

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 26 October 1989

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.P. Trainer)** took the Chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

CRIMES (CONFISCATION OF PROFITS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

ST JOHN AMBULANCE MOTORCYCLE DIVISION

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I move:

That this House congratulate the St John Ambulance Adelaide Motorcycle Division on its 50 years of service with St John and the community of South Australia.

I wish to place on record my appreciation of the efforts of retired Superintendent Margaret Richardson, Order of St John, for her untiring efforts and many hours of research in the archives of this organisation. I also commend former Superintendent Cliff Wright. In the early 1930s the late Mr Jack Anear, a member of the Indian and BSA Motorcycle Club, scouted around among the motorcycle clubs of South Australia for prospective members to learn first aid and render the same at motorcycle functions. A group of 25 men rallied together and formed the only motorcycle ambulance division in the world at that time. The division was formed with the intention of having trained first aid officers available for the Motorcycle Club of South Australia and affiliated clubs, together with the Sporting Car Club and the Racing Drivers' Association.

At that time about 18 motorcycle clubs in the suburban area were affiliated with the Motorcycle Club of South Australia and practically every club was represented in the brigade. On 1 August 1933 they attained their first aid certificates and became a registered division known as the Motorcycle Club of South Australia Ambulance Incorporated. They held their first meetings at the Hindmarsh Volunteer Fire Station under the leadership of the late C.R. (Bobby) Burns as Superintendent and Mr J.L. (Jack) Anear as ambulance officer. All members covered various motor sports on their own motorcycles. In 1934 when the agreement between the South Australian Ambulance Brigade and the St John Ambulance Brigade was inaugurated, the motorcycle division carried out transport duties at the city depot of the South Australian Ambulance Transport.

These transport duties were carried on until July 1936, when the division transferred from the South Australian Ambulance Transport and became known as the Motorcycle Club Division of South Australia Ambulance Brigade. Consequently, members were able to carry out field duties, which constituted the main argument for the breakaway with the South Australian Ambulance Transport. From that period on the brigade carried on successfully with its original intention of placing first aid officers at all motorcycle functions, together with the tutoring of new classes. It was at one of these classes that Mr McLaren was enrolled as a member and, partly through his untiring efforts, the work of the then ambulance officer, Mr J. Anear, and the approach by the late Mr Paul Goode, the brigade became a division of the St John Ambulance Brigade on 31 May 1939.

Over all these years, the division has gained a proud reputation of service to motor sports unequalled in Australia. Its service is not restricted only to motor sports, and I will explain that shortly to the House. The first efforts of this new group were to provide back-up first aid facilities to the Speedway Royal at the Wayville Showgrounds. The speedway commenced again at Camden Circuit, Anzac Highway, in 1935-36 until the outbreak of the Second World War. After hostilities ceased, Kilburn Speedway commenced at the Kilburn Oval Trotting Track on a Saturday afternoon, then went to Friday nights. During that period a World Speedway Test was held between England and Australia.

After several successful years, an opposition company started speedway racing at Rowley Park on Wednesday nights, then switched to Friday nights. Finally, Kym Bon-ython took over the management of the track. It was so successful that to cover it efficiently the Adelaide Motor Cycle Division supplied approximately 26 personnel—ambulance officers, nurses, cadets and a medical officer—at each meeting.

This division of the brigade also provided back-up support for hill climbs for motorcycles at Dingley Dell (now Pasadena) and Brownhill Creek. Last of all, Morialta and the cars at Collingrove were all covered by members of the division as well as by nurses from the Adelaide Nursing Division. Also covered were road racing for motorcycles and cars, the 1936 South Australian Centenary Grand Prix, a two-day meeting at the Port Elliott/Victor Harbor circuit with competitors from all over the world, followed by Lobethal for several years.

It is interesting to note South Australia's early history and involvement in motor sport, particularly in car racing. In 1936 South Australia held the Centenary Grand Prix. Hopefully, at some time in the future, we can look forward to celebrating many anniversaries of the Formula One Grand Prix. I have always said and believed that it is tragic that South Australia did not bid for the Motor Cycle Grand Prix. I believe that the Victorian Government was very foolish in not properly handling that event and in not encouraging the Barnard Corporation to remain as its major promoter.

But, South Australia did have that opportunity, and I believe the Minister of Sport and Recreation was a little slow in not putting in a bid. We could have out-bid New South Wales, not so much in dollars and cents but in relation to our facilities. The International Raceway is already there, and we only had to make minor alterations in ripping down a wall to provide an ideal venue to conduct a round of the World 500cc Motor Cycle Championship. It could have made our tourist industry more viable by having the motorcycle championship in April and the motor car Grand Prix in November. I remind members that at present more people watch motorcycle racing than any other form of motor sport in the world. It is not uncommon in Europe to get crowds of up to 500 000 watching one championship round. I cannot say that we would get that many here, but I believe more people would watch motorcycle racing than car racing. It would have been a wonderful shot in the arm for our tourist industry.

We find that some 50 years ago sporting entrepreneurs realised that the opportunity was there for the various avenues of motorcycle sport. Several new venues were tried, such as Nuriootpa-Angaston—and I well remember going there as a young lad. There were venues at Oaklands Park and Woodside for a few years, until it closed, and then there was Port Wakefield, Mallala and the Adelaide International Raceway. There was also beach racing at Sellicks

Beach for motorcycles and there was car racing at Buckland Park (now Port Gawler).

Motorcycle scrambles were held at many venues over the years, such as Beaumont, Sleeps Hill, Taperoo, Grange, Highbury, Snake Gully (now Golden Grove), Brooks Gully, Menglers Hill, Marino Rocks, Clarendon, Scotts Creek and Port Noarlunga. Miniature T.T. races were held at Springbank and Sheidow Park. All the functions were attended by members of the Adelaide Motor Cycle Division of St John, irrespective of whether it rained or whether it was hailing, cold, dusty or extremely hot.

The people involved set the standard back in the 1930s in regard to making an effort and a contribution to motor sport in South Australia. Some 50 years of service is a wonderful milestone to reach. This is a superb record in relation to a very dedicated group of people. Amongst the problems involved in establishing such an organisation was the locating of permanent headquarters. The organisation would meet in the Motor Cycle Clubrooms in Flinders Street, and it then had many other headquarters; for example, the physiotherapy rooms in the basement of the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the William Goodman Hall (Tramways Hall), which is opposite what is now the State Transport Authority premises at Hackney. That venue was per courtesy of the Tramways Social Club.

Through the hard work of some very dedicated members, who went doorknocking to raise funds, the division bought two houses in North Adelaide, demolished them and prepared the land for their division headquarters. Eventually, St John refused to support the development of that site and so the property was sold. With some assistance from St John, the present building now occupied in Tynte Street, North Adelaide, was purchased and became the headquarters for the division.

This was a wonderful tribute to all those people who had worked so hard. One of the most notable people involved was Max Moyle, who has served with the organisation for 40-odd years. He was responsible for establishing the Cadet Division. Over a thousand young people have had the opportunity to be trained and to qualify with St John under the leadership and guidance of Max Moyle. Many quite well known Adelaide people today, in their misspent youth, were taken around to the Church of Christ Hall in North Adelaide and, under Max's guidance, taught first aid and encouraged to become involved in the division.

Max Moyle is highly regarded in the St John movement and within the local community in North Adelaide. He gave much of his time and his own personal finances to support St. John and the Cadet Division. He took people from the streets, many of whom were wayward young people, persevered with them and moulded them into the fine upstanding members of the community that they are today. So, the division owes a lot to the large number of people who were responsible during the formation period for establishing this division and then carrying out the other functions as well. Margaret Richardson, who was a member of the Adelaide Nursing Division and who was then involved with the Cadet Division, has also had some 50 years service with St John. With people like that giving up their time so freely over many decades one appreciates the tremendous debt that we owe the volunteers in this State.

The division has also been supported by all motorcycle clubs in South Australia and, notably, the Auto Cycle Union of South Australia, the controlling body of motorcycle sport in this State. It was through that support with the various other clubs that the division was able to purchase a caravan which it could take on site to provide rest room facilities not only for the crew but for the injured in case they were

ever required. It was used as a mobile theatre for the treatment of injured or accident victims at motor sport meetings.

Many young people have worked hard over the years and recently the Bent and Buckled Bike Brigade, the 4B's as they are known—a group from the Motor Cycle Riders Association—raised several hundred dollars towards providing equipment for this division. They were recently presented with a Russell extrication device for use with spinal injured patients. It is that type of recognition, work and involvement by young people that is the icing on the cake as far as the division is concerned. A lot of people work very hard behind the scenes to assist the division.

The following is a list of just some of the duties carried out by the division. In 1978, there were 361 ambulance duties involving 2 969 hours. They attended 258 motor sports activities involving 2 670 hours. A total of 260 other functions, including events involving the Lord Mayor, the Teddy Bears' picnic, Carols by Candlelight, and other events in the City of Adelaide requiring the attendance of St John involved 2 020 hours. Assistance was provided at 154 other sports activities, including horse race meetings and cycle meetings, and that involved 800 hours.

In 1988, almost a decade later, a total of 1 281 motor sports functions were attended involving 8 916 hours. A total of 154 'other duties' involved 1 047 hours. The division attended 11 picnics involving 77 hours, 97 exhibitions and shows involving 559 hours and 13 racing and trotting functions involving 125 hours; it attended at 384 casualty rooms providing back-up support involving 3 136 hours, and undertook hospital duties on 27 occasions involving 156 hours. That highlights the tremendous effort given to the community by the Adelaide Motor Cycle Division of St John Ambulance.

On 31 May we had the opportunity to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the division's involvement with St John—a wonderful milestone and a wonderful tribute to so many people who have given so much for their community. For that reason, I commend them for what they have done and I commend the motion to the House.

Mr DUGAN (Adelaide): I have much pleasure in seconding the motion of the member for Hanson. He has given us a potted history of the contribution to the South Australian community by the St John Ambulance Adelaide Motor Cycle Division, and I can only say that everything he has said, and more, is true of that division. I recently had the opportunity to attend the fiftieth anniversary of the division with the member for Hanson and, like him, I was very impressed by the record of service over the years.

There was an extensive display of memorabilia, which had been prepared by existing and former members of the division, many of whom came to the open day on the Sunday when the fiftieth anniversary was celebrated. Many people recalled the contributions that had been made to motorcycle sport and to major sporting events in South Australia. I believe that the event was worthwhile. The division was then, and still is, involved in extensive training and getting young people in first aid courses. It also provides the service that so many South Australians have come to expect of St John, and St John volunteers in particular. I very much enjoyed the afternoon that I spent with St John on that occasion.

I would like to say one other thing, and it is something that perhaps the member for Hanson could not say himself. I congratulate the member for Hanson on his personal contribution and dedication both to motorcycle sport in South Australia and, in particular, to this division of St

John and to the work of the members of that division. He has not taken his role as patron lightly; rather, he has been actively involved in that position, which has been very respected. I therefore have much pleasure in joining with him in asking this House to congratulate the St John Ambulance Motorcycle Division on 50 years of service to the South Australian community.

Motion carried.

SHACK SITES

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I move:

That this House condemns the Government for the massive increase in prices being asked of shack owners to freehold their land or to rent their shack sites and calls on the Government to immediately review the assessments being made and to liaise with private valuers so that true and fair valuations are determined.

It is very disheartening to note that the rentals being asked and the valuations being placed on shacks seem to be escalating at a rate that the average shack owner cannot match. Members will recall that, in relation to assessed capital values of metropolitan properties, during the Estimates Committee I highlighted in great detail examples of the Valuer-General's astronomically increasing valuations of properties during the past 12 months, and in some cases over some years. I also pointed out that the increases ranged from 50 per cent up to 88 per cent.

I further highlighted that, even though some people were refused their initial appeal, they continued to object and were able to obtain massive reductions. One property had its valuation increased from \$100 000 to \$188 000 but, as a result of a simple telephone call to the office, that valuation was reduced by 22 per cent, and an undertaking was given that it would be further examined. In another instance, a decrease of \$45 000 in the valuation occurred when the property had originally been valued at \$190 000, but was revalued at \$295 000.

During the Estimates Committee I also pointed out that I was very disturbed that such huge increases were occurring and that the final result really rested on whether the individual property owner was prepared to voice an objection. I wonder how many thousands of people have simply accepted the increase in property value and said, 'It is too much trouble to seek a reduction of \$20 000, \$30 000, \$40 000 or even more.'

We are now finding that in the area of shacks the Government is again determined to rip off people as much as it can, to get every cent that it can. It is rather ironical that this Government has, for some years now, prided itself on the fact that it has had a balanced, or near balanced, budget. That is not hard to do: if one's income is sufficient one can always ensure that one's income is greater than, or the same as, one's expenditure; but at what cost? The cost has increasingly been a burden on the average taxpayer. I am sure that all members in this place have felt the pinch over the past few years. I know that the majority of persons in South Australia feel the pinch, because I speak to so many of my constituents, who continue to voice their concerns about how they must give more and more money to the Government, in either direct or indirect charges.

I thought the Government might have left shacks alone; it is the one area to which people can go to get away from it all. They go there to relax on or close to the water and enjoy themselves. The people who use shacks for recreational purposes invariably do not have much money. It is not a pastime of the idle rich: it is, in many cases, a pastime of the average working person. Often those people do not necessarily own the shack: they perhaps have an unwritten

agreement with the owner to use it for two or three weeks a year, and the owner is happy to receive virtually no rent or a token rent. Why? Because not too many costs are associated with it and people probably have not had much money to pay to rent the place, anyway.

Let us look at what the Government has been doing in relation to rent increases and seeking exorbitant rates for freeholding. I highlight one example from an area just outside my electorate—but still part of Eyre Peninsula—namely, the Port Broughton area. I use this example because there is a large number of shacks there, and perhaps this is not an isolated example that may, for one reason or another, be unrealistic. In fact, some three months ago, the shack owners had public meetings and voiced their objections to the proposed freeholding rates and also to the rent levels. An article in the *Yorke Peninsula Country Times* of 4 July 1989 states:

Angry Port Broughton owners of shacks on the foreshore have united to fight what they claim are grossly inflated freehold prices set on their blocks by the State Department of Lands.

Massive annual rental increases proposed by the department as an alternative to purchasing their land also came under strong attack . . .

It is fully realised and appreciated that some increases must occur. It continues to amaze me that the Government has, over the past year or so, said that there will be no increase in ordinary rates and taxes beyond the CPI level. As a member of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, I have seen hundreds of revenue increases, and almost all of them are in accordance with CPI figures. That in itself might sound reasonable, but has anyone in the work force received wage increases in line with the CPI? The answer is a definite 'No'. For several years now, if not more, wage increases have been less—and usually considerably less—than the CPI levels. In general terms, we are seeing increases in the CPI level in relation to the rates and taxes that we must pay, but our income has not matched CPI movements. Therefore, the Government is obviously getting much more than we are able to afford and pay. I hope that the people of South Australia, at the next election, will see through the tricks that the Government has used, because it is part of the reason why it is finding it difficult to balance the budget.

I return to the report 'Port Broughton Shack Owners'. The shack owners recognised that they should have had the opportunity to purchase their land some years ago when other blocks in the area were purchased. Many members will be aware of the Shack Site Review Committee, which handed down its findings in late 1982 or early 1983—certainly it met during the previous year or two years—and various recommendations were made. It should be remembered that the Shack Site Review Committee, when it was set up, was to be seen as continuing. It was to hand down its first report, which it did—and then there was a change of Government. This Government decided not to continue with the review committee and not to explore further some of the recommendations that it had made. Its first big mistake was to cut the committee before it had fully undertaken all the work that was envisaged when it was originally set up. The Government decided to exercise only two of the three options that the committee recommended, and that created further problems. Therefore, the Government and the Minister in particular should be very careful when they say that these things have been detailed in the past. To some extent they have, but there was more to be done at the time. Many of the problems that we are now facing are because the Government was reluctant and decided not to continue further.

Last year the Port Broughton shack owners took a petition to the Department of Lands after the owners were notified

of the reclassification of the foreshore sites. The petition requested that the shacks involved be valued on the basis of others made freehold some years ago. When the petition was taken to the Department of Lands, Mr Johns, one of the shack owners, who has been most disturbed about the freehold prices, asked to see the Minister. According to the *Yorke Peninsula Country Times*, Mr Johns said:

I was told the Minister was too busy to receive it in person.

I guess we can understand that the Minister may have been too busy, but I should have thought that in relation to such an important issue, about which the Minister says she has some understanding, she could have taken five minutes out of the day and been briefed on the shack owners' main thoughts. But that did not happen. Subsequently, Mr Johns informs us, the shack owners were advised that the Minister was unable to grant the request to value their shack sites on the basis of values that had applied some years earlier. I can partly understand that, although the shack owners felt that they should have had that right several years earlier and were denied it, so why not ask for it? The article continues:

Mr Johns said most of the foreshore blocks were only a quarter the size of township blocks. Further, because of council building restrictions, foreshore shack owners had only 50 per cent use of their sites.

Further on, it continues:

Quoting the letter received by shack owners in June this year Mr Johns said it gave three options. These were to purchase their land outright, buy on a deposit and instalment plan at the ruling rate of interest, or take up an acceptable miscellaneous lease for a term of 20 years for holiday accommodation purposes subject to revaluation every five years. In Mr Johns's case the annual rental was \$1 200 per annum.

So, several options were given. It looks reasonable at this stage, but the hidden agenda is that the prices asked to freehold these properties are about \$20 000. If that \$20 000 is translated into the cost of a normal block of land (and members have heard from the quotation that the blocks are about a quarter of the size of township blocks), the cost would be \$80 000 in real terms. It is not unusual or surprising that they should decide that this is grossly unfair. I could quote from quite a few people who are very upset about the situation. I would like to point out what one private land valuer had to say. Mr Kevin Allan, representing J.G. Esklund, First National, said:

A realistic price for the blocks would be about \$12 500. I have sold most of the properties here. Over the past three years the average price of properties sold in row one was \$23 500, on row two (which has been freeholded for quite a few years) the average price was about \$36 300. Taking one from the other we get land with the value of about \$12 500.

So, someone is wrong. It is fairly obvious from the local people and from the First National representatives there that it is the Department of Lands, yet the Minister week after week refused to budge. What is new, we ask? However, as a result of a multitude of approaches from the Port Broughton shack owners and as a result of an approach from me I received, on 23 August, a letter from the Minister thanking me for my earlier letter. She said:

I am pleased to advise that I have recently met with a delegation of the Port Broughton foreshore action group and that a number of concerns raised by shack owners were addressed. As a consequence of this meeting I have requested the Valuer-General to review the freeholding values and new rents determined for all sites, and as a result the current offer will be withdrawn. In due course I will be writing to all lessees with a new offer clearly explaining all options in detail.

What do people have to do to get action from the Minister? They have to push with all their weight and then, reluctantly, it would appear, the Minister is prepared to look at it again. It is totally unsatisfactory that people should have to be pushed into this position in the first place. I have

highlighted the Port Broughton situation but there are other areas that I want to refer to. First, the Wallaroo north beach area is in a similar situation and the home owners there want to freehold their shacks.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: That's a superb beach.

Mr MEIER: Wallaroo is a superb beach and, as the honourable member would know, many of the shacks there have been freeholded, just as many of the shacks at Port Broughton were freeholded in the first instance. Much work has been done by the Wallaroo North Beach Home Owners Association to obtain evidence on the possible flooding of those shack sites, because if flooding occurs on a regular basis one must consider the ideal remedy. I have seen letter after letter from various people—some of them shack owners and some of them people who have had knowledge of the area over many years—and all the letters indicate that flooding does not occur. It would appear, therefore, that the Minister would have few obstacles in the way of allowing the shacks to be freeholded.

But not so. In a letter to me dated 6 October the Minister indicates that she has been advised that there is considerable local opinion which suggests that at least some of the shack sites are flooded occasionally during severe storm conditions. I should like to know who is responsible for that local opinion, because I have spoken with many people, and I know that the council and the Home Owners Association have spoken with many people, but no-one has come forward with evidence to that effect. I should be interested to know who gave the Minister this information, because it is wrong, and people continually tell me that what the Minister is suggesting is wrong.

In this situation it seems that the Minister is taking the bulldozer type of approach and saying, 'No, I am going to see that those shacks are not allowed to be freeholded.' Rentals are another issue, and the Government will make sure it receives plenty of money from that source. However, the Minister should be very careful, because I believe that the Wallaroo people (as with the Port Broughton people) will not take this lying down, but will continue to fight until the Minister sees reason. It might not be very long before the Minister does not have to worry about it any more because, as we know, there is every possibility of an election being called later this year or early next year at the latest. Whatever the case, I believe that shack owners in this State, after (in many cases) having received copies of the Liberal Party's shack policy, are delighted that there is at least some hope on the horizon. As the Opposition spokesman on lands, I have found it very heartening to receive many letters of support for the Liberal Party shacks policy. Some of those letters have described the policy as being a welcome announcement, long overdue and one that is addressing problems which the Government has not attended to. I should like to quote from one letter as follows:

Thank you for your letter to shack owners dated September '89 and for the copy of your shack site policy which we found like a breath of fresh air after so many years of frustrating, negative thinking from the present Government. We will be voting to return a Liberal Government to power in the forthcoming election, in part because of your enlightened shack site policy.

That sentiment has been reflected in many other letters, and the Government must realise it by now. I was most interested in the Minister's response to my question the other day (when I thought she might pour a bucket of water over me, but she did not), when, after I had pointed out to her that she had interfered with the supplementary development plan of the District Council of Central Yorke Peninsula so that development could not be stopped behind the Black Point shacks in the near future, she said, 'Let's remember it is a difficult problem: we have to go easy on

it.' I can see that the Minister is starting to backtrack, and it would not surprise me if we were to see (for what would be the fourth or fifth time in the past few months) the Government pinch the Liberal Party policy as it relates to shacks in some areas. That would not surprise me at all.

