that migrants boost the demand side of local markets as well as the supply of labour, and given reasonable assumptions about the extent of job turnover in the economy, there are *a priori* grounds for believing that the short-term effect of immigration is to boost (rather than to depress) job opportunities for residents. However, any such effect is likely to be trivial relative to the effects of monetary and fiscal policies: immigration should neither be used as a policy tool for influencing the overall level of employment for residents, nor should it be criticised on the mistaken ground that it deprives residents of jobs.
>
> Second, migrants arriving in South Australia between 1976 and 1981 have experienced very high levels of unemployment. Although the existence of large numbers of unemployed newly arrived migrants is often viewed as 'threatening' the jobs of residents, it has been argued here that high unemployment rates amongst migrants exist precisely because the new arrivals have failed to take jobs from residents. Hence, these high unemployment rates amongst newly arrived migrants are consistent with the view that immigration provides a small short-term boost to the employment opportunities of residents.
>
> Third, the immigration work force arriving between 1976 and 1981 has been concentrated disproportionately in the manufacturing industry and the trades occupations, the very industry and occupational categories which have experienced the largest declines in employment over the six years from 1976 to 1982. This concentration implies that recent immigration has probably caused a decline in job opportunities for residents in these particular categories of the labour market. A greater number of job opportunities for residents, however, would have been created across the other industrial and occupational categories.

I now turn briefly to the history. It must be said that Australia joins a long list of many Western countries whose attitude to non-whites in the past has been based on bias and ignorance. The issue of racial superiority has troubled not only the common people in our community but also politicians and academics. Fortunately, today's attitudes have found support in much of modern research. Sociologists and anthropologists have combined to offer a vision where race is less of a factor of difference among humans beings than other characteristics. The real and most significant differences are based not on colour or physical characteristics but on traditions and culture. The anthropologist, Richard Leakey, in his book *Origins* at page 138, states:

> The physical variations among people from different parts of the world come about through geographical separation and adaptation to local conditions. The geographical races into which *homosapiens* is divided are a convenience, for there are no clear-cut physical distinctions. Cultural differences are rather more distinct.

On the distinction we make so often based on colour, Richard Leakey, (page 242) states:

> There are no global characteristics of either 'whites' or 'blacks' for the reason that these groups as such do not exist... The nonsensical use of the terms 'whites' and 'blacks' must be dropped as a first step toward breaking free from the divisive thinking behind it... If the divisiveness continues it will cut through to the heart of humanity and finally destroy it. The choice is simple—and it is stark; either the true brotherhood of mankind is universally recognised, whatever the degree of skin pigmentation, or the future is very bleak indeed.

Unfortunately, the history of the world is underscored by bigotry based on colour and the physical differences between people. Aborigines were the first to suffer the consequences of this racism which denied them recognition as human beings and allowed Government authorities and the people

to actively seek their extermination. Is there any wonder that, having survived the white man, they seek to fashion their own future and mistrust our efforts?

Asians did not come to Australia in big numbers until the gold rushes of 1850. They were welcome in Australia at that time. Their immigration coincided with the first economic boom in this country. By 1861 about 15 per cent of Victoria's population was Asian. At that time in the gold fields Asians outnumbered the whites by six to one. The acceptance of Asians was soon subject to strain with the changes in the economic moves in this country. It was always easy to find reason for racist action against non-whites. The theories of that time had divided humanity into colour groups—the white, the black and the yellow. And even the whites were placed in order of priority, depending on the 'whiteness' of their colour. The degree of colour was itself taken as a proof of superiority.

In the case of white people, there was indisputable proof of the nobility of our own species (the Gobimeau)—the inequality of human races. The debate around the White Australia Policy coincides with these feelings and the economic stability of Australia. By the turn of the century Australia was ready for total exclusion of the Asians. The Immigration Restriction Act, 1901, was not overtly racist. It achieved its aim of the exclusion of all coloureds by stealth. It introduced what is now a notorious system of dictation. The Act required the applicant, if Asian, to submit to a dictation test in a European language. If that person failed, he was not allowed entry into Australia. In the instructions to officers of the department it was specifically stated that the applicant had to be questioned on his knowledge of any European language and, on finding that he knew one language, would be asked to submit to a test in another language.