For the sake of the shack owners, I should say that we have helped them in their fight and that will be to their benefit; but I believe that people will see through this Government. The Government is running scared and does not want too many people offside. It realises that it probably has the majority offside already and is trying to patch things up left, right and centre. Shacks are a huge issue in this State and there is so much else that must be said; indeed, I hope that the Parliament will continue sitting in the next few weeks so that more can be said. I seek leave to conclude my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

MINTABIE OPAL MINING

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That in the opinion of the House the Government should immediately—

- (a) facilitate the extension of the Mintabie precious stones field so as to allow for the continuation of opal mining in the Mintabie area for the benefit of the existing miners and the local Aboriginal communities;
- (b) facilitate the Outback Areas Community Development Trust in establishing electricity to Mintabie; and
- (c) take the necessary action to have the proposed primary health care facilities at Mintabie established forthwith.

This matter has been going on for far too long. Mintabie, which currently has a population of about 1 200 people, has been one of the most productive opal fields in South Australia. A couple of years ago Mintabie was the single largest outlet for diesel in South Australia. It has been known for many years that there is an extensive area of opal in that part of the State. Many of the large contractors who found it difficult to obtain work went to Mintabie so that they could maintain their plant and equipment and make a reasonable living. The town developed and progressed to the degree that a new \$1.3 million school was opened earlier this year. That school is providing excellent facilities to the community. However, unless the Government is prepared to take some immediate positive action, those facilities will soon be of little value or use because very few people will be there.

Under the Pitjantjatjara land rights legislation a precious stones prospecting area was proclaimed at Mintabie. However, a number of mistakes were made at that time. The area was too small. When the legislation passed this House the Mines Department was carrying out extensive survey work to the south around the Wallatinna Homestead, and it was clear from the evidence obtained at that time that potential opal bearing areas existed there. Unfortunately, the Government of the day bowed to the pressure of those people who were advising the Aboriginal communities, namely, people such as Mr Toyne, who is a well-known anti-mining activist in this country and who is continuing to endeavour to tie up all the resources of this country in not only an unwise but an unnecessary manner. So, the Government did not proclaim an area which it should have proclaimed, and that was very much against my wishes.

However, since that time there has been a great deal of interest in the Mintabie area. Massive amounts of equipment investment have taken place there, and an extra community has been established for the purpose of doing things only to benefit South Australia. Not only the European mining community but also the local Aboriginal community

at Mintabie have benefited because they have had ready access to an income. Without opal mining, there is no noodling. Many people—particularly from Indulkana and some from Mintabie and the surrounding areas—were noodling on the good dumps when a lot of mining activity was taking place. They do that very well, and it is economically rewarding for them. Only a fool would want to prevent that activity continuing. However, we have had the Mintabie review and the Mintabie committee has been set up, but in actual fact very little, if anything, has taken place. There has been an ongoing request from the local community, and the progress association has made repeated requests to the Government and the Anangu Pitjantjatjara in Alice Springs.

Unfortunately, these people are a long way from the scene and it is a case of being out of sight out of mind. Basically, it is like what Paddy shot at—nothing has happened. That is not to the credit of anyone. Certainly, it is not to the credit of this Parliament, the Government or the people who administer this area that nothing has happened. The time has long since passed when action should have been taken to rectify this anomaly. This nonsense should stop.

I have been advised that all the Government has to do is alter the proclamation—it does not need to amend the Act. I have had good legal advice about extending the field. That should occur and I look forward to it taking place after December if this Government has not the courage to do so now. If ever there was a Cinderella State that wants more mining activity and more investment, it is South Australia. I repeat for the benefit of the House that there are only two industries that can help sustain South Australia: one is the agriculture industry and the other is the mining industry. However, there has been constant frustration, to make life more difficult and to impede those proper developments which are in the interests of all South Australians and, in this case, in the interests of local Aboriginal groups. If members talk to Aboriginal communities, they will find that they want this to take place—

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

Mr GUNN: Yes, they are hangers-on. These are the people living off the Aborigines. They are the ones who are collecting the cash payments. I remember going to Mimili when the Pitjantjatjara legislation was before Parliament. The people there were stirred up by political activists who were racing around trying to ensure that they got legislation passed so that they could manipulate and control Aboriginal communities. In those days it was difficult to talk to local Aboriginal communities without the influence of white advisers. However, Arthur Whyte and I managed to talk to the Chairman of the council quietly by himself. I asked him for the view of the local community in respect of mining at Mintabie, and he said, 'We are not concerned about Mintabie. It is only the white fellows from Alice Springs who are concerned.'

Mr Peterson interjecting:

Mr GUNN: We did not have the 'Taj Mahal' there then. It is of little value to the Aboriginal community, but those Europeans looked after themselves well.

The Hon. R.K. Abbott interjecting:

Mr GUNN: In response to the honourable member, it should be extended. It should go down to the Wallatinna Homestead, because mining activity was carried out there many years ago.

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: It is south-east of the existing area.

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I must continue, because there are many other things that I want to say. The local progress association

prepared a submission for the parliamentary committee inquiring into the Pitjantjatjara legislation. It is important that I read into the record what the association had to say, because much incorrect information has been circulated and several reports written by some Government officials have been an insult to the intelligence of people in the area. The submission states:

Mintabie has a population in excess of 1200. This includes an increasing number of families: 48 children are currently enrolled at the school. Local community affairs are administered through the Mintabie Progress Association which was incorporated under the Associations Incorporation Act 1956-65 on 26 July 1979 [nearly 10 years ago].

We understand that the Mintabie population would exceed half that of the Aboriginals resident on the lands. The Mintabie precious stones field is only 16.5 x 13 km or 214 square km. There is a large amount of public funds invested in Mintabie including the school, Department of Mines and Energy office, the hall, Telecom installations, the new access road, the future clinic and town power supply.

There are substantial private investments in businesses, accommodation and mining equipment. There are currently 50 large bulldozers, 37 exploration drills, 17 scrapers and several hundred pieces of light equipment on the field. Mintabie would have to be of considerable importance to the State with funds generated by the opal industry, employment relating to goods and services . . .

Mintabie is favourably regarded by the Aboriginal people who live here or visit regularly. They enjoy the opal noodling opportunities and appreciate the local facilities.

Opal at Mintabie has been found only in a narrow strip approximately 7 km x 2 km. Due to the fact that opal is increasingly hard to find on the present area available, some experienced miners have left and others feel they may be forced to do likewise, without really knowing where to go. Exploration drilling outside of the established opal bearing line has not produced any opal. Probably 80 per cent of the present precious stones field is not the type of ground which could contain opal. There is an urgent need for more potential opal bearing areas to be made available for exploration if the present machinery and mining commitments, the Mintabie infrastructure, and its population are to be given a chance of surviving.

The many discussions that have taken place indicate the deep concern that the community has about the future. A well attended public meeting held on 24 April 1988 unanimously resolved to put two matters before you, through the committee of the Progress Association. They are:

1. That the Mintabie Precious Stones Field be enlarged to include all of Granite Downs Station south of latitude 27°15' which is the same latitude as the northern boundary of the present precious stones field.

2. That the present Mintabie Precious Stones Field and the new access road corridor be excised from the Pitjantjatjara lands.

Further to No. 1: This area is requested because a significant section of it has been identified geologically as having opal bearing potential, and was recommended for inclusion in the field prior to the present small area being decided upon (from DME map dated 2.3.82, plan No. 82-104, with inclusion of 'Proposed precious stones field, based on geological mapping'). It is a part of the lands that has no Aboriginal settlement on it.

Further to No. 2: Excision would be a decisive step towards clarifying land tenure problems. Proper residential and business titles could then be arranged. (We have heard of a review committee under the control of the Minister of Lands, but have not been contacted or consulted.)

That is briefly the submission made by the Mintabie Progress Association, yet it is still waiting. This morning in the *Advertiser* we have been made aware of the issue by the headline, 'Red tape "may close" South Australia opal mine this year.' The article reads as follows:

The world's biggest opal mine at Mintabie in northern South Australia could be closed by Christmas. The President of the Mintabie Development Association, Mr Peter Mackay, said last night mining in the Mintabie opal fields, west of Woomera, was being hampered by bureaucratic delays. Mining in the area is worth almost \$40 million a year . . .

I call upon the Government to take some positive action to resolve these difficulties. Commonsense dictates that adequate discussion should take place forthwith, with the mining community and local Aboriginals, with a view to

extending the field. This is a matter of urgency, because it will assist no-one, should the Mintabie opal fields be closed; it will certainly not assist the Aboriginal community. There is an urgent need to allow the Outback Areas Community Development Trust to have that power. It wants it but it has been stopped.

The local community was frustrated when the Uniting Church for Frontier Services wanted to establish a clinic there. The local community in Mintabie was frustrated when it wanted its own water system and, eventually, it had to go ahead and do it itself. The people have asked for very little from the Government and have received even less, but they are entitled to a future. South Australia requires the continued development of this industry and it ill behoves the Government and the bureaucracy to be so tardy in bringing these matters to a sensible conclusion. Anyone with an ounce of commonsense who had been to the area would clearly understand and appreciate that there is an urgent need to extend these opal fields.

The time is long past when we could allow a small minority of people to manipulate, control and impede the proper development and welfare of the people of this State in such an unreasonable and unnecessary fashion. I have been rather cautious in my remarks today; I could have taken a heavy hand to a number of people who have been frustrating this exercise. I say to you, Mr Speaker, and to the House, that those people who isolate themselves at Alice Springs may be well-meaning but they are particularly misguided and they have acted contrary to the intentions of the Act by locating themselves there and not on the lands. Therefore, they are making decisions that are contrary to the best interests of the Aboriginal communities, and this House will have to take fairly urgent action next year to rectify that. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

NURSING HOME STANDARDS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Oswald:

That this House deplores the lowering of standards in South Australian nursing homes as a result of deliberate policies set in place during 1988 by the Federal Government and which have seen a lowering of morale amongst service providers, a lack of flexibility in staffing and funding and a diminishing of standards in the provision of quality care to the aged.

(Continued from 12 October. Page 1110.)

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Housing and Construction): I oppose the motion. In the years that the member for Morphett has occupied a place in this Parliament, whenever he talks about lack of morale by service providers and spreads a message of doom and gloom, especially in the health area, my antenna always starts to shake, because he is going down the old track of trying to scare old people. The claims that the member for Morphett makes are eventually refuted by someone on the Government side. However, we do not ever hear any apology from the member for Morphett for what he has said.

It is interesting that the same motion was moved in the other place by the Hon. Miss Laidlaw. The scaremongering tactics used by the member for Morphett in this place were used by her in another place. My colleague the Hon. Mario Feleppa adequately answered those arguments. One point he made was that the package, in terms of equity of care for aged people across Australia, is such that the Federal Government should be congratulated. True to form, the member for Morphett and his colleagues conveniently forget that and go out of their way to scare old people who need

care. No-one denies that they need care. I congratulate in this instance the member for Morphett for saying that this Government has raised the standard of health care for aged in this State since coming to office. I pay tribute to him for sometimes getting things right.

I will outline to the House exactly what the new package is all about. This package has involved new planning guidelines for nursing homes and hostels aimed at providing 100 residential care places per 1 000 residents, along with expanded assessment services and increased capital and recurrent funding of hostels; the introduction of specific quality of care/quality of life requirements for nursing homes; more flexible funding arrangements for hostels; the introduction of national uniform staffing standards in nursing homes and associated monitoring arrangements; the phased reduction in residents fees to no more than 87.5 per cent of their pension; and greater concern about residents' rights.

Subsequent components of the package will cover quality of care requirements of hostels. Concerns about the differences between and within States in the level of Commonwealth funding for nursing home residents has been raised in a number of reports including the Nursing Homes and Hostels Review and the Auditor-General's Report on an efficiency audit of the Commonwealth administration of nursing home programs.

That was completely ignored by the member for Morphett, because his one aim in this House was to spread alarm and despondency amongst old people in our community. He completely ignores the sons and daughters of those old people who, in many cases, have been desperate to get their parents into some form of institutionalised care. I will not waste the time of the House as we need to hold many votes on private members' motions today. I urge all members to oppose the motion and treat it in the way it should be treated, namely, as a typical example by the member for Morphett of his scaremongering tactics. I urge all members to vote against the motion in the usual way.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Obviously the Minister has been provided with briefing notes and has not read my speech. If he had read it, he would not have embarked on a diatribe of abuse and vilification of my efforts in endeavouring to speak up for the aged. The information I provided to the House in my speech on 12 October was gleaned from professionals in the aged care industry, from many weeks of talking and listening to the directors of nursing homes, documenting the data carefully, and coming back to the House and providing that information.

The Minister referred to the speech made in the other place. I can say that my work and research were behind the motion in this and the other place. While this motion was moved in the other place before being moved in this Chamber, I can vouch for the information provided in the other place, because I spent months talking to the directors of nursing homes. The information I provided is of vital interest, and I have waited patiently for the Minister to reply.

I will summarise some of the points that I believe the Minister failed to address in reply. I refer the public to my speech of 12 October. While it was lengthy, I made several key points. The first concern I expressed related to the rationale and philosophy behind the Federal Government's plan to introduce the 60-40 formula which was to provide 60 hostel places and 40 nursing home places for every 1 000 frail aged in the community. I asked whether the Federal Labor Party would ever come to grips with the bed shortages that exist in both hostels and nursing homes.

The second concern I raised, which was not replied to but for which I received some praise from the Minister,

relates to a historical matter in that, in the early days, a very good level of nursing care was built up by successive South Australian Governments and, because Labor has been in power for so long, Labor was in power when this occurred. The Commonwealth then imposed standards, and suddenly the level of care in South Australia went from 22 average nursing home hours a week back to 17 average nursing home hours a week; in other words, this State was dragged down to the lowest common denominator in the Commonwealth. Instead of the Federal Government bringing average nursing home hours up to the level in South Australia and Victoria, the best in the Commonwealth, it downgraded average nursing home hours to the lowest common denominator, which I believe at that time was occurring in New South Wales.

Every member of this place has a right to say that that occurred. I know it is uncomfortable for the Labor Party to say that that is not true but, in reality, we all know that it is. No-one can dispute it and, in reply, the Minister did not bother to pick up that point.

My third concern, which was not responded to in the department's briefing notes to the Minister, was that last financial year the Bannon Government failed to match the \$2.1 million provided by the Commonwealth through the HACC program. That was serious for this State. Fourthly, I expressed concern about aged patients of categories 4 and 5—and I will explain that again for honourable members. The Commonwealth has instituted a procedure whereby individual patients can be classified as class 4 or 5 patients; they are either too sick to enter a hostel but not sick enough to enter a nursing home. When this occurs the individuals have to go back into the community and be looked after in their own homes; and this is where the HACC program comes into play.

With the State Government not matching the \$2.1 million Federal HACC funding, I am advised that suddenly less money was available for those residents who were not being picked up under classification 4 or classification 5. This relates to residents of South Australia who, once upon a time, before the Labor Party got its clutches on this whole area of nursing home care, used to enjoy excellent care. I give praise to the Labor Government for instigating these South Australian standards, but it has now sat mildly by. I gave the Premier the option in the original speech: as President of the Australian Labor Party he should do something about the matter at a Federal level and speak up for the residents in South Australian nursing homes. We should not have to contend with what happened a couple of years ago.

I also addressed in that speech the matter of the 28-day leave provision, which was referred to at great length. Nursing home directors have a considerable amount of concern about this. This matter comprises a lengthy part of the speech and I will not take up the time of honourable members by going through it again. All I will say is that I did not hear a response from the Minister in relation to that matter. Nor did I hear any response from the Minister about the other problem concerning allocation of hours to frail aged residents of ethnic, non-English-speaking backgrounds. They do not mind doing it, but the staff have to spend an inordinate amount of time with ethnic or non-English-speaking residents. As we all know, the older these people get the more they tend to swing back to their native tongue.

Where a frail aged person might be classified in about the category 3 which allows 20 hours nursing a week, if this involves any ethnic person who has drifted back to using their native tongue, many more hours of nursing may be necessary than allowed for under the allocation. If the nurs-

ing staff do that, under the present allocation, it means that they cannot spend time with someone else. That was a legitimate point to raise in my speech and it should not have been ridiculed by the Government and the Minister on the front bench, who chose once again simply to ridicule me for bringing up a very important subject and to say that all I was doing was scaremongering. It was not scaremongering, and I hope that the Minister understands that I have a legitimate right to raise such matters. When I bring up medical matters of this nature in this Chamber, it is not scaremongering but the raising of matters of vital concern to those people in the community who are dealing with the aged.

The third matter that the Minister did not respond to concerns the area of hospice care. What is the Federal Government and the State Government going to do about hospice care in nursing homes for the aged? Members opposite were prepared to ridicule me earlier but they have now gone very quiet. Hospice care is a matter of concern to the administrators of nursing homes. A person classified in, say, category 1 would get 27 hours care a week, but hospice care patients need far more than 27 hours a week. Once again, the system is not working and the Government has not done anything about it.

Over the years, this Government and Federal Governments, Liberal and Labor, have done an enormous amount in the rehabilitation area in this State. I applaud the Health Commission and the health professionals for their absolute dedication and professionalism in this area of rehabilitation. I raised the matter in my speech and again was ridiculed by the Minister. However, in fact the funding formula does not properly take into account this aspect of rehabilitation of patients. Once again, this relates to the number of hours that the Commonwealth allows the nursing homes to treat patients and look after them.

If someone requires rehabilitation and they are fortunate enough to come in on, say, classification 3, they will get 20 hours a week, but that person might require many hours of physiotherapy and an extra hour here and there involved in carefully moving them around. Perambulating them, massaging them and looking after them all requires additional time. This formula is so clinical, cold and uncaring that it does not take such matters into account.

In his summing up, the Minister did not address the points that I made in my speech. They relate to serious matters, which have been raised by the health professionals working in this State. These matters were not addressed and answers were not provided. I urge members to support my motion. The Government has not in any way whatsoever provided any information to indicate that the points raised in my speech were incorrect.

These points stand. They can be verified at any time by talking to the directors of nursing in any large or medium sized nursing home that caters for the five categories. We all know that when someone goes into a nursing home they are classified somewhere between one and five, and that classification stays. That person's health may deteriorate but I am advised that the classification does not alter, or it is a terribly complex job to have it changed.

As people become more frail, the number of nursing hours allocated to them does not change, and that is of concern. I have established in this motion that nursing home standards have declined since the Hawke Government started to tamper with the hours. The morale of nurses in these nursing homes has declined—there is absolutely no doubt about that. If members of the Bannon Government vote against this motion, thus not accepting that these things are hap-

pening, they are surely governing with their heads in the sand. I urge all members to support my motion.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (15)—Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, Becker and Blacker, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Meier, Olsen, Oswald (teller) and Peterson.

Noes (24)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, Duigan and Ferguson, Ms Gayler, Messrs Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings (teller), Hoppood, Keneally and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McRae, Mayes, Payne, Rann, Robertson, Slater and Tyler.

Majority of 9 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

ENTERTAINMENT CENTRE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Lewis:

That this House urges the Government to place both the construction of the proposed facilities for an entertainment centre and its recurrent administrative functions in the hands of a non-government agency or agencies in order to avoid the unfortunate consequences of cost overruns and blowouts in the construction phase and the unnecessary risk of administrative cost escalation becoming a burden to the taxpayers of South Australia.

(Continued from 12 October. Page 1113.)

Mr De LAINE (Price): I oppose this motion, because our proposal does not involve a blank cheque in relation either to construction costs or to management costs. I refer to a news release issued by the Premier on 28 September which states:

The Premier, Mr Bannon, today announced that the construction contract for the Adelaide entertainment centre would be let to Jennings Construction Limited. Work on the centre, which will occupy a 4.7 hectare site at Hindmarsh and seat around 12 000 patrons, is scheduled to begin on site next month—October.

As far as the construction costs are concerned, State Cabinet has approved Jennings' offer following submissions from five selected contractors on a fixed price basis, so the contract for the construction of the centre was let to Jennings Construction Limited on a fixed price basis, that is, the contractor carries all the project risks and therefore there will be no cost blowout to the Government. Construction is scheduled for completion in June 1991. There is provision in the contract for liquidated damages in the event that work is not completed by the target date. The project will be managed by the South Australian Department of Housing and Construction (Sacon) and professional services will be provided by Hassell Pty Ltd, architects, the primary consultants responsible for provision and coordination of professional services. The entertainment centre will be ready for business by September 1991.

The responsibility for the management of the entertainment centre has been assigned to the Grand Prix Board, as was announced by the Premier on 17 October. A separate board of management drawing on national and international expertise will be established to manage the centre, but membership and terms of office have yet to be determined. The Grand Prix Board has demonstrated world-class professionalism and flair in running the Adelaide Grand Prix, which is a complex commercial undertaking and, therefore, the board is ideally suited to manage the entertainment centre. In relation to recurrent costs, under the agreement with the Government, the Grand Prix Board will be assigned management of the centre for five years, with an option for a further five years.

A separate board of management will be established to manage the centre, whose membership will be subject to the approval of the Premier. The Grand Prix Board will receive a management fee of 10 per cent of the first \$1 million of annual operating profits of the centre and 15 per cent of any further profits. This proves that the management costs, as well as the construction costs, are not open ended and there is certainly no blank cheque. This money can then be used by the board for the entertainment centre or for the board's other activities such as promoting and staging the Grand Prix. The board will also be allowed to retain a portion of the operating profit involved in developing the commercial potential of the entertainment centre site. This money will be reinvested in the entertainment centre operations. In his speech on the motion the honourable member for Murray-Mallee said:

... the basic difference—between me and my colleagues in the Liberal Party—indeed the future Olsen Liberal Government—and the Bannon ALP Government. We in the Liberal Party are responsible and experienced and have demonstrated our understanding of the need to apply these qualities to our future administration of Government.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr De LAINE: As my colleague says, 'What a joke!' We all know the disastrous consequences of the 1979-82 Liberal Tonkin Government and that it left this State almost bankrupt. It has taken a very concerted effort on the part of the Treasurer of South Australia and, indeed, the Government to repay that debt—it has taken six years. I cannot see the point that the honourable member makes in his assertion that the Opposition is more experienced and can handle business matters better than the Government.

The honourable member's second point is that the Government made a botch of our involvement in the America's Cup and that it wasted hundreds of thousands of dollars. However, we have received a great deal of very positive feedback from the world at large. South Australia's exposure as a result of participation in that 12 metre yacht race has led to an increase in inquiries from overseas investors and potential trading partners. That venture has been a very worthwhile exercise. Much of the expenditure on that exercise was recouped with the sale of the vessel and, overall, the total expenditure was very worthwhile and put South Australia on the map in many ways.

The honourable member also criticised the construction of the *Island Seaway*. He called it a 'disastrous floating supermarket trolley with twisted wheels and an inability to direct itself'. The *Island Seaway* is a very successful vessel, which has completed several hundred trips to Kangaroo Island and back and, to my knowledge, it has not sunk yet. Friends of mine who recently travelled on the vessel were ecstatic about the excellent service provided and the way that they were treated by all crew members. Kangaroo Islanders required a cheap ferry service between the mainland and the island and the *Island Seaway* serves that purpose admirably. Further, the operating cost of that service is about \$2 million cheaper than the previous service.

The entertainment centre seems to attract a lot of criticism from members opposite and, as my colleague says, they do not want it. It is all right for the Opposition, representing constituents who can afford to go to other venues such as the Opera House and so on for entertainment, but this particular entertainment centre will service all South Australians and particularly people in my electorate and in my colleagues' electorates in the western suburbs. Those constituents—most of whom are young or unemployed—will be able to go to this centre because of its locality and because the cost structure will be quite low. It

will certainly be a great boost to the people of the western suburbs.

As the Premier in his press release on 17 October, said, by using the Grand Prix Board as the manager, all profits made on the entertainment centre will eventually be returned to the taxpayers of South Australia who, after all, are paying for the centre. That is true and belies what the member for Murray-Mallee said about the Government writing a blank cheque for the construction and recurrent management costs of the entertainment centre. I have put an argument against that proposition. I urge all members to oppose the motion.

Motion negatived.

WELFARE CUTS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Robertson:

That this House calls on the Leader of the Opposition to clarify his attitude to the welfare cuts proposed by his Federal Coalition colleagues.

(Continued from 19 October. Page 1318.)

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I understand that members of the Liberal Opposition have now tagged me as being the Paul Keating of South Australia. I have been called many names by members opposite, including Hollywood, and I do not mind. They can call me what they like. We all know the old saying about sticks and stones. The reality is that when people resort to personal abuse and put tags on me, I know damn well from past experience in the trade union movement that I have got them on the ropes. This is no exception. They do not like it.

Coming back to the motion, one only has to look at the debacle amongst the Federal Opposition. Peacock has had to pull in his shadow Ministers and carpet them, because they do not know in which direction they are going, particularly in child-care. There is utter confusion in the ranks of the Liberal Party. Suddenly members opposite are very quiet. We talk about compassion. Half an hour ago we heard a contribution by the member for Morphett. What hypocrisy! What outrageous rubbish! Let us have a look at what his Federal colleagues want to do to the unemployed and to the Aborigines, the disadvantaged in the community, yet let us have a look at what his silvertail mates such as Elliott will receive out of their policy.

What will he get out of it: the massive capital tax free benefits that the Liberals want to give to their mates. The old *quid pro quo*: 'You look after us, throw a few quid into the coffers for the election campaign, and this is what we will give you, our President, dear Sir!' What an outrageous attack upon the working class in this country.

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: The Opposition does not like the truth and I know when members start yelling and screaming they want to shout you down, particularly the member for Coles, whose squeaky little voice does not upset me at all. I do not mind because I know that when they have a go at me I am on the ball.

Let us have a look at what the Greek community has to say about what the Liberals are doing. Even a bishop has attacked the Opposition's plan. Proposals by the Federal Opposition to fund tax cuts at the expense of disadvantaged families would be irresponsible, according to the Executive Director of the Brotherhood of St Lawrence, Bishop Peter Hollingworth. We all know about the Brotherhood of St Lawrence; over the years I have read many of its contributions.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: And its integrity.

Mr HAMILTON: Indeed, as my Minister points out, its integrity. It has attacked Liberal Party policy. The Opposition knows it will not get too many votes from the disadvantaged in the community because, traditionally, the Labour Party looks after them. What about the hypocrisy of the member for Morphett in talking about care for the aged! Let us have a look over the years. The record stands for itself of what his Party, State and Federal, has done for the disadvantaged, the elderly in the community and the working class in this country. I know from my own experience, coming from a poor background, whom I will put my money on to look after me and my lot.

Let us have a look at how the Liberals want to try to con the middle class in this country. There is an attack on the migrants, including the Greek community, which is prepared to complain to the Human Rights Commission and the Equal Opportunity Commission about the Federal Opposition's plan to deny some social security benefits to migrants during the first year in Australia. The Opposition's economic and tax policy states that under a coalition Government migrants would not qualify for unemployment benefits, sickness benefits or invalid pensions until 12 months after arriving. What the hell are they going to live on? The Opposition talks about wanting to foster family reunion, but what does it want? It wants to bleed those people who want—and rightly so—to bring their own families out to this country. Let us have a look at the reintroduction of the Liberals' child tax rebate policy. In the main, it is directed to the male partner in the family because the wife, under their proposal, never gets the benefit from it. Under this Federal Government the woman in the house, in the main, receives that money because she can spend it wisely on the children.

I would like to take up the remainder of private members' time on this subject because I have a very strong conviction about it. We have heard the hypocrisy of members opposite talking about the aged and attacking Labor Party policies in this country. History will soon record how, in both the State and Federal spheres, the elderly, the disadvantaged, and people on pensions, etc., have been treated. Who has upgraded pensions in this country? We all know who has given an undertaking and lived up to its promise. I support and applaud my colleague's proposal and ask that the House support this motion.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hamilton:

That this House fully supports and endorses the Government's initiative in introducing the Neighbourhood Watch scheme and notes and applauds the decision to give additional support to this program as one of the many effective community programs aimed at reducing crime.

(Continued from 28 September. Page 1006.)

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I applaud the Government's initiatives in this matter. This Government has really picked up and run with this issue, and I have no doubt that, by its response, the community of South Australia fully supports and endorses community policing. I applaud the role the South Australian Police Department has taken in this matter. Many members of the Police Force give up a lot of their time to assist in the setting up of Neighbourhood Watch programs. Last Monday evening I attended a meeting at the Grange Golf Club with a group from the electorate of my colleague the member for Henley Beach,

the members of that group being keen to have Neighbourhood Watch schemes set up in my electorate (the area in question, because of council boundaries, having had to be split in two).

I have said on many occasions in this House and publicly that I believe there is room for more corporate sponsorship in terms of community policing in South Australia. I believe very strongly that the Commercial Union Assurance Company should be publicly acknowledged in this place for the tremendous work it has carried out and the contribution it has made to the Neighbourhood Watch program in this State. In conjunction with the Minister and with the Commercial Union Assurance Company, other insurance companies (including the State Government Insurance Commission) should become involved and make a considerable contribution to community policing programs.

Benefiting from what the Commercial Union Assurance Company has done, all those major insurance companies should, I believe, put their money where the Commercial Union Assurance Company has put its money. Other organisations have contributed in other ways, and I refer specifically to the insert in the *Sunday Mail* of 22 October. Mutual Community has contributed quite considerably to this booklet, entitled 'Crime prevention—a practical guide', which deals with home security, personal security, possessions and so on.

It is an excellent booklet which gives practical hints on what people should do to protect their home—indeed, their children—as well as dealing with questions about personal security, particularly that of senior citizens. I know there is considerable concern in the community among seniors citizens, many of whom reside in my electorate. The booklet also outlines practical help on babysitting, on protecting one's possessions, such as credit cards, bicycles, etc., and on marking one's property. The protection of motor vehicles and business security measures, etc., are also outlined. It clearly shows that this Government, quite properly, is addressing the issues of law and order in this State. Whilst we have seen attempts by the Opposition—and particularly the member for Light—to discredit some of the figures and reports that have been provided to this Parliament, the Minister of Emergency Services has, quite properly, refuted those unfounded criticisms.

It is with a great deal of pleasure that I move this motion. I recall the outrageous campaign waged by the Liberal Party in the lead-up to the 1979 election. I was most offended by that, and I have never relented, nor will I as long as I am a member of this Parliament, in drawing the public's attention to that outrageous attack upon myself and many of my colleagues who were candidates, the implication, with that stocking-masked bandit act, being that we were condoning rape and murder in South Australia.

When it comes to talking about crime prevention and law and order issues my colleagues, who knew of my interest in this matter, say, 'Kevin, get up on your feet and talk about it.' It is one of the issues to which I pay a great deal of attention, and in which I have been deeply involved. I applaud the Premier and my Ministerial colleagues, and I welcome the support I have had from my Caucus colleagues, particularly in connection with the Neighbourhood Watch program. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

WEST LAKES DUNES

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hamilton:

That this House congratulates the Government for its decision to end the encroachment on beach front land at West Lakes and

Tennyson and thereby to protect our environmentally sensitive dune areas.

(Continued from 28 September. Page 1006.)

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): For some time, I have watched with dismay the encroachment onto Crown land by the activities of people who had no entitlement in this area, involving land that belongs to you, Mr Speaker, to me and to all members of the South Australian community. In one instance, a resident not only flattened a sand dune and planted lawn but also had the temerity to install a sprinkler system. Another resident decided to encroach considerably—by many square metres, in fact—in order to build a rockery, construct a swing, plant lawn, and take over Coast Protection Board land in doing so.

I have a particular memory for some things, and this situation reminded me of a similar situation many years ago in Mosman, New South Wales, where there were allegations of bribery and corruption in respect of New South Wales politicians. Allegations were made about involvement of Premier Wran. Not only did people encroach on public land but they also blocked access to public land and they had the gall to install a swimming pool, of all things, on land that belonged to the community, on Government land.

With that situation in mind and knowing what took place in New South Wales, I took a particular interest in this matter. At the outset, I commend the gutsy display by the Minister for Environment and Planning who is *par excellence* in the way she handles her portfolio: she does an excellent job. The Minister came down to look at the situation, assess the position quickly and said, 'Kevin, we will do as much as we can.' The decision had to be taken by Cabinet. A few people were upset about the situation. Some of the locals were upset by the Minister's decision, but for my part I had made it abundantly clear, as had the local ALP branch, that we were willing to go to the wall on this issue. It is a basic and fundamental issue that no-one has the right to encroach upon and take land that does not belong to them, irrespective of their socio-economic background.

On a number of occasions constituents have rung me and wanted to know what has been happening with that stretch of land. This matter occupied quite a time and it involved people like Robert Tucker from the Coast Protection Board and others who had meetings with other Ministers to try to find a resolution to the problem. Alternatives and compromises were discussed, and I can remember talking to the Minister at the time about a proposition.

Further, I must put openly on the record that I did agree to a compromise. I walked away but within 24 hours I felt most uncomfortable about that compromise and went back to the Minister and said, 'I am sorry, I just cannot accept the compromise to which I agreed yesterday.' The Minister was understanding of my position. I pointed out that it would be an untenable situation for this Government to agree to such a proposition. We would have set a dangerous precedent by allowing people to encroach and take unto themselves land that did not belong to them. That situation extended the timeframe before a resolution was agreed to.

If one looks at the land in question, members will understand the environmentally sensitive nature of the dunal area. Indeed, it is with some regret that I put on record my disappointment that houses were ever allowed to be built on that dunal area west of Military Road. I believe that that construction should never have been allowed. I offer that open and frank criticism of some of my predecessors. My criticism is not done with malice but is based on my concerns about the erosion of those dunal areas in that part of my electorate.

One has only to see what is taking place north of the Tennyson area, particularly around Semaphore Park and Mitani Court where there is erosion of the beach area and where there are houses and units within metres of the sea. It is a matter of great concern to those people who built or purchased houses there many years ago, never expecting that the sea would erode the dunal area to the extent it has. Only last year, with the mayor, local residents and the past town clerk of Adelaide, Mr Russell Arland, we met on a cold and wintry morning—it was raining like mad—to discuss this issue, and properly so. There were subsequent meetings with the Minister.

Coming back to my proposed support for and congratulations to the Minister, I can see that, if we did not stop this encroachment, we could allow people to take more and more of that land. Indeed, one could say that, by allowing a handful of people to encroach on those areas, other residents whose properties abutted the Coast Protection Board land could equally say that, if it was good enough for Joe Bloggs down the road to encroach out into the dunal areas and the Government did not do anything about it, it is good enough for them. That could expand: other people could say that it has been done in Tennyson, so why could this not be done at Semaphore and other parts of the metropolitan area on coastal reserves, river frontages and other parks and lands owned and controlled by the State?

The Minister's decision was proper. I just cannot see myself allowing such a dangerous precedent to be set here in South Australia. I believe that conservationists would quite properly have condemned this Government, and I would have had great difficulty if this Government had not made this decision. My local branch of the Labor Party has been outspoken, as I know the Minister understands, and a considerable number of people are involved, and have been very much involved, in environmental issues over the years. My ministerial colleagues would know that also, from the type of correspondence they received, and from statements in the media about the local environment. They are not like some Johnny-come-lately environmentalists when it comes to problems such as the Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works, the West Lakes Waterway, noise control, the arsenic impregnated soil at Hendon, and so on. There have been all sorts of problems, and I have never walked away from those issues.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: And lights at West Lakes.

Mr HAMILTON: As my ministerial colleague points out, lights at West Lakes was another problem. These issues should be met head-on, and they were; they were quite properly addressed. I know that my constituents and the members of my local branch of the ALP are happy with the decision.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: As my colleague points out, the South Australian community is very happy with the decision that the Minister for Environment and Planning, the Hon. Susan Lenahan, has made on this matter, because it is a clear and specific warning that this Government will not tolerate encroachments upon Crown land in South Australia in future. If any such instances are brought to my attention, the people of South Australia can be assured that I will be quite happy to take up the matters and refer them to my ministerial colleague. I ask that the House fully support this proposition. I cannot see any reason why any member of this House would want to disagree with what I propose.

Mr LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]

PETITION: WILDERNESS AREAS

A petition signed by 4 735 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to enact legislation to enable protection of wilderness areas was presented by the Hon. S.M. Lenehan.

Petition received.

PETITION: HOUSING INTEREST RATES

A petition signed by 1 388 residents of South Australia praying that the House take action to persuade the Federal Government to amend economic policy to reduce housing interest rates was presented by Mr Olsen.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

The Treasury of South Australia—Report, 1988-89.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. Frank Blevins)—

State Transport Authority—Report, 1988-89.

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—

Coast Protection Board—Report, 1987-88.

Department of Environment and Planning—Report, 1988-89.

By the Minister of Marine (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—

Department of Marine and Harbors—Report, 1988-89.

CROYDON PARK COLLEGE OF TAFE

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following interim report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works:

Croydon Park College of TAFE Technology Centre for Printing and Visual Communication.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME**ECONOMY**

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Premier support the call by the United Trades and Labor Council for the Federal Government to change economic direction? In response to interest rates remaining at record levels for some time to come and today's inflation figures which show the CPI going in the opposite direction to Mr Keating's budget forecasts, the United Trades and Labor Council is calling for a change in economic direction. On the ABC radio's *World Today* program, Mr John Spoeher, the community liaison officer with the Trades and Labor Council, said this afternoon that it is time to recognise that Labor's economic policies have failed and there needs to be a change in direction.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am delighted that the Leader of the Opposition is now acknowledging the Trades and Labor Council as having some authority and standing in this area. As I recall, he and his colleagues have spent most of their years in this Parliament attacking anything that the

Trades and Labor Council said, abusing its members and generally debunking the constructive role it is playing in South Australia. I certainly welcome the fact that the Leader of the Opposition is now endorsing the United Trades and Labor Council. It has been a big turnaround, and he had better pass the word around to some of his colleagues.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As to the question of the change of direction, I do not think that current economic conditions should cause the panic activity that is suggested by that approach. One talks about change of direction. To zig-zag our economic policy in any way would send out totally wrong signals to the marketplace, and would definitely, as the member for Eyre suggests, plunge us into a recession.

The fact is that, despite the balance of payments difficulties and despite the high interest rates, we still have growth in our economy and we still have high levels of employment and lower levels of unemployment. If, in fact, some drastic change of direction took place, we would put at jeopardy those jobs and make people's situations even worse.

It is interesting to note the reaction of the market to the balance of payments figures this week and to the CPI details released today. It has been calm. I suggest that the calmness exhibited by the international market ought to be reflected in our own economy. I was glad, incidentally, that the Leader of the Opposition made reference to the consumer price index figures issued today. Naturally, he did not have the grace to add what I thought was a most significant factor about that consumer price index, namely, that in Adelaide's case it was the lowest in the country.

Through our persistent control of costs in this State—and I am talking about Government costs and charges—we actually had a negative impact on the last CPI, and a .26 per cent impact, I think it was, on this quarter's CPI. One compares that with the policies, for instance, of the Greiner Liberal Government in New South Wales, which single-handedly has added a number of points to the CPI for the second occasion in this country, by its activities in lifting compulsory third party insurance (it went down in South Australia) and in relation to a whole range of other Government charges, way above the CPI. That is feeding into our system.

Indeed, I hope that the Federal Treasurer, in addressing the CPI, and indeed the Leader of the Opposition here, will, first, take note of the adverse impact that the Greiner Liberal Government policies are having in New South Wales, the sorts of policies that the Opposition here wants to impose on hapless South Australia and, secondly, have the grace to acknowledge that in South Australia we are keeping that control which has resulted in the lowest cost of living increase in the country.

HOMESTART LOANS PROGRAM

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction tell the House how the HomeStart Loans Program is being funded? A story in today's *Advertiser* quoted Democrat Leader (Hon. Ian Gilfillan) as saying that the Government did not have the money to subsidise the program. This claim has worried some of my constituents, who have contacted me already for assurances.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the member for Henley Beach for his question. I appreciate the anxiety caused by the Hon. Mr Gilfillan's statement. It was indi-

cated at the launching of HomeStart that funds for the scheme would be available through the South Australian Financing Authority, commonly known as SAFA. I well remember the Premier being asked a specific question at the press conference after the launching as to how much funding would be raised and how we would do it.

Prior to the public announcement of the scheme SAFA had been busily raising funds for HomeStart on the indexed bond market. To date, SAFA has raised close to \$100 million to fund HomeStart in its first year of operation. So this is \$100 million, to bring to fruition the aspirations of people seeking home ownership under HomeStart. This information has been known by the media, and yet the Hon. Mr Gilfillan appears to be ignorant of it. His statements have no doubt caused anxiety amongst many people who hope to attain home ownership through HomeStart. To suggest, as the Hon. Mr Gilfillan did, that the Government has launched HomeStart fraudulently is going beyond political decency. It is the type of gutter politics which is well known in Queensland but which has no place here in South Australia.

I can assure the constituents of the member for Henley Beach that the funding for HomeStart is in no doubt whatsoever and that the Government is currently considering raising further funds through SAFA to increase the number of loans provided in the first year of HomeStart. I deplore the misleading claims of the Hon. Mr Gilfillan because of the potential heartache such claims can cause in the community. Because of previous allegations made by the Hon. Mr Gilfillan, I wrote to him offering him a briefing on HomeStart by senior Government officers. Fortunately for the community, the Hon. Mr Gilfillan has accepted my invitation—and tomorrow morning cannot come too soon as far as I am concerned. I only hope that, after tomorrow's briefing, the Hon. Mr Gilfillan does the right thing and publicly retracts his suggestion that HomeStart has no funds.

COMPUTER SYSTEMS OPERATORS

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister of Labour. Why did the Commissioner for Public Employment agree to a secret wage deal for computer systems operators in the Public Service which has resulted in wage increases of up to 25 per cent, and what is the cost to taxpayers? I have in my possession a copy of a letter dated 31 August this year written by the Commissioner for Public Employment, Mr Strickland, to the Chief Executive Officer of the Attorney-General's Department, Mr Kelly. That letter records an agreement on a new structure and salaries for computer systems officers and related positions.

According to the latest annual report of the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations, there were 295 such officers employed under the Government Management and Employment Act at 30 June this year. I have been informed that under these new arrangements, which took effect on 28 August, some officers have received very substantial salary increases—some up to 25 per cent. The new top of the range annual salary has been set at \$48 109 compared with \$44 179 under the former structure. As well as setting out arrangements for the new structure, Mr Strickland, in his letter, also stated:

It has also been agreed with the Public Service Association that no publicity will be given to the agreement reached on this new structure, I request that Chief Executive Officers observe this agreement.

I have been informed that many officers affected by these arrangements are employed in establishing and operating

the Justice Information System, and the reason for this secrecy is the Government's reluctance to have disclosed further costs involved in a project for which the cost has already blown out by more than \$20 million.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It so happens that I have received a briefing on this very matter just today from the Commissioner for Public Employment. First, as one would expect, the innuendo in the explanation is rejected totally. There has been a service-wide salary classification for computer systems officers. These are computer professionals—*The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:*

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It was not a secret.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Well, I am not sure that public announcements are made when reclassifications are taking place, but there was nothing secret about the exercise. It was well known to all those involved and all those affected by it. The reclassification and salary increases that resulted from it obviously have to conform with the wage fixing principles, with which initially, of course, not only my colleague the Minister of Labour but, most importantly, the Industrial Commission would have to be satisfied.