Underlying this debate there seems always to have been lurking a strong sentiment of genetic superiority of the British race. As recently as 1939 prominent persons in Australia were pedalling the most debasing and abusive insults about refugees. Under the heading 'Historical note: keeping refugees out' the *CARE* newsletter states:

> Here is the Melbourne *Age* report of Sir Frank Clarke, pastoralist and President of the Victorian Legislative Council addressing the Australian Women's National League in May 1939. The headline read: 'Menace of the Refugee—Sir F. Clarke is outspoken'. He described refugees as 'shrinking, rat-faced men, under five feet in height and with a chest development of about 20 inches [50 cm], who worked in backyard factories and other localities in the north of Melbourne for 2/- to 3/- a week and their keep. It was horrible to think that such people would want to marry Australian girls or even bring their own under-nourished and under-developed women, and breed a race within a race . . .'
>
> Later he explained that he was not against all refugees or even all Jews but certain types of Eastern Europeans, Jews and non-Jews, who were in his opinion 'deficient in some of the qualities that made citizens of the British Empire'.
>
> Professor Blainey makes the same sort of distinction: he is not prejudiced against Asians but does note that they lack certain attitudes and experiences that are part of our democratic framework.

It is now noticeable that the history of racism since then is a little more subtle. It is closely connected with the large influx of immigration. Australia by now had some world experience, having taken part in two world wars. Australia had become less isolated and had experienced the need for people to progress and develop.

In more recent times Australia has quickly moved from a policy of assimilation to the granting of parity of citizenship to all Aborigines, to the dropping of the White Australia Policy, to the abandonment of assimilation in favour of integration and, finally, to the proclamation of multiculturism as the underlying way of understanding our society much better. The struggle against discrimination is by no means yet won, but certainly we are a tangible way ahead of any previous period in this country. Therefore, the intervention of Professor Blainey and his fanatical supporters has done nothing at all to advance this progress. Rather, they have retarded it and, hopefully, the damage will be very minimal.

Concerning the view of the immigrants, in debate in the past few months, everyone in Australia has been hurt. Any slur based on race immediately makes our original inhabitants, the Aborigines, direct targets and recalls their bitter history at the hands of the white settlers. It brings back to life attitudes that should belong only to the past, and many migrants recognise in these attitudes some of the vilification that they had to suffer on their first arrival in Australia many years ago.

It is something that every one of us has wanted to forget for our own sake and for the sake of this great country that we have adopted and learnt spontaneously to love. Yet, the pillars of support and freedom of discussion for equality keep on reminding us of the less attractive moments of our process of settlement. Some 30 to 40 years later we have Professor Blainey voicing a similar and more vocal abuse of the early days of post war immigration programmes. In those days, like today, it could be claimed by popular opinion that large numbers of Southern Europeans (the Italians, Greeks and other immigrants) were taking away jobs from legitimate Australians. This criticism was not justified then nor can it be justified now. Immigrants came to this land at the request of this country. They are neither ungrateful nor displeased and have earnt their keep. From recent criticism those who have been most hurt are the Asian immigrants and, in particular, the Asian refugees. There seems to be little point in attempting to explain why the current discussion is wrong.

The people who are pushing it seem to have vested or irrational reasons for it. These are people who lack not only compassion but also basic principles of human justice. The suffering of refugee groups has been evidenced for a long time. The Indo-Chinese group of countries has had a history of misery for the past few decades. Their subsequent escape to freedom has only partially been recorded, but that is terrifying enough. In Australia they have settled as well as any other immigrant group. The immigrants have not been insensitive to the recent debate. From their own experience they have acquired a deeper sense of justice. They have learnt to value that virtue, which has been proclaimed so much as a part of the Australian idea of a fair go. They believe that the current state of racism is very unAustralian and that people fostering it directly or indirectly should be called what they are: 'unAustralians'.

The question should be asked: what are the implications of this debate for the future? Perhaps saddest of all is the realisation not only that racism is not yet dead but that cynical politicians and irresponsible academics still consider it to be a legitimate soapbox for their ends.