On 31 August the Commissioner advised that the new structure and salaries had been developed after intensive negotiations and discussion. The structure separates management from specialist practitioner, allowing career progression in both streams. In other words, it is part of the award restructuring approach being taken in a range of professional categories not only within the Public Service but in private sector employment all around Australia. The CEO will determine the appropriate classification level for each computer systems officer position on the basis of criteria and benchmarks laid down. The Commissioner says, and this is the important factor in the whole exercise:

It is hoped that these new arrangements will assist in retaining some of the more experienced and skilled employees.

In other words, in order to provide a career path and structure for these highly skilled officers, who are much in demand in the private sector as well as the public sector, the particular exercise has been undertaken. The final and most important point on this matter is that this can be done only under the State wage principles which apply.

INGLEWOOD BRICKWORKS

Ms GAYLER (Newland): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning advise the House of the results of tests conducted at the Inglewood Brick Company following allegations of pollution problems at that plant? Some months ago, I wrote to the Minister asking for a series of tests to be conducted to determine whether there was an acid rain problem arising from the Inglewood brickworks. I asked for tests on sulphur dioxide and nitrogen dioxide, as well as in a number of other matters, to determine whether any emission control devices were needed. A report in yesterday's *Messenger Leader* states that, of the number of tests conducted on vegetation in the area, one leaf showed a high reading of fluoride.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for her question. It is a very serious matter. The honourable member has written to me and the answer to her question is that all the tests she requested have been carried out. Because of the gravity of the allegations, it is important to provide the honourable member with a detailed account of what has transpired. Mr O'Leary, a local resident, has complained about offensive odour from the brickworks.

The complaint has not been found to be justified. Mr O'Leary then complained about kiln gas emissions. These were tested and found to be well below the statutory limits, and below the levels of the few larger works in South Australia which need gas scrubbers to reduce fluoride emission.

Mr O'Leary then complained that sulphur dioxide and nitrogen oxides were affecting him, and that 'what came out of the chimney was irrelevant'. These pollutants were measured at the locations specified on his land and on a neighbour's land and were found to be well below levels likely to affect health or vegetation. In other words, these levels were well below World Health Organisation requirements. A neighbour complained of fluoride levels in his stock water trough. The levels were low—in fact, lower than recommended for potable water. Similarly, Mr O'Leary's water supply was not affected by pollutants from the brickworks.

Mr O'Leary then complained that vegetation on his property was damaged by fluoride. The department then called in the Botanic Gardens whose officers examined his site on at least two occasions and concluded that some of the vegetation showed symptoms consistent with fluoride attack. However, these were sent to Western Australia for analysis and two of the three samples were well below the recommended goal for fluoride concentration. The third sample was, in fact, so high that it is anomalous in Australian experience. Another set of samples, chosen by Mr O'Leary as being what he considered to be fluoride affected, have now been sent interstate for analysis, and the results will not be available for approximately three weeks. Mr O'Leary has now disputed the validity of his own sampling. His letter of 20 October to his local member—Ms Gayler—states:

We believe that all parties only want to know what is coming out of the chimney, not where it lands. If it comes out of the chimney then that is the end of the matter.

That, in fact, directly contradicts his earlier demand that, instead of testing the emissions from the chimney—which, of course, have been proven to comply easily with the regulations—the branch measure pollutants at the point of effect, that is, on his land and vegetation. Mr O'Leary refuses to accept any of the scientific evidence obtained to date because it does not support his allegations.

I totally reject all the allegations made by Mr O'Leary that the branch has worked 'in a very slack, disinterested fashion'. In fact, I would like to put on record the correct position. Over the past 18 months all but two of the 15 members of the branch have been directly involved in the investigations to examine thoroughly the operation of the brickworks and to determine the level of pollutants commonly emitted from the brickworks and the traces of other pollutants that may be emitted which cause any of the problems that Mr O'Leary has alleged. This involvement has also tied up the Air Quality Branch monitoring equipment so that it could not be used for other monitoring work. The particular allegations made in one letter about a staff member are being examined to ascertain whether a case of libel should be brought against Mr O'Leary.

Officers of the South Australian Health Commission have not been able to complete their investigation into the health aspects of the complaints. However, results to date do not implicate the brickworks as a risk to public health. To date no evidence has been found to justify Mr O'Leary's demand for the installation of anti-pollution equipment at the brickworks.

The Air Quality Branch has expended considerable resources in terms of equipment, staff time and money, which has been out of all proportion to the apparent prob-

lem. Of all the tests conducted, only one sample—in fact, the honourable member said one leaf—of vegetation, which was on brickworks land, showed excessive fluoride, and that level was so high as to be questionable in its validity. We will need to await the results of further tests of additional samples of vegetation, which have been sent to Western Australia, to determine whether there is any real risk. Then, of course, appropriate emission controls would be insisted on. However, until the results of those tests have been received, no action can be justified based on existing evidence.

Would any member of this House (or, indeed, any reasonable member of the community) seriously suggest that the Government should move in and close down Inglewood Brick Company when there is not one shred of scientific evidence that there is any risk? I would then be criticised, no doubt, for marching in with jackboots to close down a company employing 25 local people. But, I reiterate, if any persistent level of contamination is subsequently found, I will be the first person to take immediate action.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! When the House comes to order we can proceed with Question Time.

PILOTS DISPUTE

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): My question is to the Premier. Is the Government now prepared to consider chartering aircraft to alleviate the impact of the pilots strike on South Australia? The Minister of Tourism told Parliament on 5 September that the Government would consider this option if the situation demanded it. Representations that the Opposition is now receiving from the tourism industry in South Australia and the business community, and the first reliable figures on the economic impact of the dispute, indicate that this option must now be seriously considered.

Today, domestic aircraft movements at Adelaide Airport are only just over 40 per cent of what they were on the last Thursday before this dispute began—contrary to the general claims being made that domestic air services currently are operating at 60 per cent capacity. While the Grand Prix will provide some temporary improvement, considerable damage already has been done and, with the indefinite nature of the dispute, including suggestions that it could continue until Easter, further action is required to reduce the exposure of the State's tourism operators to rising losses.

Impacts identified so far include: hotel occupancy rates down by as much as 50 per cent; takings from accommodation alone being almost half a million dollars down in September compared with August, when September traditionally is a much busier month; up to 10 000 delegates being unable to attend conventions, representing spending losses of about \$8 million; restaurant takings down by up to 25 per cent; and taxi takings in Adelaide down by as much as \$34 000 a day.

Typical of the impact on individual businesses is a letter the Opposition has received from Mount Lofty House, one of South Australia's winners in the latest national tourism awards. In the first two months of the dispute, this prestigious accommodation attraction of 30 rooms had 296 confirmed room nights cancelled as a direct result of the dispute, representing a conservative dollar terms loss of \$120 000.

For other sectors of the South Australian economy, the major problem is ready and reliable transport for sales managers to the Eastern States. I am advised that many South Australian companies are now losing a great deal of

business to Eastern States competition because this access has been cut off. It would appear that while Melbourne, Sydney and Brisbane are receiving very adequate air services in the present circumstances, further action is required to maintain a reasonable air capacity for Adelaide.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not think that any of us should underestimate the impact of the pilots dispute on South Australia. I cannot verify the precise figures put before us by the member for Coles, but there are severe impacts on a number of sectors of our industry. Mention is made, of course, of our spectacular performance in the recent national tourism awards. For those in this community who have tended to denigrate or downgrade South Australia's tourist performance and tourist offerings, that was a very stunning refutation. Obviously, we want to make the most of it and try to ensure that the attention directed at South Australia in consequence of those awards yields full results. It is difficult for it to do so while the dispute remains unsettled and full services have not been restored. The effect on tourism has been very mixed. The member for Coles has quoted some figures for hotel occupancies down some 50 per cent, and that would be true in some cases. Interestingly enough, in other cases, occupancies are at record levels—they have never been higher. There have been aspects of our tourism industry, probably because more South Australians are staying within South Australia—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, plus transport and so on, but I am talking about regional tourism, in particular, which has benefited quite considerably over the past few months. One would hope that with the full restoration of air services the gains made in those sectors and the attention they managed to get will be built on. In other words, one would hope that there would be an overall plus in that area as a result of the dispute.

So, it has been a mixed experience and I do not think it has been unmitigated gloom. Some sectors of the industry have done much better than ever, and we have to try to ensure that that continues to happen. I have seen the figures, Mr Speaker. As to charter flights, all the efforts and energy have been directed in recent weeks to ensuring that we are able to obtain sufficient flights and seats for the Grand Prix, and we have managed to improve that situation greatly, although it is by no means adequate as yet.

We still hope that some further services will be announced, even within the next couple of days. As to chartering for normal passage, that is something that is under active consideration by the group that meets regularly with the Minister of Tourism. I do not know what the latest view of that is or how beneficial it might be, and I will refer that point to the Minister of Tourism for a response.

SEATON COMMUNITY CHILD-CARE CENTRE

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Education use his good offices to assist the Seaton Community Child-Care Centre to acquire an eight metre strip of land from the adjacent Seaton North Primary School? It has been brought to my attention that the centre is endeavouring to obtain an eight metre strip of land currently part of the grounds of the Seaton North Primary School, which lies adjacent to the centre.

The strip of land is intended to be used to enlarge the outside playing area at the centre which, I am advised, is desperately needed. I understand that the Seaton North Primary School Council is agreeable to this piece of land

being taken over by the centre. Currently located on the land in question is an old shed, as well as a portable building.

I am further advised that arrangements have reached the stage where it is agreed that the centre could lease the above-mentioned land for a period of 21 years at a cost of \$10 per annum. However, negotiations have now reached a deadlock as, allegedly, the Education Department is seeking \$250 000 from the Children's Services Office as payment for the land, as well as an added charge of somewhere between \$10 000 and \$20 000 for moving the portable building. I am advised that four years have now elapsed since negotiations first commenced for the centre to take over this eight metre area. The staff advised me that the centre does not have the space to utilise fully its staff resources; for example, it is unable to have a number of activities and projects in operation for the 32 toddlers-kindergarten children at one time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for raising this issue and assure him that, as Minister of Education, I will talk to the Director of Children's Services about the conflict that seems to have arisen in this matter. I hope that there will be an amicable resolution of the matter. It is very much in the interests of everyone in the field of education and children's services that there be a cooperative arrangement for the provision of new and emerging services in this State.

During the period of this Government we have provided 39 new child-care centres across this State, many of which have been located on Education Department properties, and there is a very amicable relationship between those service providers who are, in essence, quite complementary. I am concerned to hear that there has been some delay in resolving this matter and I will try to ensure that it is resolved as soon as possible.

GLENELG DEVELOPMENT

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Will the Premier state whether the Government supports the proposed Kangaroo Island ferry terminal for Glenelg and, if it does, will he explain the actions of senior officers of his own department who have, first, failed to give any encouragement to the Western Australian-based developer to hold preliminary discussions with them, even to the point of failing to answer telephone calls from the developer seeking to arrange these discussions? Secondly, those officers made it patently obvious that the State Government would encourage the project only if the ferry terminal was transferred northwards to a site owned by the Government through the West Beach Trust. Thirdly, they stated that land leases may not be readily available at Glenelg. Will the Premier also respond to statements in this week's *Guardian* by the Mayor of Glenelg, Mr Brian Nadilo, that the State Government has forced the council to work in the dark over the past six months on plans to develop the Patawalonga mouth?

In explaining my question I would like to quote from the Messenger Press *Guardian* of this week, 25 October, as follows:

Glenelg Mayor Brian Nadilo is writing this week to Premier John Bannon in a show of frustration at the State Government for forcing his council to 'work in the dark' on plans to develop the Patawalonga mouth. Mr Nadilo said he was tired of waiting for the Government to indicate whether or not it backed a proposal for a residential/retail development at the mouth. Plans for the \$35 million proposal, which include a Kangaroo Island-linked ferry terminal, were lodged with council last week by Western Australia-based Foremost Group of Companies.

Mr Nadilo said his letter to Mr Bannon would list meetings and telephone calls initiated by council with departmental heads and officers over the past six months in trying to discover the Government's stand. The letter would also ask Mr Bannon to meet with a council delegation. Mr Nadilo's move is seen as a direct snub to Premier's Department Director Bruce Guerin. Mr Nadilo said he had expected a telephone call from Mr Guerin last week after the plans had been lodged with council. When the telephone call did not come he decided to go directly to the Premier.

Mr Nadilo is quoted as saying:

I don't want to find that we have in good faith encouraged a developer and find we can't deliver the goods because the State Government hasn't given a commitment to work with Glenelg council.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There has been, and is, continuing work within government on aspects of the Patawalonga, West Beach and Glenelg areas. We are not in a position to make an announcement or to give specific indications. Obviously, when we are in such a position, that shall be done. There is no refusal to meet anyone. It is certainly true that the Glenelg council has before it, and has indeed published in the newspaper referred to by the honourable member, plans by one group for particular developments. The plans are before the council at present. Yes, I have received a letter from the Mayor of Glenelg, Mr Nadilo, in which he lists contacts that have been made and he concludes, incidentally, by stating:

We are acutely aware of the delicate environmental issues and the community concerns associated with any development involving council areas.

He goes on to state:

We believe the concept proposed by the Foremost Group has considerable community support.

In addition, it provides the basis to initiate joint discussions with an aim to prepare a strategy to address existing environmental issues of concern associated with the Patawalonga.

In fact, the letter from Mr Nadilo was not as rabid as the press commentary that was read out by the honourable member. I think a few glosses have been put on that.

An honourable member: It's a fact.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Well, it's a fact; and it is also a fact—and I think this is important—that in this rather febrile pre-election time, obviously many groups in the community are seeking to raise issues and get some response from Government. In fact, I am informed by my Director that during a telephone conversation on 13 October the Mayor of Glenelg indicated that he considered he and Glenelg had the best opportunity in the next few weeks, before an election, to push the Government into a commitment to delivering benefits to Glenelg that it would not have for four years: if it did not campaign publicly now, it might miss out. That is a legitimate statement by any pressure group that wants to push its cause. But, I can assure the House that the Government will not be stampeded in that way. I remind members—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —about the Jubilee Point proposal; everyone suggested that we should jump in and put it into effect. Did the member for Morphett support that Jubilee Point proposal? I would be very interested to know whether the member for Morphett supported it, which aimed to do all these things. If it had not been for the great care exercised by Government and the indepth environmental assessments, mistakes could well have been made. We will not make mistakes on our coastline.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his inane interjection which, of course, has

an opposite effect. We have consistently demonstrated that we will not tamper with our coastline. If the member for Morphett wants to go into his electorate and pick up certain proposals, so be it. But, he will not, in this context, stampede the Government into taking precipitate action that has not been properly researched and warranted.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It might be six years. Let's get it right.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I specifically call to order the Premier and the honourable member for Morphett. If any members of the House think that I do not take the matter of maintaining order seriously, I remind them of the warnings I have given in recent weeks and in recent days of sitting. If the House appears to be reaching a stage of becoming disorderly, or if a member is being disrupted or shouted down, I will deal with the individual or individuals responsible. The honourable member for Briggs.

SCHOOL OF THE FUTURE

Mr RANN (Briggs): Will the Minister of Education report on the response from high schools around the State and from the teaching profession to the School of the Future established at Technology Park and opened by the Premier in May?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTY: I thank the honourable member for his continued interest in this very exciting new initiative of the Education Department. I can advise the House that almost a quarter of our high schools in this State have accessed that new program since it was opened some five months ago. In addition, some 700 teachers and principals from 90 schools across this State have accessed programs in technology related areas.

In response to the incredible interest in this new school, plans are under way to further develop a number of aspects of its offerings. First, with respect to student participation, it is intended to expand the group offerings to include courses in digital electronics, laser applications, control technology, fibre optics, and materials technology and to develop support programs in various areas, in particular, arts and humanities.

In respect of teacher training and development, it is proposed to formalise the program to allow short term half day sessions, or 10 week blocks, in areas of identified need, for example, computer aided design, digital electronics, and various programs. It is proposed to further develop special programs, including programs for the gifted and talented and a girls and technology program, by identifying needs and ways of responding to those needs. A woman is currently being appointed to coordinate a girls and technology program, to work in conjunction with the women in engineering and women in science and technology networks which are already established in this State.

One of the most exciting elements of the Technology School of the Future has been its sponsorship from industry in this State. In this Year of School and Industry considerable interest and support have been provided by private enterprise in the establishment of the Technology School of the Future. There are currently over 25 companies supporting programs by means of financial donations, equipment donations, technical support or, indeed, heavily discounted items purchased by the centre. In particular, the

companies at Technology Park have been most valuable in helping staff and students, as have the six major sponsors of the Technology School of the Future, namely, AAF, Apple Australia, Random Access, Computer Corporation of Australia, ETSA and Telecom.

BREAST CANCER

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): Will the Minister of Health explain what steps the Government is taking to reduce the lengthy delays that women are experiencing in obtaining treatment, or follow-up investigation, for breast cancer or suspected cases of breast cancer at the Royal Adelaide Hospital? I have been advised that women who have been diagnosed as having breast cancer have to wait, on average, five weeks before obtaining treatment at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and that this situation has existed for virtually the whole of this year. Of graver concern to doctors working at the hospital is the fact that women who show up abnormalities during mammography screenings now have to wait two months or longer for follow-up investigations to be carried out at the Royal Adelaide.

I am told that doctors treating private patients would not want a delay of more than a week in following up abnormalities discovered in mammograms, and that they would not like treatment on existing cases of breast cancer to be delayed for longer than a fortnight. Therefore, public patients appear to be at a disadvantage when seeking breast cancer assessment and treatment at the Royal Adelaide, solely because of a lack of resources.

Breast cancer is the largest cancer killer of women today, and, of the 500 South Australian women who are annually diagnosed as having breast cancer, 200 will die. Prompt identification and treatment of breast cancer is paramount in a successful outcome. Naturally, once suspected or diagnosed as having breast cancer any delay in treatment can cause extreme anxiety and distress to women.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member's claims are false. No doctor will allow that situation to occur. It is, of course, a matter of judgment on the part of any medical practitioner as to the urgency of any sort of treatment or the nature of the treatment. I can give an assurance that in none of our public hospitals would there be any untoward delay where in the judgment of the medical practitioner there is any suggestion that that is the case.

The Government is concerned to ensure that the incidence of breast cancer is reduced as much as possible. It is why the Government has identified in the present budget additional sums of money to allow mammographic screening to take place throughout the community. We will continue with that. Mammographic treatment is becoming increasingly reliable as time goes on. There has been some discussion in the medical profession about the efficacy of treatment because there has been some margin for error. There have been circumstances where people have been called up for further treatment and have had some period of anguish, only to find that no further cause for concern existed. The number of cases in that category is continuing to decline.

In any event, I do not think that is justification for not going into programs such as this. I will have the honourable member's claims, such as they are, double checked. However, I can assure members that in this as in all cases it is up to the judgment of the medical practitioner as to the urgency and nature of the treatment. That is the case whether it be in public or private hospitals. Certainly, it would not

be any lack of resources that would be having an impact on this at this stage.

SPORTING FACILITIES

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport tell the House what recreation and sporting facilities have been completed or are under construction by the Government in South Australia? In a recent speech in this House, the member for Bragg claimed that there was a lack of first-class sporting facilities in South Australia and that nothing was happening. These claims were repeated in a newsletter from the Liberal candidate for Newland.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question. He is well known for his longstanding interest in sport in both this State and nationally. It is important to put on record the following facts to counter the false stories which the member for Bragg is endeavouring to spread around the community about what is being done. Looking at what was done in the last year of the Tonkin Liberal Government, I believe it compares favourably, \$132 000 having been spent by that Government on recreation and sport capital works programs.

That is a pretty sick figure when one looks at what has been done in the past few years by the Bannon Government. I am delighted to relay to the House what has been achieved and also to respond to what is a pretty shabby attempt both by the shadow spokesman for sport and in a newsletter distributed to the Newland electorate by the Liberal Party candidate. Just to put the record straight—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: A lot more than your predecessors did, I can assure you, which was nothing.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will direct his remarks through the Chair.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Thank you, Mr Speaker, indeed I will do so. There is the completion of the international hockey/lacrosse complex which has been acknowledged by international sportspeople as probably one of the best facilities in the world. Designed for the South Australian Government by one of our architects, Ms Sue Campbell, who has done a magnificent job in this area, the complex is proving to be one of the South Australian sporting community's major assets. We have also resurfaced the Olympic Sportsfield track, and it is very important to record this fact, especially following the recent Masters Games events, which benefited from that facility. Major improvements have been carried out to the State shooting park through the provision of a clay target range, an international practical shooting range, and an international hand gun and metallic silhouette range.

I know that the member for Flinders was very anxious to see the re-establishment of 13 netball courts at the Port Lincoln netball centre. There was also the provision of a fully covered riding arena for disabled riders at Craighburn Farm, Blackwood, and the construction of a second international softball diamond at Barratt Reserve. The list goes on. Rebound Ace surface tennis courts and assistance with lighting have been provided at Memorial Drive.

Mr Ingerson: That's three years ago.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It is not; it is quite recent. The development of an indoor community recreation centre at Salisbury is another of our achievements, and the construction is about to commence on an international standard small bore and air-rifle facility at Wingfield.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: That is about to start. Mr Speaker, you can see that members opposite are very sensitive about this because their Government's record of capital works in recreation and sport was abysmal—absolutely atrocious—and they achieved nothing. In 1989-90, a total of \$5.5 million has been allocated for capital works, compared with that miserable amount of about \$130 000 in the last year of the Tonkin Government, an appalling record for those members opposite to stand by. Let me turn to the Newland Liberal candidate's outrageous claim, endorsed by Mr Ingerson. The newsletter in question states:

Mr Ingerson also reminded Parliament that the State Government only contributed 20 per cent of the cost of the hockey centre, with the remainder coming from Federal funds.

What an extraordinary incapacity to deal with figures! Let me just give the figures. The hockey stadium cost \$4.715 million, of which the State Government provided \$2.285 million.

If that is 20 per cent, I give up. The Opposition should re-enrol in grade 1 arithmetic. That is pathetic! Talking about telling 'porky pies' to the electorate, the member for Bragg really takes the cake. He is even better than the member for Mitcham with his question yesterday. The Government's contribution is about 60 per cent. If this is the sort of misinformation from the Opposition that the electors of Newland have to put up with, I know which way they will cast their vote: for the sitting member.

This is the worst case of misinformation that I have seen in a document, where the Opposition claims a Government contribution represents 20 per cent of the cost. The State Government came up with approximately 60 per cent for a world-class sporting facility. The sporting community knows full well this State Government's commitment to sport, and we have delivered. They know the shambles the Opposition is in. Indeed, the electors of Newland, whom the local Liberal candidate (who does not even live in the area) has tried to mislead, will, I am sure, make their own decision very carefully, and it is very clear which way they will vote.

ISLAND SEAWAY

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I direct my question to the Premier. When will arrangements be finalised to repay the State Government Financing Authority \$3.3 million it is still owed for the construction of the *Island Seaway*, and who will be responsible for making the payment to SAFA? This amount is still owed as the capitalised cost of interest incurred on funds advanced by SAFA to build the vessel, and the Government is seeking to place responsibility for its repayment on the current owner of the vessel, the National Australia Bank. I have been advised in response to a question I asked during the Estimates Committee that SAFA is now seeking to arrange to have the National Australia Bank repay this outstanding amount, and I seek information from the Premier on whether this payment has been made or whether it is in dispute, as this \$3.3 million has been outstanding for some time.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will bring back a report for the honourable member.

WOMEN'S EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Mr DUGAN (Adelaide): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education say whether the Women's Employment Development Program will be continued and,

more particularly, will it be expanded? A project to identify, test and implement strategies to expand employment opportunities for women has been piloted in the western suburbs of Adelaide. Personnel from a number of employment projects in the northern suburbs have expressed interest in the project and are keen to see it expanded into the northern suburbs.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question. As Minister, I look forward to many more questions from him as the member for Adelaide, and I am sure that that will be the case. The pilot study, which is being undertaken by the department with the support of two very—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The Women's Employment Development Program, through the Department of Employment and Further Education, has been very successful. Also, the pilot scheme undertaken with the Self-Help Adult Unemployment Norwood (SHAUN) and, of course, the community employment development project has, in fact, been so successful that we will continue the project. Two officers have been appointed and they will concentrate on helping sole parents to gain employment. Of course, they are concentrating on those areas where women are faced with particular crises, and they have addressed that area very successfully.

We are so pleased with progress that, since approval of the pilot studies, two other organisations have expressed interest in sponsoring a women's employment development program. I am sure that members will be interested. One is Newpower Incorporated, which is located at Tea Tree Gully. It wants to care for an estimated 160 women in that area. It also covers part of the Salisbury area as well. It hopes to be able to offer to those supporting parents benefits, plus potential for people in those northern suburbs which it has not reached with its existing infrastructure. The Newpower scheme would involve 0.6 of a full-time equivalent person in creating new employment opportunities through innovative enterprises for women who are sole parents.

The other organisation is the YMCA of Whyalla. It would like to sponsor an officer to work with the local Whyalla agencies to foster local economic development. In particular, the YMCA would work in the area of improving women's employment in the tourism industry, including employment amongst Aboriginal women.

Those are commendable objects that they have both chosen. I can indicate to the member for Adelaide (and also to my colleagues, the members for Whyalla and for Newland) that I have approved funds for both of these projects in the sum of \$17 000 each, so they can proceed. Those members and constituents of those areas will see direct benefits coming from those schemes.

PATAWALONGA

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): Has the Minister for Environment and Planning been able yet to count up properly the number of times that she can or cannot flush the Patawalonga in November, or has the homework proved too difficult? There appear to be conflicting statements from the Minister, the E&WS Department and the friends of the Patawalonga. The Minister says she will flush the Pat 60 times. Don Reed, for Friends of the Pat, claims the tide will be high enough to do so on only 11 such occasions in November.

The Minister says she was only acting on the report of the E&WS, and the E&WS, in its report, says it did not go

into the number of times the tide was high enough. As the issue of refuse and sewage in the Patawalonga is a serious problem in the Glenelg area, the conflicting statements and assertions this morning are only adding to the confusion over what can and cannot be done.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I take this whole question of the cleaning up of the Patawalonga very seriously. Obviously—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has the call, no-one else.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I certainly made sure that I listened to the honourable member when he asked his question, albeit in a fairly frivolous manner. I take this very seriously; so seriously that earlier this year I established a Patawalonga Basin Task Force, which was made up—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask members on my left to conduct themselves in a more orderly fashion.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Mount Gambier and draw his attention to the fact that I use the word 'warn'—not 'caution', not 'call to order', but 'warn'—because the honourable member for Mount Gambier was clearly defying the Chair's instruction to bring the House to order. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. As I said, I take this matter very seriously. In fact, I received a report from this task force, which was made up of a number of people who have some expertise and knowledge in the whole area of the issues and problems surrounding the Patawalonga.

These issues and problems are not new. They have not just recently arisen, and I believe that even Opposition members, particularly those involved locally with the Patawalonga, would acknowledge that these problems are the result of actions taken further upstream from the Patawalonga, and that a number of other council areas have, in fact, contributed to the amount of refuse and to the poor quality of water in the Patawalonga. I recently received a report from this task force which suggested that as a first step we might look at a means of ensuring that a volume of fresh sea water could be used to dilute what is already in the Patawalonga and used as a means of flushing it out.

It was agreed that we would start these tests early in November. The point that was missed by the critics of this proposal was that part of the process would be to lower the level of the basin to the lowest level practicable so that we would not impinge on users of the basin at this stage. This indicates that we do not need excessively high tides for some sea water to flow into the Patawalonga and cause some diluting effect on the water within the basin.

I understand that the vast majority of the Friends of the Patawalonga have welcomed this move. One particular gentleman, I suspect, has not welcomed it, because he seems to be fairly negative about anything which is undertaken. I think he sees some grand engineering solution—and that may well be the only solution in the long term. However—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I found that I was actually having to raise my voice over the gable opposite. I realise that you have asked us to behave in a reasonable manner within the Parliament, and I do not intend to be shouting over the top of the Opposition.

I believe that a number of points must be put on the public record. First, this was announced as a trial—and that

is exactly what it is. Secondly, it will not cost anyone anything. It will not cost the community any money to undertake this flushing process. Thirdly, and I have made this very public, we are going to monitor the water quality closely under the auspices of the State Water Laboratory to indicate whether there is an improvement in the quality of water in the Patawalonga. I believe that this is a very sincere and genuine attempt by the task force to make a recommendation to the Minister to look at the effects of this trial.

I welcome the task force's recommendation and most certainly will move to ensure that we conduct this trial, notwithstanding the frivolous and rather petty comments of the member for Chaffey, and that we will see in the fullness of time whether this trial has or has not been successful. If it is proved to be successful, of course, I am sure that the member for Chaffey will rush back into the Parliament and apologise. If it is successful, we will have a fundamental base from which to suggest further improvements, which may well be engineering solutions, but we will also be able to provide a base for some of the proponents of the suggested developments of the Glenelg area. I believe that that, in itself, will be extremely beneficial.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to Standing Order No. 160, which states:

Any Member may rise to speak 'To order,' or upon a matter of privilege suddenly arising.

I seek from you, Mr Speaker, clarification of the nature of the document which you received in the form of a letter from Baker O'Loughlin on 11 October and drew to the attention of the House before proceedings began on that day. In your opinion, Sir, is that a petition or a request seeking a petition to have the House consider a matter of privilege?

The SPEAKER: It was a petition to the House seeking a matter of privilege to be raised. I placed it before the House but have taken no action other than placing it before the House. The Deputy Premier.

Mr LEWIS: On a further point of order, Sir, I refer to Standing Order 161. Given that that is your ruling and that it is now more than two weeks since you drew the matter to the attention of the House, what procedure is now appropriate in keeping with Standing Order 161, which provides:

All questions of order and matters of privilege at any time arising shall, until decided, suspend the consideration and decision of every other question.

The SPEAKER: It is a matter for the House to resolve by way of substantive motion. The Deputy Premier.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move: That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 7 November at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move: That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Notice of Motion, Other Business, No. 19 to be taken into consideration forthwith.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (31)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon and Blevins, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Crafter, De Laine, Duigan, Eastick and Ferguson, Ms Gayler, Messrs Goldsworthy, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood (teller), Ingerson, Keneally and Klunder,

Ms Lenchan, Messrs Lewis, McRae, Mayes, Peterson, Rann, Robertson, Slater, Tyler and Wotton.

Noes (10)—Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, S.J. Baker, Becker, Blacker, Chapman, S.G. Evans (teller), Gunn, Meier and Oswald.

Pair—Aye—Mr Plunkett. No—Mr D.S. Baker.

Majority of 21 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

URANIUM

Mr RANN (Briggs): I move:

That this House opposes the establishment of a nuclear power plant and uranium enrichment plant in South Australia.

Several weeks ago I gave notice that I intended to move this motion which is about the nuclear industry, but it is also about courage. It will test whether the Leader of the Opposition, who fled this Chamber one minute before the motion was moved, has the guts to stand by his policies and statements.

Mr GUNN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the member for Briggs at the commencement of his speech is acting contrary to Standing Orders. He is imputing improper motives to the Leader of the Opposition which are grossly defamatory, untrue and outrageous, and which are designed purely to get a headline—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has said enough in raising his point of order. I ask members on all sides of the Chamber to be careful to not impute improper motives to one another.

Mr GUNN: On a further point of order, Mr Speaker, we ask for an unconditional withdrawal by the member for Briggs, because he has reflected on the character, integrity and motives of the Leader of the Opposition. It is quite untrue and therefore contrary to Standing Orders, and we seek an unqualified withdrawal.

The SPEAKER: Order! In all honesty, the Chair did not hear the words to which the honourable member is referring because my attention for the moment was on other documents. However, I did hear that reference was made to the honourable Leader of the Opposition. I will have to accept the word of the member for Eyre that there was an imputation contained therein, and I ask the honourable member for Briggs to withdraw whatever imputation was therein contained.

Mr RANN: I do not believe that I did make an unparliamentary comment—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr RANN:—but I will certainly withdraw in the interests of order in the House. The Leader of the Opposition left this Chamber one minute before this debate began. I want to know whether he is prepared to come back in here and debate his policies and stand by his statements and those of his shadow Ministers. This motion will test whether the Leader of the Opposition is prepared to come out of the nuclear closet and say what he means and, more particularly, to mean what he says.

It will test whether his colleagues support his embrace of the nuclear industry, or whether they are prepared to stand up and be counted on environmental issues. I am sure that members of this House noted with interest the division amongst members of the Opposition when the motion to suspend was called. It was a very interesting division. Was it the wets versus the dries or the wets versus the whimps?

For three weeks we have seen delaying tactics to avoid debate on this motion. For three weeks we have seen an

Opposition pathetically trying to filibuster in private members' time in order to avoid debate on this motion. For three weeks we have seen a frightened Liberal Opposition that wants to defer, delay and avoid a vote, suspend judgment and suppress coverage. We have heard denials. We have heard reversals on policy. We have heard about turns and back flips. We have heard threats, abuse, and even the odd writ or two flung at the media.

Let me just say this to the Leader of the Opposition, who left this Chamber one minute before the suspension: he can run, but he cannot hide. No amount of advice that the Deputy Leader gets over the phone from his frightened colleague will hide that fact. On 14 September the Leader of the Opposition announced that a Liberal State Government would support the establishment of a uranium conversion and enrichment plant in South Australia. That is a fact. The *Advertiser* reported that, in doing so, the Leader of the Opposition announced that a future Liberal Government would also consider nuclear electricity generation for our State—and the whimps are getting wetter and the wets are becoming whimpier. Addressing the annual meeting of the South Australian Chamber of Mines and Energy, the Leader of the Opposition said:

It was time to consider the further processing of uranium produced at the Olympic Dam mine. Ultimately, we must be prepared to complete the mining and processing cycle. We can't stay half-pregnant.

Well, what we are trying to test today is how pregnant the Opposition is on the nuclear question. The Leader of the Opposition said:

Controlling the processing would give South Australia greater influence in guaranteeing the end product was used only for peaceful purposes. It would triple the value of the State's uranium exports.

According to the *Advertiser*, the Leader of the Opposition said:

The use of nuclear energy in South Australia could not be discounted in the longer term if atmospheric pollution was to be reduced.

He was getting into nuclear power as some kind of greenie statement. That was the Leader of the Opposition's fulsome embrace of the nuclear industry. Quite clearly, his policy says that the Opposition supports uranium enrichment, but the Leader of the Opposition's announcement of what was called 'policy' was desperately, dangerously short on detail. He failed to give concrete details of how such an enrichment plant would be financed, how much it would cost and where it would be located. He simply told journalists who attended that meeting that it would be located well to the north of South Australia. How about that for an ambit claim! Let me tell the House, he will not be putting one at Salisbury; and I am sure that members on this side of the House are determined he will never get the chance to put one in any part of the State.

I think that that broad statement was not good enough. If the Leader of the Opposition means Port Pirie, Port Augusta, Whyalla or Roxby Downs, he should have the guts to say so. Overseas uranium plants are located close to ports. If that is not the case with the Liberals' plan, they should surely tell South Australians where the plant would be located and from which port containers of highly radioactive enriched uranium or canisters of uranium hexafluoride would be transported. Would it be through Port Pirie? Would it be through Port Adelaide, which is another area being touted? Or, would it be through Port Stanvac or Port Bonython? The residents of these communities, and all South Australians, have a right to know.

In his announcement, reported in the *Advertiser*, the Leader of the Opposition flagged the eventual establishment of a

nuclear power station in South Australia. Never mind Chernobyl; never mind Three Mile Island; never mind the fact that no nuclear plant has been ordered in the United States since 1978. Obviously, in the Liberals' eyes this does not matter. An Olsen Government—and God forbid that that ever happens—would go against world trends and establish a nuclear power plant in South Australia, the first commercial nuclear power station in Australia's history. Again the Leader of the Opposition refused to say how such a plant would be financed, how much it would cost, how much it would be funded, why it was necessary and where it would be located.

The Leader of the Opposition also failed to reveal where high level nuclear waste from such a nuclear power station would be disposed. Would it be dumped in South Australia; if so, where? Tell us—as the Leader of the Opposition would say, 'Come clean.' Does the Leader of the Opposition honestly believe that some other Australian State or some other nation would accept waste from a South Australian plant that would remain deadly for hundreds of thousands of years? I will come to nuclear waste later in more detail.

Following that announcement, headlined by the *Advertiser*—which, incidentally, three weeks earlier did not think that the Liberals' position on enrichment and nuclear power was newsworthy—there was a deafening hush from the Leader's Liberal colleagues. It was apparent to any intelligent observer that the State Opposition's endorsement of nuclear power was in direct contrast to the position of the Federal Opposition and Andrew Peacock. Mr Peacock, of course, is loyal to his colleagues down south. He did not want to dump on his State counterpart, and for days his beleaguered staff issued a 'decline to comment' when journalists rang up to ask whether he supported the South Australian Leader of the Opposition's position. They simply continually tried to avoid commenting.

But the coalition has now clearly rejected the nuclear power plant announced by the Leader of the Opposition. Eventually the Federal Liberals were flushed out and, when they did comment, they pulled the plug on the State Opposition's mines and energy policy. In the unlikely event that the Leader of the Opposition ever becomes Premier of this State, he would need the support of a sympathetic Federal Government in order to approve and license the construction of a nuclear power plant in South Australia. Well, they have Buckley's chance. Neither the Hawke Government nor Andrew Peacock's shadow Ministry will now back the South Australian Liberals' plans to use nuclear power for electricity generation in South Australia.

As to this side of the House, our position is quite clear. We believe that a nuclear power station would be unacceptable to the vast majority of South Australians, on both environmental and economic grounds. We on this side of the House have the clear support of the Federal coalition. Senator Puplick, Andrew Peacock's shadow Minister for Mines and Energy, was quite unequivocal. He said:

A nuclear power plant in Australia was not viable for a variety of reasons, primarily economic.

So, there is quite clearly, as we have seen today at the moving of this motion, a split in the Liberals' ranks on nuclear power. That split is not confined to a dispute between Federal and State colleagues. That is why I wanted to have this motion debated. I want all members of this House to actually cast a vote, to show the people of South Australia where they stand on this issue. The motion will test whether they have the guts to stand by their policies. I also think it will test whether some members opposite have the courage to voice their opposition to their Leader's embrace of nuclear power.

For instance, I am told that the member for Coles does not support the construction of a nuclear power plant in our State. Here is her chance. I hope we will hear from her today. Does she or does she not support a nuclear power station? I also challenge the member for Coles to have the courage to state her position on the construction of an enrichment plant in South Australia. Let us just pause for a minute to think about the statements made by the member for Coles. Last year she was very vocal on environmental concerns. She enrolled in an environment studies course, and it was very much a case of conversion on the way to Damascus. Overnight she became a late change greenie. We remember, too, that when she was Minister of Health she actually moved an amendment to the Radiation Protection and Control Act to prohibit, through legislation, the establishment of an enrichment plant in South Australia. Of course, we all remember last year that the member for Coles was so concerned about environmental issues that she threatened to lie in front of a bulldozer in order to stop the proposed Wilpena development. Would she threaten to lie in front of a bulldozer to stop the construction of a nuclear power plant or an enrichment plant in South Australia?

It is time for the member for Coles to let South Australians know whether or not she is dinkum on environment issues, or is she some green tinged Zsa Zsa, just desperately seeking publicity? If she does support nuclear power for South Australia, perhaps she could also inform the citizens of this State how and where highly radioactive waste would be disposed of. It would be fascinating to see whether the member for Coles was again prepared to buck her Leader, again prepared to publicly exercise her conscience—or whether she has been gagged or muzzled by her Leader.

We have been told that the Leader has instructed members opposite not to speak on this issue. That will be left to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. So, we will have to see whether we can find out whether or not the member for Coles is genuine on these environmental questions. I believe, and I am sure that many Liberals believe, that the Leader of the Opposition is being very foolish in endorsing uranium enrichment. It would be a white elephant and indeed any such venture would need to be underwritten by South Australian taxpayers. There is, after all, a massive worldwide over capacity in enrichment. The only enrichment facilities, operating anywhere in the world, are given 100 per cent Government backing. The very few efforts made to set up private enrichment facilities, particularly in the United States, foundered at the first fence because private financial institutions would not provide backing. A South Australian enrichment plant would be a bottomless pit for taxpayers' dollars. The private financiers would not touch it with a barge pole.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, as we will see later, no doubt (because the Leader of the Opposition will be too scared to come into the Chamber to debate this matter), is in a time warp. He has focused obsessively on his brief shining moment as Deputy Premier. We all remember that he met with people from Urenco-Centec, whose record can be described as controversial. They made him feel big time. They duchessed him around Europe, and took him to Capenhurst, Almelo and Windscale (which of course has been renamed Sellafield). They also took him to Tricaston and Marcoule. However, they took me to the same places, and I am equally qualified to comment on those facilities.

I believe it would pay the Deputy Leader to make another trip and to make the subject again uranium enrichment. He should go first to Ohio in the United States. There, construction of a uranium enrichment plant was begun in 1977. Some \$US3.5 billion was spent on this project. That is four

times our health budget. The project was abandoned only three years ago because it was not economically viable. This is the same kind of plant that the Leader of the Opposition wants to inflict on the taxpayers here. In relation to that plant in the United States that was \$3 500 million down the drain. That blunder alone wasted more money than the United States Government has spent on all renewable energy research during the past decade.

The Deputy Leader could then return to Britain and revisit his old stamping ground of Windscale. There have been a series of accidents there, including Britain's worst radiation leak, which, ironically, occurred a week before former South Australian Premier Don Dunstan visited that site. It was covered up for six months and the people responsible were found to be criminally negligent. But that is another matter. The Deputy Leader was over there and he was told about the big enrichment plant that was planned—that is, the sister plant to the one that was destined to be his political monument in South Australia. However, even the Thatcher Government pulled the plug on that one. Quite simply, it was not economically viable.

On ABC radio recently, Keith Conlon interviewed Dr Dick Damania, Lecturer in Public and Resource Economics at Flinders University. He was asked:

Aren't we told—

presumably by the Liberals—

that uranium enrichment is a safe process.

He replied:

We're told it's a clean technology, that it's a reasonably safe process, but there are still risks associated with it. The difficulty here is that in contrast with other technologies, when things go wrong they go badly wrong. So the risk component, or the risk calculation factor, is substantially higher than it is for other technologies, such as coal for instance or hydro-electric power . . . Once things go wrong the costs of that are . . . enormous, substantially higher. The risk factor is a very, very important component.

Further, Dr Damania said, and I quote:

After Chernobyl most countries have stopped and are actually thinking again.

So, in a sense the Liberals are suggesting that we in South Australia should go against world trends rather than with current world trends. Even the producers of enriched uranium would be able to tell members opposite that there is an excess of supply over demand in both conversion and enrichment capacity, worldwide, following persistently and flagrantly inflated demand forecasts. Indeed, it is now predicted that this overcapacity in both conversion and enrichment will continue well beyond the year 2000.

However, it does not surprise me that the Opposition is not aware of these facts. Indeed, its statements reveal an appalling ignorance of the actual process involved in both conversion and enrichment. It is quite clear that around the world the enrichment industry is essentially government owned and government controlled, and exists along with domestic power stations.