There are certain things in society where Parties of all political persuasions should be united. The condemnation of racism and any form of incitement to it should be one of them. It is very easy to camouflage more or less violent forms of racism behind the veneer of a discussion on immigration policies. Those of us who have been or are at the receiving end of these discussions can recognise the intention and the symptoms very quickly.

On this note I am glad that a person to whom directly I want to refer is in this Chamber. I wish to commend the Liberals and the Democrats of this Chamber who have urged their Federal counterparts to drop this issue as soon as possible. In particular, I commend the action taken by the Hon. Murray Hill, who publicly stressed to his Federal Leader, Mr Peacock, the necessity to check the growing slide to extremism. There are also implications for persons in

public office. They are not in a position of public trust to represent every outlandish view in existence with individuals in our community. Certain views have no right of existence or representation, and a belief to the contrary would be acknowledging that racism has a right to be heard and to convert others. Therefore, people in public office should consider the responsibility that they carry in countering such views rather than provide them with a sense of legitimacy.

Another consequence of the recent debate is the necessity of providing an educational philosophy and practice at school level that fosters tolerance and condemns outright racism. Every movement of extremism that has succeeded or failed has been won or lost in the schools of a nation. The recent report of the Task Force on Education, 'Education for a Cultural Democracy', although not directly dealing with racism, provides a practical set of recommendations that would foster greater understanding and acceptance among the various minority groups in Australia. The report recommends the adoption of a sound philosophy as well as of practical elements. I am sure that in due course the Minister and my Government will accept the recommendations of this report and will endeavour to implement them.

Probably the most important consequence of the recent debate on racism is the urgency to encourage the effective participation of all minority groups in the social and political life of Australia. Too many of Australia's official institutions are still under-representative of minority groups. The development of a diverse and harmonious society is more dependent on the participation and contribution of all its member groups than on maintaining it under the dominance of one group. This absence of various groups in our society is evident at all levels, as I have said in the past, not excluding the evidence in this very Chamber.

All political Parties can make valid contributions to the cohesion of our society by simply encouraging participation of all minority groups in their activities, not only as supporters but as Parliamentarians and leaders in our community. Even in my brief experience as a member of Parliament I can testify to the importance of representation from other minority groups. Ultimately, latent racist attitudes will not be defeated until all groups in our community have had an opportunity to share in the power that shapes our society. Participation in power will have the effect of creating not only a society that is more responsive to the needs of the people but also a society in which people learn to know and to trust each other better and more.

Finally, it is a fact of life that all good intentions and logic can break down in the face of the self-interest and irrationality of individuals. Individuals in our society will continue against all sense and logic to believe in and push racist attitudes. Therefore, we should ensure that racism is made officially unacceptable in our society.

It was refreshing to hear recently Her Honour Justice Dame Roma Mitchell advance the suggestion that Governments should legislate against racial defamation; that is, defamation on the basis of race. Dame Roma reiterated her suggestion, which comes on the heels of a similar recommendation made last year by the Human Rights Commission. The recent public slur on Asians prompted the comments of Dame Roma Mitchell. I heartily support the suggestion of Her Honour and urge my Government, particularly my immediate Leader in this Chamber (the Minister of Ethnic Affairs and Attorney-General), as well as members of the Opposition and the Democrats, to encourage the Federal Government to take action in this matter. It is imperative that this be a national rather than a State law. It would acquire more strength and more credibility.

However, just as in the past, so now South Australia could take the lead with its Anti-Discrimination Act to fit Dame Roma's suggestion. Before I take my seat I confess that it was not my true intention to revive such an issue in this Chamber. I did it because of my duty and because of some expectation by citizens of this State that I rise in this Parliament and reject very strongly the abusive argument of Professor Blainey and his supporters. I am sure, Mr President, that you, my Government and all other honourable members in this Chamber will join me in encouraging the effective participation of all members of our community to develop a more diverse, respectful and harmonious society.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT secured the adjournment of the debate.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The House of Assembly notified its appointment of sessional committees.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.56 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 8 August at 2.15 p.m.