Enrichment services are currently offered on the world market by the USA, the Soviet Union, the Deputy Leader's friends Urenco-Centec and the French Eurodif consortium. In the early 1970s the provision of enrichment services was a US Government monopoly. At that time it was widely believed that there would be a rapid growth in demand for enrichment, a belief stimulated by the oil price hike and world energy crisis in the mid-1970s. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has had lengthy talks with representatives of Urenco-Centec. They would be able to tell him that there is now a buyers' market in enriched uranium. Even Urenco, known for its surplus of optimism in predicting future usage, has predicted a 20 per cent surplus of capacity over

demand by the year 2000. There is now aggressive competition and price slashing between the various consortia as they attempt to reduce idle capacity. Now, of course, there is an additional threat, the development of new technology which looks likely to make existing processes—the processes that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition supports—appear redundant. I am talking, of course, about the laser process.

A fortnight ago on radio, in a celebrated interview on the Keith Conlon show, the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council revealed that his Party's proposed enrichment plant in South Australia would be a world first—it would actually be privately financed. If this is true, we would be breaking totally new ground. However, no details were given of which companies were prepared to finance such a plant, destined to lose money and become commercially and technologically redundant. I would like to meet these anonymous companies which have \$1 billion to fork out to build a plant at a time when a continued excess of supply over demand is projected, and a time of falling prices. The Opposition's policy is phoney. It is trumped up—no companies, no Government in its right mind, would back such a risky proposition.

More public concern has focused on the Leader of the Opposition's plans to support nuclear power for electricity generation in South Australia. This has perplexed energy experts, environmentalists and the general public. No-one that I can find wants nuclear power stations in South Australia. In the 1970s, nuclear power was seen by many as a viable and suitable alternative to dwindling oil supplies. Now, in the late 1980s—with oil prices down and after Three Mile Island, Chernobyl, with runaway construction costs, insurance and maintenance problems, and the still unresolved problem of high level waste disposal—nuclear power is in the doldrums and is likely to remain that way.

Let us face facts. As I pointed out at the beginning of this debate, no United States energy utility or power supply company has ordered a nuclear reactor since 1978. Elaborate regulatory and judicial processes in the US have stopped atomic power cold. Since Three Mile Island, nuclear construction in most countries, with the exception of France and Korea, has been grinding to a halt. At the time of the Three Mile Island accident there were more than 250 nuclear plants under construction world wide. Today, there are just 97. In the United States right now—in October 1989—there are just two plants still under construction. That compares with 94 at the time of the Three Mile Island accident. And those two power stations—being completed in the face of massive public opposition—were both ordered prior to 1978.

Three Mile Island and Chernobyl graphically revealed the technical and human flaws in the safety systems essential to the safe operation of nuclear power plants. The simple fact is that the benefits to South Australia of nuclear power generation do not compensate for the risks. The risks are so large that it is hard to put them on a scale that we normally think of in terms of any other mechanical or technical disaster. The risks of a nuclear accident can, as we have seen at Chernobyl, be so devastating and so widespread and last such enormously long periods of time. We are, after all, talking about the potential for thousands of years of contamination. These are dangers on a scale we do not normally contemplate. And, of course, there is still the unresolved and very controversial issue of safely disposing of high level waste.

The highly radioactive waste which arises from nuclear fuel reprocessing is so dangerous that it must be isolated until the various radioisotopes have decayed to insignificant levels. Unfortunately, these wastes remain dangerous for hundreds of thousands of years. So when Governments

consider how to handle this problem they are faced with time horizons that transcend human experience. A series of commissions of inquiry in Australia, in the UK, in Europe and the US have found, and continue to point to, the unsatisfactory nature of the technology for the final and safe disposal of highly radioactive wastes.

We then come to the contentious problem of how waste from a South Australian nuclear power plant would be disposed. Again, this is an area where the Leader of the Opposition has been strangely silent. Would high level waste from his plant be disposed of here or would he, as I said before, ask other places to take our nuclear waste? But that is where the Opposition's embrace of the nuclear industry is transformed from the politically suicidal to the sinister.

Every member of this Parliament would be aware of the proposed synroc waste disposal method. Synroc is an idea developed here in Australia. It proposes to incorporate high level waste in molten, synthetic rock, which would then be deposited underground in geologically stable conditions. Synroc is an idea, a concept. If it works, let us hope it can be used by countries overseas to dispose of accumulated, high level waste that will remain deadly for thousands of years. That is fine. We are not Luddites. If synroc can be of assistance overseas, all sensible people would welcome its use—overseas. But no-one in their right mind in South Australia would want our State to be the dumping ground for the world's nuclear waste. But there is a proposal around that would see South Australia applying the synroc concept in our State.

It has been suggested that a high level nuclear waste disposal facility be established at Roxby Downs or some other area in the north—in geologically stable mine shafts. The proposal suggests that we, as a South Australian community, could earn a great deal of money by establishing a depository for the world's nuclear waste. That would mean that waste that would remain radioactive for many thousands of years would be transported through South Australian ports, driven along South Australian roads and through our communities en route to a final resting place in the outback.

The Premier, in this House, confirmed that preliminary approaches had been made to establish a nuclear waste facility but that these had been rejected. He could not contemplate the devastation that would result if high level waste of this nature were to be spilled in transit in our State. Could we really risk an accident that could contaminate areas of our State for thousands of years? No-one on this side of the House would contemplate such a risk.

I am told that the Liberals in this State endorse the establishment of a synroc waste disposal facility in South Australia and that it should be an integral part of a 'nuclear reservation' to be established at Roxby Downs. Such a reservation would include a centrifuge enrichment plant, a uranium hexafluoride plant plus the nuclear power station and nuclear waste facility. Liberals in this State want to transform the Festival State into the nuclear dump State. Is that really the Opposition's vision for South Australia in the 1990s?

On Channel 7 a few weeks ago we heard Martin Cameron, the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council, give the idea of a synroc plant in South Australia a ringing endorsement. In the *Sunday Mail* on 1 October the Deputy Leader of the Opposition joined the chorus. Let me read the *Sunday Mail* article in its entirety to avoid any accusation that I am quoting selectively.

The article is headed 'Libs back Roxby nuclear dump move'. It states:

A controversial idea to use Roxby Downs as a dumping ground for high level nuclear waste has been backed up by a second,

senior South Australian Liberal. Former Mines Minister and Deputy Liberal Leader, Mr Roger Goldsworthy, said last night the only problem with the plan was convincing the public it was safe. 'I'm convinced in my own mind, but we would have to convince the public—as we did over Roxby Downs itself between 1979 and 1982,' Mr Goldsworthy said.

Uranium industry bosses have had secret talks with South Australian Government officials about turning the Olympic Dam uranium mine, at Roxby Downs, into a nuclear dump for the world's radioactive waste. A Government source confirmed last night that the talks involved Roxby's operators, Western Mining Corporation. According to the source, mine officials estimated the plan was worth billions of dollars in dumping payments and industrial trade-offs.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr Speaker, I draw to your attention the fact that the honourable member is canvassing a matter that is the subject of court litigation and if he wants to persist it will only make the offence more serious.

The SPEAKER: Order! Matters set down in a civil court may not be referred to, although the House of Commons, from which we draw our practice, has resolved to give the Chair some discretion to allow matters to be referred to in certain specified circumstances provided there is no real and substantial danger of prejudice to proceedings. However, this practice is in no way intended to restrict the ultimate right of the House to debate matters that are the subject of public interest, provided members do not specifically refer to matters before the court in a manner that could unduly prejudice those proceedings. The honourable member for Briggs.

Mr RANN: I do not want to play on the sensitivity of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I am quite aware that there has been an attempt to cover up any debate on this matter in this State and that writs have been thrown at members of the media in order to suppress debate. I was not surprised at all to note his sensitivity. The South Australian Opposition's position on waste disposal is one of telling people, 'Don't worry, we know how to dispose of waste in theory and the practicalities will be worked out in the future.' That is as about convincing as telling people to have themselves snap frozen in the hope that someone will perfect the details of everlasting life before the next power failure. As we have heard before, we now hear that the Liberals are throwing about writs and squealing to editors and reporters that they have been misquoted.

Two weeks ago Liberal staffers and shadow Ministers were telling journalists that the *Advertiser*—which I quoted at the beginning of this motion (and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition did not jump up and complain about that)—had wrongly reported their Leader as endorsing nuclear power for electricity generation in South Australia. If that was true, why did it take 2½ weeks—and perhaps the odd opinion poll or two—for the Leader of the Opposition to cry foul. On an issue this controversial—and we have seen by the squealing—

The SPEAKER: Order! At the moment the honourable member is speaking in a way that may prejudice proceedings, because he is commenting on the veracity or otherwise of the matters before the court.

Mr RANN: I am sorry, Mr Speaker, I am now referring to the *Advertiser* story, which is not the subject of any litigation. This story is about the Opposition's endorsement of enrichment.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair apologises.

Mr RANN: On an issue this controversial and important, surely the Opposition would have phoned the Editor of the *Advertiser* and demanded a retraction, or at least a correction, the very next day. I am not referring to any writs to other people. But only a fortnight ago, with the heat on them, the Opposition staffers tried that hoary old chest-

nut—the threat of a stop writ against me. In the morning they rang around radio stations and journalists telling them that a writ was about to be issued to make the member for Briggs shut up. I was delighted. If going to court means that there is an opportunity to question senior Liberals under oath on their statements, I would have been delighted to cooperate. In fact, I offered to stand on the front steps of Parliament House to receive the writ and have the debate there and then to see whether the Leader of the Opposition had the guts to debate the matter. Of course, I waited in vain. Just as he left this Chamber at the beginning of this debate, he wants to run but, as I mentioned earlier, he will not be able to hide.

Unfortunately, I was left off the lawyers' list. We have seen today, and in the past three weeks, indications that the Liberals have been wounded on this issue. It is a signal that the Liberals realise they are in a mess over their nuclear policy and they want to stifle questions and kill debate. It is a panic move. I am fairly sure that, after three weeks of trying to avoid and defer debate on this issue, they will try desperately today to avoid a vote. I do not believe that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has the courage of his convictions, or the support of his colleagues, to put it to the test today and to show where they stand.

It is all very well talking in Parliament. I will not need parliamentary privilege: I am more than happy to speak out on these issues outside the House at any forum. The Opposition must think the media in this town is pretty gutless or pretty stupid to be scared off by threats of libel action. There will be no cover-up and Parliament will not be muzzled and neither will the media. On Friday 13 October the *Advertiser* proved that it could not be muzzled by publishing an article by John Brittle entitled 'Australia is nuclear waste dump inevitable'. The article states:

Large stretches of the north of South Australia would be ideal, experts say, for long-term storage of nuclear waste. Politicians are speaking cautiously about an Australian nuclear industry and some, including the Deputy Opposition Leader, Roger Goldsworthy, are openly advocating nuclear waste disposal in the north of South Australia or in the Northern Territory.

Of course we have seen the threats and cover-ups in country newspapers. We saw an attempt by a woman in Port Augusta to raise the question of where the Liberals stand on this issue and she was subjected to abuse and threats.

I return to the central issue of this resolution. I have the firm belief that nuclear power is unacceptable to South Australians, just as it is unacceptable to the Federal Liberal Party leadership. It is interesting that opposition to nuclear plants in the United States has risen from 30 per cent before Three Mile Island to well over 60 per cent today, according to United States opinion polls. That opposition rises when the proposed plant is in one's neighbourhood. I am sure that that would be the case here in South Australia, and that is why the Leader or the Deputy Leader refuse to say where the enrichment plant would be located. I will be very interested to see whether the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, in rising to deflect attention from his Leader today, will be prepared to actually put on record, as well as voting on the issue, where his enrichment plant will be located, how much it will cost and who will be funding it, and to reveal the sources of that funding and the actual costings.

It is not just safety considerations that should make South Australians and this House oppose the nuclear power option in South Australia. Using nuclear power to provide electricity for this State is possible only if it is affordable. The best evidence from around the world indicates that investing in nuclear power has become a risky proposition. In the United States, where financial reporting requirements are strictest, the latest generation of nuclear plants costs more

than three times as much to build as equivalent fossil fuel plants, and significantly more than a number of renewable-energy facilities. Operating costs—an area where in the past nuclear power enjoyed an economic advantage—are also growing malignantly. Facing skyrocketing costs as well as slower growth in the demand for power, United States utilities have cancelled billions of dollars worth of nuclear plants, many of them already well under construction. Between 1974 and 1987, 108 plants were scrapped, most of them after the Three Mile Island accident. More than half the nuclear power capacity that was planned in the United States has now been cancelled.

Every day we hear the Liberals say they are interested in the bottom line—in dollars and cents. Well, again, the nuclear option does not stand up. After Three Mile Island a great burden fell on the builders of the many plants still under construction. Components had to be replaced or rebuilt. Cost over-runs, already out of control, became astronomical. Some utilities began offering revised estimates of costs and completion dates on a quarterly basis. Nuclear power began driving up the cost of electricity for consumers. Once touted as 'too cheap to meter', nuclear power became too expensive for the balance sheets of most utility companies. Nothing that the Leader of the Opposition is told over the telephone from the Leader's office can prove otherwise to this House.

I am sure that the Opposition will try to delay voting on this issue. This is the real test. Are they prepared today to put this issue to the vote? Are they prepared to be counted? They know within their ranks that there is division on the nuclear question. They know that their Leader is a loser, and some do not want to act like lemmings, as they did in 1985 over privatisation, and follow him over the cliff.

We know that there has been a bit of a deal going on in the last few weeks with the Leader of the Opposition. They are saying that provided there is support, provided that the troops are loyal, they are prepared to give him nine months—some say even 12 months—after the election to try to rebuild. He took them backwards in 1985 and they have such a lack of confidence that they are talking about giving him nine or 10 months—a bit extra super perhaps—to try to rebuild after the election. That is the confidence that they have in the Leader of the Opposition.

I believe that nuclear power will be about as palatable to the electorate in 1989 as privatisation was in 1985. But the Leader of the Opposition has to run this route. He had to say what he said that day when he launched the policy, because, in order to hang on, he sold his soul to the ideologues—the McDonalds and the McLachlans—to retain his position and have one more try.

Let me remind members opposite that the Liberal Leader's nuclear policies will divide South Australians. In the unlikely event that the leader ever becomes Premier of this State, his embrace of nuclear power would be divisive and would see one of the biggest debates in this country. It would see the hardest fought environmental battle in Australian history, dwarfing the Tasmanian wilderness and Franklin dam campaigns.

But it will not come to that. In embracing enrichment, nuclear power and nuclear waste disposal, the Leader of the Opposition is like a turkey praying for an early Christmas. I have no confidence in the Leader of the Opposition to come back in this House and have the guts to debate this issue. He will not want to debate it. That is why he slunk out of the door a minute or two before this motion was moved. I shall be interested to see whether the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will tell us who will build this enrichment plant and where it will be located. Is the Leader

of the Opposition going to present to this House this afternoon an alternative Government, or are we going to see a bunch of cowards? I urge members to support my motion opposing nuclear power and uranium enrichment in South Australia.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): We are witnessing a political stunt. I might say at the outset that this exercise makes a complete mockery of any agreement that I will be making with the Deputy Premier in future in relation to the operations of this House. We had a meeting on Monday when the week's program was agreed. For this political stunt the Deputy Premier has broken the agreement, and it will be very difficult in future to reach any sort of agreement with him. I make that point initially. If the fabricator expects the Leader of the Opposition to dignify him by entering this debate—

Mr RANN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the Deputy Leader is imputing an improper motive to an honourable member and he is not using my correct title.

The SPEAKER: Order! For the second time I must apologise to the House for the fact that, at the very moment a point of order regarding the imputation of improper motives to another honourable member was being made, I was in consultation on another matter of parliamentary business and did not on this occasion hear the words, either. I ask all members on both sides to refrain from anything that could be categorised in that way. The honourable Deputy Leader.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is interesting that no Minister seeks to lead in the debate. The Premier is what truly involved in this fabrication. He sat and listened to the member for Briggs, who is widely known as the fabricator. He sat and listened to what he said.

Mr RANN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: again, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is imputing an improper motive to a colleague in this House.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask members on both sides, for the third time, not to indulge in imputing improper motives to one another. I ask the Deputy Leader to try to restrain himself. The honourable Deputy Leader.

Mr ROBERTSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Earlier this afternoon a member on this side of the House was asked to withdraw under similar circumstances. The Deputy Leader has used the same term twice in two minutes. I ask you to direct him to withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Briggs took the original point of order and did not at that stage request the withdrawal of whatever words were uttered. I do not see that it is within my power to extend that to him at this stage. The honourable Deputy Leader.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I intend to move an amendment to this trumped up motion in relation to the remarks that have been made. The amendment will read as follows:

That this House condemns the deliberate scaremongering of the member for Briggs, which is based on a set of vicious falsehoods about non-existent plans to establish waste disposal facilities at Roxby Downs; that it condemns the Premier for aiding and abetting the campaign of the member for Briggs; and that the House supports a feasibility study into the establishment of uranium processing facilities to cover issues such as technology, environmental impact and location of such facilities, with no decision to be taken about their establishment in South Australia until the study has been completed, made public and subjected to full public debate.

The fabricator (the member for Briggs) has excelled himself. He can now be called the merchant of fear as well. The member for Briggs treats politics as the art of trying to frighten as many people as possible so that they will vote

for his Party. We should not be surprised at his tactics. In response, I intend, first, to remind him and the House of a little piece of recent history. It was just over 10 years ago that the member for Briggs accompanied the former Premier, Mr Dunstan, on an ill-fated visit to Europe. Ostensibly, that trip was intended to obtain the latest information on nuclear waste technology and international safeguards policies. The decision to make the trip was sudden. It came at a time when Labor was under increasing pressure for its economic failures. Yet it had a strongly anti-uranium mining policy which would have prevented the development of the Roxby Downs mine.

If we give credence to what the member for Briggs said today, he is obviously advocating the closing of that mine. There is no other conclusion that one can draw from what the member for Briggs said today than that he wants that mine closed. The development at Roxby is a development that the member for Briggs now says he supports—one could not gain that impression from what he said, but that is what he has been saying—even though he also claims that the products of Roxby Downs could bring an end to the world or spread poisonous nuclear waste throughout the community. That is what he said, and more. Therefore, he wants the mine closed.

There is absolutely no doubt that Mr Dunstan intended the trip in 1979 (accompanied by Mr Rann; he was not in this place then) to be the forerunner to a significant softening of Labor's anti-uranium policy which had been forced on the Premier over the previous two years by Labor's Left, particularly Mr Peter Duncan.

The Premier was accompanied on that trip by the present member for Briggs, by the present Director-General of the Premier's Department (Mr Guerin) and by two advisers to the Government on uranium issues—Sir Ben Dickinson and Mr Ron Wilmshurst. At the end of their studies, the group met in Amsterdam before flying back to Australia. There, the group was presented with a statement by Mr Dunstan which he said he would make immediately upon his return. I have a copy of that statement.

In the interests of the truth, I am making the statement public for the first time. The former Premier had promised his study group that it would be made public. It never was, for reasons I will come to in a moment. But let me quote certain parts of that statement. It stated that, as a result of the studies, the group was 'in a very good position to reassess our policies on uranium'. This is the group of which the member for Briggs was a member. The statement then made the commitment that 'these findings will be made public in the same way that I intend to make public some of the reports on aspects of the uranium question prepared previously for the Government's considerations. As I have said, this commitment was not honoured. The statement recorded:

I am able to say that my advisers and I are in full agreement on the outcome of our mission so far and its implications for the uranium development policy of our State.

I repeat that, so that the member for Briggs will not forget:

I am able to say that my advisers and I are in full agreement . . .

There has been a fair bit of fabrication since then. The member for Briggs was one of those advisers. The former Premier had locked him into what followed in his statement, although it is probably more accurate to say that he had locked himself in. I now come to the crux of that statement for the purposes of the present debate. Mr Dunstan proposed to say this about waste disposal:

On the matter of disposal of the extremely radioactive high level wastes from nuclear reactors, it is quite clear that dramatic developments have taken place in the past two years.

I repeat—‘dramatic developments’, according to Mr Dunstan. He also proposed to say, ‘It is clear that very substantial practical advances have now been made in this area.’ While Mr Dunstan also planned to say he was less optimistic about the second issue studied in detail—safeguards against diversion of nuclear fuel for military purposes—he planned to concede in his statement that, in summary, ‘Progress is being made.’

Ironically, this statement ended as follows:

Many of the facts for and against uranium development are unpalatable to advocates of one course or the other. But these facts must be faced if we are to decide our course with responsibility. The South Australian Government will not be joining a crusade in one direction or another.

Of course, on his return to Adelaide, Mr Dunstan did exactly that. He renewed the crusade against uranium mining when he found the Caucus numbers were not there. For the member for Briggs to suggest that the Liberal Party is divided on this issue when we know that the Labor Party is split right down the middle with senior Federal Ministers—including the Minister for the Environment—openly advocating further extensions of the uranium industry, to have the hide to come in here—

Mr Rann interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He would not dignify the debate by debating the Fabricator. For the member to suggest that we have a problem, while senior Federal Ministers are openly advocating extensions, is the height of hypocrisy. Mr Dunstan renewed the crusade against uranium mining when he found that the numbers were not here back in South Australia. We well remember the activities of Mr Peter Duncan in his absence, seeing that the numbers were not here. He did this even though he had told his study group in Amsterdam that he would be setting out to change Labor’s policy. He told them it might take one or two years—but it would be changed. If the member for Briggs were not a fabricator, he would admit these facts to the House.

Mr Rann: That is a lie!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Read the statement.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It takes one to find one, that is all I can say.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is of the opinion that it might have heard unparliamentary language incorporated in the interjection coming from my right. If the honourable member for Briggs used the word ‘lie’ I demand that he withdraw it.

Mr RANN: I withdraw.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: However, the member for Briggs has spent the past 10 years on a mission to manipulate, to mislead and misrepresent this issue. With his background, none of us is surprised.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Briggs had his speech written down—so what? He has had it in his hip-pocket for months. He has been trying to whip this up for weeks without a flicker of interest from the media, except from one of his mates. On his return from this 1979 visit, Mr Dunstan was forced to come into this House and lie about its outcome. In doing so, in trying to defeat a no-confidence motion, he described the member for Briggs as follows:

He has been a leading anti-nuclear campaigner for years.

He wants to close Roxby—he has told us this today. He continued:

... A leader of the Greenpeace Movement in New Zealand, when he was there, and one of the organisers of New Zealand’s intervention in the French atomic test area in the Pacific.

He has been an anti-nuclear campaigner for years, and still is. As we gauged from his speech today, he wants to close Roxby. Let there be no mistake about it. The member for Briggs wants to close it down. Consequently, he is constantly in touch with people in the anti-nuclear movement. That was Mr Dunstan, on 6 February 1979, telling the House about the track record of the member for Briggs.

Nothing has changed, as we heard today. He is anti-nuclear and wants to close down all the mines. He does not look at this issue in any way objectively or honestly. He is only interested in the politics of fear and misrepresentation. In trying to whip up enough fear in marginal seats to rescue Labor from its impending defeat, he is again down in the gutter. For a month, he has desperately tried to whip up this issue. He has one friend in the media prepared to play this game, but what are they trying to prove? They are talking about waste disposal. Nobody in the Liberal Party, I repeat, is advocating the establishment of a nuclear power plant in South Australia. I do not know how many times we have to deny that, but half of the Fabricator’s speech was built on that.

Mr Rann: It is *sub judice*.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It was not *sub judice* when the member for Briggs was speaking. He chose to repeat the fabrication. They allege that the Liberal Party has a secret plan to turn Roxby Downs into the world’s nuclear waste dump. This is just one more fabrication, and a complete fabrication, at that. But let the House consider which Party has been more active in canvassing this issue publicly. It has not been the Liberal Party. I take the House back to 1981, to a request by the former Premier of New South Wales, Mr Wran, to dump radioactive waste in South Australia. That waste had been accumulated at the Lucas Heights research facility.

The former Liberal Government accepted that it could be disposed of safely—and economically—and pointed out that there were plenty of locations close to Sydney where it could be buried. In doing so, we saved the South Australian Branch of the Labor Party from very acute embarrassment, I might say, when their colleague the Premier of New South Wales wanted us to bury the waste from Lucas Heights. Because you see, only a fortnight before Mr Wran made this request to the former Liberal Government, the South Australian Labor Party Convention had passed a motion calling on South Australia to be declared nuclear free. No Roxby Downs—no nothing; no nuclear treatment in hospitals, if that is to be taken seriously.

But the total hypocrisy of Labor does not end there. More recently, Mr Wran has publicly supported the disposal of nuclear waste in Australia. This time in his capacity as Chairman of the CSIRO, he was quoted in the *Australian* of 8 March 1988 as supporting a proposal by a South Australian-based company, Nuclear Waste Management, to establish a waste disposal industry in Australia. This prompted similar expressions of support from across the Labor spectrum—from leading Left identity, Mr John Saunderson (who said in the *Australian* of 9 March last year that a waste plant in Australia could be used as a model for other countries) to the Minister for Industry, Senator Button (who has been a constant advocate).

The South Australian company developing this technology holds the commercial licence for synroc—a technology developed over the past 10 years in Australia to immobilise and permanently dispose of waste. The work of this company has been carried out in conjunction with the South Australian Institute of Technology. The member for Briggs is a member of the institute’s council, so I should like to ask him: does he support this work, or has he, through his

membership of the council, sought to stop it? He issued a press statement on 2 October which no-one bothered to run but which asked 'Do the Liberals believe the synroc process is a safe way of disposing of radioactive wastes?' We might ask him whether he does. He is supporting the investigation of it, obviously. Like many people in the Labor Party, we believe that it can be. This is not only current thinking in the Labor Party.

In 1981, as members of the Upper House Select Committee on Uranium Resources, Dr Cornwall and Mr Foster of the Labor Party included in their findings the acknowledgment that the synroc process would probably provide a technical solution for high level waste disposal. So, what nonsense has the member for Briggs been carrying on about? On the Channel 7 news on Saturday night, 30 September, he was interviewed by Randall Ashbourne, who was making a very rare weekend appearance.

The member for Briggs said this about alleged plans to dump waste at Roxby Downs:

What they're not telling us, that all this plutonium poison has to go through South Australian ports, along South Australian roads and past South Australian homes before it gets to this supposedly safe nuclear dump.

A complete figment of their imaginations. In the *Sunday Mail* (Country Edition), which went on to the streets that night, the member for Briggs was quoted in a story which carried Mr Ashbourne's by-line, which he quoted today. The member said:

If the Liberals' only vision is to turn the Festival State into a nuke dump State, I'm appalled.

Quite coincidentally, the Premier issued a press statement the following day. In it was reference to members of the Liberal Party wanting to see nuclear waste shipped through South Australian ports and driven through South Australian communities to be dumped in the outback. Our highly original Premier also said this:

Mr Olsen's vision for South Australia in the 1990s appears to be a change from the Festival State to the nuclear dump State of the world.

The Premier is going to count the cost of allowing the member for Briggs to infect him with the politics of fear, allowing the member to so blatantly put such scandalously false words into his mouth. I have demonstrated that the member does not have one shred of credibility and we have known it for a long time. He has been living lies for a decade on the uranium issue. Because Labor remains so divided, it has to produce stunts like this. Because the Premier is so timid, he has to hide behind the words of the 'Fabricator'. He has to put him up in Government time to try to give further credence to these complete falsehoods. There is no doubt the member for Briggs was one of the leading players in the plot to force Mr Norm Foster to rescue Labor over Roxby Downs. It was a most disgraceful episode. Today, we have seen more of this gutless approach to a very serious and sensitive issue.

The member has been in the gutter for so long that he just cannot get out. This motion refers to uranium enrichment. The 'Fabricator' has often quoted Mr Dunstan as his political bible. Let us see what Mr Dunstan has had to say about enrichment. I refer to a statement Mr Dunstan made not recently, but more than 14 years ago, when development of this technology was in its relative infancy, before recent progress which has proved its safety. Mr Dunstan said this in this House on 17 June 1975:

The gas centrifuge system—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We have not finished yet. Mr Dunstan stated:

The gas centrifuge system of proving has a great many advantages for Australia and involves far fewer questions of danger of pollution of any kind than does the gaseous diffusion process. If the gas centrifuge system is used, South Australia has few problems at all in relation to it.

This is his boss and mentor. He continues:

There are no problems with regard to thermal pollution, waste or water. What is more, it would be within the possibilities of the future development of power in South Australia that this system of uranium enrichment could be used here.

There we have even Mr Dunstan advocating it, yet the Liberal Party has not! Let the 'Fabricator' get around that. There is more. The 'Fabricator' says that this Government is not having a bar of uranium enrichment. Let him explain this: why is the Government's own Uranium Advisory Committee maintaining contact with Urenco-Centec, world leaders in enrichment technology? In answer to a question I asked in the Estimates Committee, the Minister of Mines and Energy has replied, and I quote the Minister:

The Uranium Advisory Committee maintains contact with the Uranium Institute and with representatives of Urenco Limited.

I got that answer a week ago. Why is the committee doing this if the Government is not seeking to keep up to date with the latest developments in technology and market opportunities? Of course this is what is happening. But just for the coming election, the 'Fabricator' wants the public to believe that the Labor Party is not entertaining the enrichment option—now or at any time in the future. Yet it is keeping up contact with Urenco, it is keeping up with the latest technology. The Minister shakes his head, but I have the answer in writing from the Minister. Further, he has tried to claim that enrichment will not be economic—that there are not any market opportunities. We heard it again today. What did the Minister say in reply to my query?

In reply to another of my Estimates Committee questions, the Minister has admitted that the market for enriched uranium, even in the short to medium term, is expanding. Even if that expansion is only slow, it is expanding. The Minister says that in the period to the year 1995, it is estimated that 86 800 tonnes of uranium oxide will be required above that to be supplied under existing supply contracts. I got that information from the Minister 10 days ago. This means additional world demand is 140 times greater than the 1988 production at Roxby Downs. So let us have no more of these untruths about market opportunities—those opportunities exist.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If members listen carefully to the amendment that I will move, they will understand what our position is and they will be hard pressed, in the light of the answer that I have just had from the Minister, not to support that motion.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We should be working to study where South Australia can responsibly fit in. Behind the scenes, this is going on, as I indicated in respect of the answers from the Minister. This is going on. The Government is maintaining contact and it is keeping up with the latest technology. This is something that the 'Fabricator' just cannot come to terms with.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is probably at fault for not pulling up the honourable member much sooner. It is completely out of order for any member to attach a pejorative name to another member and to then continue to refer to that member by that title, almost to the exclusion of any other title, particularly when the title is one that most adversely reflects on the veracity of the member being referred to. It is not that long ago that the Chair made the honourable member for Briggs withdraw a reflection on the

veracity of the Deputy Leader, and I direct the Deputy Leader to cease using the title that he has been using up until now for the member for Briggs forthwith.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Certainly, Mr Speaker, I will refer to the member for Briggs as the member for Briggs and not by the name by which he is commonly known here. This is something that the member for Briggs just cannot come to terms with. His long malicious and mischievous campaign within the Labor Party has failed and now that he cannot argue against uranium mining—having prepared this speech a day or two ago, we understand that he wants to close Roxby Downs—he has had to find another opportunity to spread fear within the community. So he has latched on to enrichment, which is a technology proven overseas to be safe—and to be capable of giving Australia more influence over the end use of the product. This motion is nothing more than a stunt. It has no foundation in logic or honesty. No-one is proposing to build a nuclear power plant in South Australia—nor have we advocated it. That is not an issue. The member has invented the scenario that Roxby Downs will be used as a waste disposal site for spent fuel from overseas when the Western Mining Corporation, the alleged proponent—

Mr Rann interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: You are in Government—what are you going to do about it? It will be used as a waste disposal site for spent fuel from overseas—

Mr Tyler interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Fisher is out of order for interjecting.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not want this point to be lost on members opposite. I can understand their discomfiture but I will say it again so that it sinks in. The member has invented the scenario that Roxby Downs will be used as a waste disposal site for spent fuel from overseas when the Western Mining Corporation, the alleged proponent, and the Department of Mines and Energy know nothing about this.

This was also part of the fabrication erected, we now know, at the instigation of the member for Briggs. The member ropes enrichment into the debate when this is a technology which successive South Australian Governments, Labor as well as Liberal, have been actively investigating for 15 years. It is scandalous that the Premier uses the—I am sorry, Mr Speaker, I had the 'Fabricator', but it is the member for Briggs—member for Briggs to do this dirty work for him.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is not a matter of like or dislike: it is a matter of speaking the truth. It is the perception of all members, including the member on the backbench opposite who is scratching his head—he knows every bit as well as members on this side that what I am saying is true. It is scandalous that the Premier uses this member to do the dirty work for him, just as the Premier used Norm Foster in a despicable way to get him out of his political dilemma over Roxby Downs; and now the member for Briggs has been commissioned to run a campaign of fear through marginal seats. That is why the Premier took time out to listen to the member for Briggs, and then absented himself from this part of the debate. This is typical of the Premier. He is a political two-timer. There is a division in the community over our future economic direction because he has failed to give any lead.

Any Premier who wants to be seen as both pro and anti uranium mining, depending on who he is talking to, deserves no respect, because of Labor's internal divisions, and they are all too apparent as I pointed out. There has also been

a war within the Public Service for the past 15 years over which advice should be accepted. Information has been concealed, covered up, misrepresented and misinterpreted.

As a result, the public does not have all the facts, and they should have. Under the next Liberal Government all this Government's files will be opened to show the depth of dishonesty to which Labor has descended over the past 15 years, going back to the—and I am sorry, Mr Speaker, I will have to change the word again; I had the 'fabricator'—member for Briggs' time with the Dunstan Government when this manipulation began.

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the Deputy Leader. He will not be the first person in the history of this place to have suffered the wrath of the Chair for simulating slips of the tongue. The honourable Deputy Leader.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, I was reading a bit too quickly; I will be ever so careful from here on.

The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder: This is puerile.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister must be feeling particularly uncomfortable. He sits here and suggests that this is puerile when, during the Estimates Committees, he refused to answer any questions on this issue because it was too ticklish for him. He sat there like a dummy. He said that he would not answer. I asked whether the Mines Department officers could answer these embarrassing questions, and the Minister refused to let them answer.

The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder: It was irrelevant.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It certainly was not irrelevant. It was very pertinent to the issue that the member for Briggs has been trying to whip up for the past six weeks. The member for Briggs has finally conned the Government into giving him Government time to try to whip up this issue. The fact is that the Minister's department has now sent the answers to those questions, and they clearly indicate that the impression the Minister sought to give the Estimates Committee was false. The Government is actively pursuing and collecting information in relation to, the activities of the Uranium Institute and Urenco. That was not the impression the Minister sought to give during the Estimates Committees. This issue was too hot to handle, and he knows it. Anyway, I have quoted the Minister's answers; they are here for all to read. I let the public draw their own conclusions.

I now return to the motion. When the full story is told the member for Briggs will be exposed for what he is—although we know what he is. His approach is beneath contempt. I move to amend the motion as follows:

Strike out all words after 'that' and replace them with:

This House condemns the deliberate scaremongering of the member for Briggs which is based on a set of vicious falsehoods about non-existent plans to establish waste disposal facilities at Roxby Downs; condemns the Premier for aiding and abetting the campaign of the member for Briggs; and supports a feasibility study into the establishment of uranium processing facilities to cover issues such as technology, environmental impact and location of such facilities, with no decisions to be taken about their establishment in South Australia until this study has been completed, made public and subjected to full public debate.

I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on what may or may not be a point of order from the honourable member for Heysen, the House has not yet received a written copy of the Deputy Leader's amendment.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Here it is, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Leave has been sought—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Is it a point of order?

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave has been sought for the honourable Deputy Leader to continue his remarks. Is leave granted? Leave granted.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.
A quorum having been formed:

The SPEAKER: Call on the Orders of the Day. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have called on the orders of the day.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has the call.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, Mr Speaker, I seek leave to move a—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have called on the honourable Minister.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, Mr Speaker, I did not get a chance to get the call.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot accept that as a point of order.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Well, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister has the call and no-one else. The honourable Minister.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Emergency Services): I move:

That the time now allotted for the completion of the Legal Practitioners Act Amendment Bill and the State Opera of South Australia Act Amendment Bill be until 7.15 p.m. today.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Deputy Leader has a point of order?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: No, Mr Speaker. I wish to move something. I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Notices of Motion: *Other Business, No. 10, to be taken into consideration forthwith.*

The SPEAKER: I cannot accept the point of order under—

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It's a motion.

The SPEAKER: I cannot accept it—

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Why not? You accepted it from the other side.

The SPEAKER: Order—under Standing Order No. 465.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: How on earth can the Government manipulate private members' business to get up a motion which suits its convenience, yet the Opposition cannot get up a private member's motion which we consider far more important than the one that has just been debated?

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. I have given a ruling and drawn attention to Standing Order No. 465, which states:

After the orders of the day have been called on, no motion for suspension, without notice, shall be entertained . . .

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr Speaker, I sought to gain your attention to move this motion, but you did not even look this way. How on earth can we seek to redress the abuse of this week's program, when Government private member's business was brought up and debated, if we are not to be allowed the opportunity to do precisely the same

sort of thing with motions we consider more significant to the State—

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order. As soon as the business to which the honourable member referred was concluded, I went on to call Orders of the Day. I was momentarily interrupted by a quorum call—and I am not reflecting in any way on the legitimacy of a member drawing attention to the state of the House—and as soon as the quorum call had been satisfied I then returned to calling on Orders of the Day.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order. How does a member draw your attention to the fact that they wish to move a motion of the type that I have just outlined I wish to move? Do we stand up and shout in our place? How does one catch the eye of the Speaker under these circumstances? I was standing up trying to move a motion, and no notice was taken of me.

The SPEAKER: The Chair had already called on the Minister at that time.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. When I stood in my place to draw your attention to the state of the House it was my intention, and indeed I attempted at that time, to give notice that I intended to move a motion.

The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: No. You were not on your feet at that time. Mr Speaker, I stood and at that stage I was sat down.

The SPEAKER: Order! At that time the Chair could not entertain any motion from the honourable member for Heysen in any case because the honourable Deputy Leader's amendment had not yet been seconded.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: A further point of order, Mr Speaker. I was ready to speak immediately the amendment was seconded. Mr Speaker, I had been advised that it was important that I should indicate that I wished to move that Standing Orders be so far suspended prior to you, Sir, calling on the business of the day, and that is why I was on my feet to do so.

The SPEAKER: The Chair does not have telepathic powers. I was not aware when the honourable member rose to call for a quorum that he actually intended to call for something else instead.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. It was certainly my intention. I do not know how else I can do it. I stood up. I went to speak and you, Sir, suggested that I should take my seat. The Deputy Leader then stood up and you, Sir, called on the Minister.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair's recollection of events is probably not as exact as it would have been had I, in anticipation, known what was going to unfold. It is very difficult for me to recall everything precisely in retrospect. But, I am clear in my own mind that the honourable Minister was on his feet before the Deputy Leader, and I called on the honourable Minister then, as part of the procedure of calling on Orders of the Day.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, today the Government saw fit to alter the business of the House.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: With 2¼ hours notice.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier is out of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Light has the call.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The Opposition acceded to that request.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Deputy Leader would cease interjecting, I would be able to hear the member for Light.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The Opposition acceded to that request and now we seek the same courtesy from the Government for a similar action relative to private members' time. Are we to take it that the Government is going to renege on the matter of equality in this House for the Government and for the Opposition?

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot accept that as a point of order. They were obviously philosophical remarks directed across the House to members opposite.

Mr PETERSON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, can I have the situation clarified? I understand that the motion is for an extension of today's sitting to 7.15 p.m. I cannot see how that precludes the Opposition from moving its motion.

The SPEAKER: Standing Order 465 prevents that, after Orders of the Day have been proceeded with—

An honourable member: Nothing has been proceeded with.

The SPEAKER:—have been called on.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE (BUILDING INDUSTRY) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The SPEAKER: Message No. 39 from the Legislative Council to the House of Assembly: the Legislative Council has agreed to a Bill returned herewith entitled an Act to amend—Order! I ask the Deputy Leader to please extend some courtesy—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! In trying to maintain order from the Chair it is always very difficult to balance out the needs of the House, the need for order and the need to maintain the authority of the Chair. I am giving serious consideration at this very moment to naming the member for Victoria for displaying a contemptuous attitude towards the Chair by interjecting out of his place, alongside the Chair, at the time when the Chair was calling the House to order, after having been interrupted while reading a message from the Legislative Council. On deliberation, I will decline to do so on this occasion, though the member for Victoria has been given previous warnings of this nature. This is absolutely the last occasion on which he will receive this tolerance from the Chair, tolerance which is extended at this moment only because I am trying to give consideration to expediting the business of the House.

Bill returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask that the Minister, or any other member, not leave the Chamber while messages are being read.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendments.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 September. Page 752.)

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): The Opposition supports the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

STATE OPERA OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 October. Page 1205.)

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I indicate Opposition support for the Bill. In doing so, I have pleasure in congratulating, on behalf of the Opposition, the board, the Director and the staff of the State Opera Company for turning the company around from a most unfortunate position last year to a position where this year it now enjoys a strong basis from which to strike forth to a year which I think all opera lovers will look forward to with keen anticipation. Page 418 of this year's Auditor-General's Report outlines the situation very succinctly, in identifying the significant features of operation of the State Opera of South Australia during the immediate past year. The number of performances of the State Opera decreased from 51 to 29. That was unfortunate, but it was a hard decision taken in the interests of bringing the company back into the form of a viable opera company and one whose deficit would not have an adverse effect on the finances of the State.

The average number of people attending performances increased from 670 to 790. In the light of the decreased number of performances, that was an extraordinary achievement and great credit must be paid not only to the artists and performers but also to the company's management and to the way in which the performances were effectively promoted. The deficit per seat sold (average for all productions) fell by \$9, to \$49. Another interesting and relevant fact is that the Opera Theatre, which has subsequently been renamed Her Majesty's Theatre, was transferred to the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust on 1 July 1988 in consideration of the long-term liability of \$2.6 million. The company pays the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust for the hire of these facilities.

The deficit of \$665 000 in 1988 has been transformed to a surplus of \$103 000. I have no doubt that in the forthcoming year that surplus will be significantly increased. Earlier this month the State Opera presented its program for the forthcoming season and outlined a program that will certainly enchant and attract opera lovers in South Australia. The season will commence at the Adelaide Festival of Arts with a performance of Tosca. That performance will be conducted in Elder Park and it will be a superb way of drawing opera to the attention and delight of a vast section of the public—far more people than would normally have any possible chance of enjoying opera. Tosca will be followed by Aida, the Marriage of Figaro and Samson and Delilah, a mixture which is enticing in its prospects for all opera lovers. That program will follow the highly successful recent season of La Boheme. I think any member of this House who was present in the Festival Theatre for the performance of La Boheme could not fail to have been touched and inspired by the beauty and quality of that performance.

The purpose of this Bill is two-fold: first, to increase the number of members of the board from seven to eight; and secondly, to clarify the areas of accountability and responsibility of the board by making the company subject to the general control and direction of the Minister. In another

place it has already been emphasised by my colleague the Hon. Legh Davis that the subjection of the company to the general control and direction of the Minister must be limited to subjection to financial control and not in any way to encompass a hint of artistic direction or control, which would be an anathema to the Liberal Party, the arts community and, I feel confident, to the Government also.

Without canvassing all the matters dealt with in another place, I reinforce the congratulations of the Opposition to the company for the turnaround in its fortunes which has been achieved only by dint of extraordinary management skill and extraordinary effort on the part of all involved, and I wish the company well for its Festival performances and its 1990 season which, having seen details of the program, I feel will mark a truly splendid decade, carrying the State Opera through to the end of the twentieth century.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology): On behalf of my colleague, I wish to thank the member for Coles for her contribution to the debate and the indication of support for the legislation. I, too, am looking forward to a very exciting season next year, as I know are all members of the Government. We are seeing a turnaround in the financial affairs of the company, and that will give it the capacity to go on and excel artistically, as it has done so many times in the past. I thank the honourable member for her support.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: RURAL ASSISTANCE INVESTIGATION

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Agriculture): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In the matter of M.R. and C.A. Fabian with respect to rural assistance raised by the member for Victoria in Question Time on 5 September, I have further details to provide to the House. The honourable member's question coincided with a request by me to the Department of Agriculture for an urgent report into the circumstances surrounding the granting of a re-establishment grant to the Fabians who had been declared bankrupt and who, I subsequently learnt, were under investigation by the Fraud Squad.

The facts are that the Rural Assistance Branch was first contacted by Mrs Fabian on 30 May 1989. She was given copies of:

- (a) the relevant departmental fact sheet;
- (b) the asset declaration form; and
- (c) the guide to filling out the application.

Secondly, for bankrupts, the Rural Assistance Branch requires a statement of position in the form of the debtor's petition for bankruptcy. The recovery officer received the document from Mr and Mrs Fabian on 1 June 1989. The document had been completed by M.R. Fabian on 30 May 1989.

On 5 June 1989, the recovery officer received notice from the Official Receiver of M.R. Fabian's property. A letter was sent to the Official Receiver on 20 June 1989 advising that the Fabians had applied for a re-establishment grant. The recovery officer wrote up a statement for the then Deputy Manager, Mr Alan Hayward, on 27 June 1989, together with an approval form for a re-establishment grant for the signature of the Minister's delegate. The approval

form was signed by Mr Hayward as the delegate on 30 June 1989.

The letter of offer for the re-establishment grant was sent to the Fabians on 11 July 1989. Mr and Mrs Fabian came back to the office of the Rural Assistance Board on 17 July 1989 and wrote a letter of acceptance of the offer. A cheque for \$28 860 was released to Mr Fabian on 26 July 1989.

I have been unable to report to the House on this matter until now because of the complex circumstances surrounding this issue and the need on several occasions to seek further information, including Crown Law advice. Advice from the department indicates that policy guidelines and conditions applying to assistance under the Rural Adjustment Scheme were followed. There have been instances of people who are declared bankrupt receiving re-establishment grants, which are intended to help people who decide to leave their farms. In fact, the bankruptcy legislation clearly envisages that bankrupts could receive re-establishment grants as it specifically exempts amounts paid under the States and Northern Territory Grants (Rural Adjustment) Act 1985 from property divisible amongst the creditors.

I have been advised that, in assessing applications, there is no basis on which the branch can permissibly pre-judge the outcome of police inquiries or any legal proceedings. I am advised that the mere fact of investigation would not be a ground to refuse a grant. In any event, I understand the decisions taken by the Rural Assistance Branch in this instance were made before the commencement of police inquiries.

While I accept that the guidelines and procedures of the branch were strictly adhered to in this case and there is absolutely no evidence of malfeasance or other impropriety by any officer of the Department of Agriculture, I believe the case raises the need for a careful examination of those guidelines and procedures relating to rural assistance, and I will be pursuing this with the Director-General of Agriculture and with my Federal colleague, the Minister for Primary Industries and Energy.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: HOCKEY/LACROSSE STADIUM

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr INGERSON: I apologise for the error in my speech made recently in the House. I made a mathematical calculation error and not an intended error in commenting on State funds used in the construction of the hockey centre at Gepps Cross. I accept the statement made by the Minister of Recreation and Sport today in the House that close to 60 per cent of the funds were provided by the State Government.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Stuart): This may well be the last opportunity I have to make a contribution. Whilst I do not want it to be seen as a swansong—because there are matters of critical importance that I want to bring before this House—just in case it is the last opportunity I have, I want to thank my electorate, which has given me enormous

support over the past 19½ years, and all those who have helped me over that time, particularly my wife and family, my electorate secretaries, my ministerial staff in the various ministries for which I had the pleasure to be responsible, the parliamentary staff and, of course, my colleagues in the Parliament. I have enjoyed my time in Parliament. I have been very fortunate and I owe a debt of gratitude to the South Australian Branch of the Australian Labor Party for its endorsement and support over the years.

I want to speak more fully on a subject to which the member for Briggs made passing reference earlier today; that is, something that happened at Port Augusta in relation to the whole question of nuclear waste and the performance of the endorsed Liberal candidate for Stuart. As a result of information I have received, I took the opportunity this afternoon to telephone a constituent who had written a letter to the local *Transcontinental* and, as a result of that letter, was contacted by the Liberal candidate, who had also written to the *Transcontinental*. The circumstances of that contact were such that I was particularly concerned.

This is the first time I have had cause to speak to this woman, and I do not believe that I have met her personally. I can assure the House that, to the best of my knowledge, she has no political affiliations whatsoever, which really makes the circumstances of the case that I will outline so much worse. As a result of publicity in the *Statewide newspapers*, my constituent wrote to the *Transcontinental* expressing her concern at the suggestion of senior Liberal Party politicians and some scientists that 'South Australia's Far North would be an excellent nuclear waste dumping ground'. Before she submitted that letter to the Editor of the *Transcontinental*, my constituent took the opportunity to ask the Liberal candidate for Stuart what he thought of the letter. Also, because she is non-political, she showed the letter to the Labor candidate for the electorate of Stuart. Both candidates told her that they thought it was a good letter and that she should have it printed. In fact, the Liberal candidate said that he was particularly concerned about the environment and was having a number of discussions with his daughters on the subject.

After the letter was printed, she then took the opportunity to check it out with another candidate for the electorate of Stuart and was again assured by that person that the letter was sound and appropriate. However, it is obvious that in the meantime the Liberal Party detected that there was very strong opposition throughout South Australia to any idea of a nuclear waste dump anywhere in the State, particularly in our part of the world, where constituents of Stuart would be concerned that it might be located in an area close to Port Augusta, Port Pirie or Whyalla. Obviously, the Liberal Party made that information known to the local candidate, because he telephoned my constituent and harassed and threatened her with writs. She has described their conversation as most unpleasant and she was reduced to tears. These people are personal friends who visit one another's house, who eat at each other's home and, despite that, the Liberal candidate for Stuart has acted in a way that I believe is totally inappropriate and it is certainly a level of politics that, in my time as the member for Stuart, has never been introduced in local elections.

I know the Liberal candidate for Stuart; he is the principal of a school and a man for whom, hitherto, I have had a lot of respect. He is a gentle, concerned individual and there is no way that I would accept that, of his own volition, he would have adopted this aggressive and quite outrageous attitude towards one of my constituents unless he had been directed to do so by a higher authority within the Liberal Party. I took the opportunity to telephone my constituent

this afternoon—I contacted her, she did not contact me—to test the veracity of the information I had received, and she confirmed it. In fact, she said she was prepared to let the matter rest, except that in yesterday's *Transcontinental* the Liberal candidate described her comments as a malicious falsehood. I do not believe that he would have taken this action at all if he had not been directed to do so.

My constituent confirmed that during the discussion, when she was harassed and stood over, the Liberal candidate frequently used the words 'the press secretary of the Leader of the Opposition', so there is no doubt that the Leader of the Opposition's office has contacted the Liberal candidate at Port Augusta and directed him to stand over this lady. I might say that this lady is not a fragile flower; she is a lawyer, the wife of the local dentist and a person of some standing within the community and someone who does not take lightly the issue of nuclear waste, nor the way she has been treated by her friend who is now the Liberal candidate.

I asked her if she minded my raising the matter in Parliament, and she said that she would have if she had not been libelled by the candidate in the way that she has in this week's press. She said she finds it difficult to go down to the supermarket to do her shopping this afternoon because people in Port Augusta may feel that the Liberal candidate, who is respected, has a valid point of view on this issue. I believe that this woman probably has a case for legal action against the Liberal candidate, which is quite interesting when one views the actions that the Liberal Party has taken against others who it alleges have said things about nuclear waste.

I deplore what has happened at Port Augusta. I deplore the fact that the Liberal Party is standing over its candidates to require them, in turn, to stand over concerned members of the electorate. I deplore that a Liberal candidate, who hitherto has been a person of good reputation, has been reduced to trying to back up or defend the Liberal Party's position when everyone knows that Party's policy on the whole nuclear industry. Incidentally, the letter this woman has written is one that, in normal circumstances, the Liberal candidate would have supported although, in fairness to him, he did tell her that he did not think that the Liberal Party at that time was considering dumping nuclear waste in the North, but he certainly supported the enrichment plant.

I think that that matter needs to be brought to the attention of this House, and I hope that the election campaign in Stuart can continue without candidates ringing up, threatening and standing over constituents with writs, and so on. I have had seven occasions to go to the people in the electorate of Stuart. On every occasion I have been contested by the Liberal Party and, on some occasions, by Independents. On every occasion, once the election has been completed, I have been in a position to say that the election was clean and that there was no intrusion of underhand tactics or of things that could be regarded as libellous or slanderous. I believe that that should continue.

I also believe that the Liberal Party is so desperate and so concerned that it has been found out in relation to its policies on the nuclear cycle, particularly in terms of enrichment and nuclear waste disposal, that it has now adopted the attitude that anyone who dares to raise their voice—any concerned person within the community, any young mother who is concerned about her children, any person with concerns about the health and well-being of the community of South Australia—will be harassed, threatened and stood over, particularly if the Liberal Party thinks it has any influence over them. We all know that many people in the Liberal Party—particularly the member for Coles

who is in the House at the moment—share the Labor Party's and Government's view about the nuclear fuel cycle and the possibility under another Government that nuclear fuel waste will be deposited in South Australia. I deplore what has happened in Port Augusta.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I regret that I have heard the last of the member for Stuart in this House, because I—

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: You like him?

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Yes, I do like him, but I refute his allegation that the Liberal Party stands over its candidates. That has never been and never will be the case, and there is no way on earth that the honourable member could prove that.

My purpose in speaking on the adjournment debate is to refute a substantial number of the statements made by the Premier in his ministerial statement to the House yesterday in relation to Health and Life Care Ltd and to refute statements by the Chairman of the company at the annual general meeting yesterday, reported in the *Advertiser* this morning. I want to give the House the background to my involvement in this issue.

In May this year I was visited by a solicitor who expressed extreme concern that the State Bank, through a loan, was propping up a company, Health and Life Care, which should have been in receivership. He felt that this matter was of such concern that it should be raised in Parliament by the Opposition. At the time, I did not pursue the matter, but I noted it and kept a number of the documents in my files. A few weeks ago five employees of Health and Life Care, some of them former employees, came to my office seeking my help in trying to right a wrong that they believed was being done to them. They wanted redress for an injustice under which they believed they would be pursued to the point of bankruptcy (and they presented me with sufficient convincing evidence in writing that that would be the case) if their unpaid liabilities under an employee share scheme were called up.

In the light of those five people—not one, two or three, but five—coming to me and in the light of the solicitor's documents that they brought to me, I raised the matter in Parliament. It is interesting that a matter, which allegedly is now completely under control, is currently being pursued on behalf of a number of people by more than one solicitor in Adelaide and could result in the matter going to court. I give that as an indication of the gravity of this whole situation, the fact that I do not treat it lightly and that I have checked my facts. I now want the Premier to check his facts. That is the background.

Yesterday, in his statement to the House, the Premier suggested that I was misusing the words 'It is almost like a State Government guarantee.' Reference to *Hansard* at page 1281 will indicate that the member for Mitcham, by interjection, suggested that a loan from the State Bank was almost like State Government backing, and I acknowledged the validity of that comment. The fact is that the State Bank is Government guaranteed. No matter what kind of loan we are talking about, it is guaranteed by the Government. That fact cannot be disputed.

The Premier went on to say that he was at a loss to understand how I could argue that staff members entered into the share scheme based on some faith in the State Bank if the State Bank was not involved—suggesting that the State Bank was not involved. The fact is that the Premier is not correct when he states that the shares under this scheme were taken up by 10 October 1986 and 'that the

bank was not involved with HLC at the time the employees entered the scheme'.

For the information of the Premier, a continuing series of staff share schemes was entered into by the company. The last of these schemes was implemented in November 1987—months after the State Bank was well and truly involved in the affairs of HLC. That is a fact.

On the second page of his statement, the Premier said that I claimed that a threat had been made on behalf of the bank that, despite the agreement of Westpac, Partnership Pacific and the Stock Exchange to vary the employee share scheme, it would act to liquidate the company and pursue the employees for the outstanding balance of their shares.

Earlier this week I gave to the House a statutory declaration—an affidavit sworn before a Commissioner of Affidavits—that this threat had been made. It is the word of one man against another. I can only say that the word of the man whom I quoted in Parliament, Mr Michael Collins, was sworn under affidavit. If this matter ever comes to court, the evidence of Mr Michael Collins and the evidence of Mr John Heard and Mr Len Harper will be tested in court. If necessary, in the meantime I can obtain further affidavits, including one from one of my parliamentary colleagues, who was told in a private conversation by Mr John Heard, the 'consultant' appointed to supervise the affairs of the company in November 1988, that he had been appointed as unofficial receiver. That is two people who are prepared to swear that they were given that information.

Further on in his statement, the Premier said:

The directors of Health and Life Care have been informed of the bank syndicate's desire not to have the outstanding balances forgiven at this stage. I am informed by the State Bank that the cancelling of these shares faces some legal problem.

That may be the case, but the fact is that at yesterday's annual general meeting of the company, Mr Graham Brooke, the newly appointed Chairman of Health and Life Care, said—and I was immensely relieved to hear this assurance—that the board did not intend to seek payment of the remaining liability on the shares. That is the assurance that the employees have been seeking, that is the assurance that I was trying to obtain from the Premier, and that is the assurance that will relieve this monumental burden that has been hanging over the heads of the employees. The Chairman of the company has at last given that public assurance, but it had not been given at the time that I raised the matter in Parliament.

At the annual general meeting, the Chairman of the company, Mr Brooke, is reported as saying that I incorrectly asserted that HLC was insolvent. I contacted Mr Brooke this afternoon by telephone in Melbourne, and he acknowledged that he had not read the *Hansard* report of my statement when he made that comment. I draw the attention of the House to what I did say, namely, that in May 1988 Health and Life Care was found to be insolvent—and it was. It could not pay all its monthly interest debt to the State Bank of South Australia, and at that stage it was insolvent. I might add that, in respect of receivership—and I have acknowledged on the record that was incorrect, that the company is not in receivership—its \$1 shares at the time I made that statement were down to 5c. Indeed, as recently as yesterday, 110 000 \$1 shares went through at 3c. At the time I made that statement, HLC had sold its major assets—all its South Australian hospitals—to SGIC. At the meeting in March this year at which this decision was approved by the shareholders, the directors stated that, if the approval for the sale did not go through at that meeting, the company could be in danger of imminent liquidation.

My credibility in raising these matters has been questioned by the Premier and by the Chairman of HLC. I

believe that the information that I have put on the record indicates that I have done my homework, checked my facts, got the documents and obtained a statutory declaration to reinforce the validity of what I said. If necessary, I can obtain further statutory declarations. In the light of the fact that it appears on the assurance of the Chairman of the company that justice will be done and that the employees will be forgiven the debt, I am pleased to reinforce the good news that appeared in this morning's finance pages that, under its new board and Chairman, the company is trying to trade its way out of its difficulties and may—I certainly hope it does—succeed in doing so. However, I refute these allegations, which have no substance.

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): The member for Stuart, speaking some time ago, said it might be his last opportunity in this Parliament to put a few things on the record. I do not for a moment think that it will be my last opportunity in this House, but it may be my last opportunity in this Parliament. In consequence of what the member for Stuart said, I want to add a note of farewell and valediction to the member for Stuart and to the members for Mitchell, Spence, Gilles and Playford.

I believe that they have been excellent representatives of their electorates and, more particularly, excellent representatives of the working people of this State, and have done a magnificent job in their years in this place, their collective service covering many decades. They have been good teachers and, above all, good friends to me, and I shall miss them.

I want to spend my remaining time this afternoon dealing with some criticisms which have been levelled at me in my role as the convener of the consultative group on the Marino Rocks marina. I want to put some of the results of my participation in that process on the record for the benefit of those who are interested in those things. As a result of my discussions with developers at various stages and with people from the Department of Environment and Planning and elsewhere, I know that a number of options are presently on the table which I believe would not have been there had it not been for my participation and the participation of local people.

These include an access road from the marina development to Lonsdale Highway, which access road will take pressure off the road north from Hallett Cove (namely the Cove Road), as well as the subsidiary roads north (namely Bandon Terrace, Newland Avenue, Kauri Parade, The Esplanade and other roads in the City of Brighton). That is a very positive aspect of our participation. The aspect of public parking at the marina and the suggestion that local people will be able to launch their boats, park their cars and leave their boat trailers there also came from me via the committee.

I also made the suggestion that the marina developers take into account the need for the South Australian Sea Rescue Squadron to have access to launching facilities in any marina proposal. I believe that to be an essential factor in any proposal, because it will enable the South Australian Sea Rescue Squadron to gain access to the southern coast which, of course, is probably more windswept and in some ways a more desperate coastline than the coastline further north.

Also as a result of my representations, I believe the developers will now consider providing a means of access by the general public to the rock platform at the base of the cliffs. Furthermore, I have suggested to the developers through the Department of Environment and Planning that access be assured to the paths along the top of the cliff above the

offshore component of the marina and west of the housing. That would include the historical Tjilbruke Trail, and enable Aboriginal people (who occasionally visit that trail) and many non-Aboriginal people to have access to that rather beautiful and spectacular cliff-top walk.

Another consideration has been access to open space. It has been my persistent view that open space throughout the development on both sides of the railway line should be open to all members of the public. At the moment, of course, both sides of the railway line are private land and the public is not allowed in. One positive aspect of any proposal would be that those areas would be opened up, and I have suggested to the developers and to the people from the Department of Environment and Planning that the public ought to have access to walking trails, the green belt and even cycle trails within that development.

The whole concept of the Marino Conservation Park was largely a result of my work with local people to set aside a very significant area of coastal heathland immediately above the marina proposal. I have pursued that with some vigour for the past two years, and it is my understanding that within the next few weeks moves will be made to gazette and, indeed, even open the park, and I should like to take the opportunity to record my thanks to Marion City Council for its role in the creation of the new Marino Conservation Park, as it will be known.

As a result of my intervention on behalf of the consultative committee, I understand that the developer will no longer be looking at putting housing between the new access road and Perry Barr Road. That will provide to residents of Karrara, particularly in the region immediately south of Perry Barr Road, an open green belt, a buffer zone, between the housing for Karrara and any housing associated with the marina. I believe that it is important that those people can continue to look out their front and back doors and see green grass, open fields and public open space, as that area would be.

That access road from the marina to Perry Barr Road is important in many ways. It is important because it will take traffic off the Cove Road, as I mentioned earlier, but if my suggestion is followed it will be done in such a way that no additional traffic is contributed to Perry Barr Road, because the access road will join directly onto the western end of Aroona Road.

That will ensure not only that Perry Barr Road is relieved of additional traffic but that pressure will be taken off the rather dangerous intersection of Perry Barr and Aroona Roads. If that suggestion is taken up by the developers, many of the current problems will be alleviated. The access road will also provide both a visual and a physical buffer between Perry Barr Road and Linwood Quarry which, at the moment, is causing local people some consternation.

If that road goes in, as I have suggested, it will provide a southern boundary to the operations of the quarry and will preserve the residents of Karrara from the further imposition of noise, dust and ground vibration which is normally associated with quarrying. It is interesting to note in passing that Linwood Quarry enjoys the status of a private mine, courtesy of the Tonkin Liberal Government and, as such, enjoys very significant exemption from the Planning Act, the Mining Act and the Mines and Works Inspection Act, all of which would have provided many of the planning controls we need had that area not been declared a private mine back in 1982.

I believe that my participation through the consultative committee has also been largely responsible for the decision to locate the Karrara Primary School at Quailo Avenue in Karrara and not north of Perry Barr Road. Had it not been

for that stipulation that the area between the access road and Perry Barr Road be preserved from housing, there might have been a need to place that school north of Perry Barr Road. As it is, there is no need: the school will be located at Quailo Avenue, which is where everyone in Karrara wants it to be, and I believe that the residents of Karrara will be most satisfied with that outcome.

Finally, the very existence of the consultative group and of a mechanism by which local people can participate in the planning process was an insistence of mine, an issue I discussed with the Minister for Environment and Planning, and one of the very positive outcomes of the free and open way in which this proposal has been treated to date and the way in which I have been taken into consultations both by the developer and by the Minister.

I wish to place on record my thanks, particularly to the Minister, but also to people from the Premier's Department, for the way in which they have taken trouble and done me the courtesy of asking questions about the development on the way through. Because of the trouble they have taken, we have been able to set up the consultative group, and I believe that the outcome of that group will be to give local people participation in planning and, for the first time in a development of this kind, local people will have a very real say in a project as it unfolds and develops.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.20 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 7 November at 2 p.m.