

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 20 August 1987

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. Anne Levy)** took the Chair at 2.15 p.m.

The Clerk (Mr C.H. Mertin) read prayers.

QUESTIONS

KALYRA HOSPITAL

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Attorney-General (who looks a bit like a petunia today) a question about Kalyra Hospital.

Leave granted

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: In a story in today's *Advertiser* the Premier Mr Bannon says:

It is estimated that it would cost about \$12 million to rebuild Kalyra while accommodation is being under-used at Julia Farr and Windana.

He also said that the closure of the hospital was necessary because the buildings were old and not suitable for modern patient management techniques. I am told that in 1981 Kalyra requested money for a capital rebuilding program. It was an ambit claim at a time when there was capital works money available and architects from the Health Commission were looking for proposals. The work did not proceed, obviously, and no further request from Kalyra has been presented to the Health Commission. I understand that the Health Commission is claiming Kalyra has been seeking public funding to have the hospital rebuilt for some years.

In fact, the situation is quite the opposite. For those people who do not know Kalyra's background, it is a private charitable institution run for the public and is non-profit-making. It was set up under a trust in about 1894. It runs not only this hospital but a number of other live-in units around the metropolitan area which are provided to the aged at very low cost indeed. Kalyra now does not wish to rebuild, and my information is that the Health Commission is fully aware of that. The people who run the hospital believe it is perfectly sound structurally and totally adequate for the services offered, which are hospice care and rehabilitation.

The only request for capital works in recent years was a small sum for fire prevention measures. The first stage of these measures came from Government funding. The rest will be paid by the hospital's own James Brown Trust. Proposed new bathrooms and toilets also will be paid for by the James Brown Trust. There has not been and is not any request for capital expenditure of \$12 million this year and, in fact, there has not been since 1981. In fact, these buildings all have strong heritage value and any proposal to knock them down I predict would be strongly resisted by groups in the community.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: And in this Parliament.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Yes. There is clearly a difference of opinion between the Premier and the Health Commission and Kalyra as to whether there is a current request for capital works expenditure. My understanding is quite clear that there is no present request for major funding. I seek leave to table a copy of 'Hospice care policy, South Australian Health Commission'.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: This document clearly lays out the hospice care policy of the South Australian Health Commission in 1985. There is a foreword by the Hon. John

Cornwall, Minister of Health, and that is a very clear indication of the Minister's support for hospice care. He says:

I have taken a keen interest in seeing the concept of community based palliative care developed in South Australia. I regard such a service as a hallmark of a caring, civilised society.

Throughout this document there are photographs of Kalyra: on page 1, page 2, page 3, page 8, and page 10 consists totally of photographs of Kalyra. The document shows quite clearly that the whole of the hospice care policy was based on this institution called Kalyra. It was obviously very acceptable at that time, because it was the basis of a policy document of the Health Commission.

I understand also that the Kalyra Trust has indicated that it is prepared to meet \$700 000 of the \$1 million in expenditure. It shows that it is prepared to meet \$700 000 of that outlay through the implementation of a number of strategies. I seek leave to table a copy of a letter dated 19 August 1986.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: This letter states:

... recognition by the South Australian Health Commission of the trust demonstration of savings of \$700 000-plus in a full year through implementation of a number of strategies.

So, in fact, the figure of \$1 million quoted is not correct. If the Kalyra people are prepared to meet \$700 000, the total will be \$300 000 instead of \$1 million. My question to the Attorney-General is this: will he, as Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council, request the Premier to withdraw the proposal to close Kalyra, as it appears that, of the \$1 million saving claimed by the Premier, Kalyra has offered to come forward with \$700 000, and there is no current request or potential future request for any major capital funds of the nature described by the Premier yesterday?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am not sure whether all the facts stated by the Hon. Mr Cameron are correct or incorrect.

The Hon. Peter Dunn: Are you saying he didn't tell the truth?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: No, but obviously there can be differences of opinion about matters, as the Hon. Mr Dunn well knows, so I am not able to indicate whether or not what the honourable member says is correct. What the honourable member has to realise, of course—and one would have expected members of Parliament to have come to that realisation by now—is that the Government must find ways of rationalising services in light of the difficult budgetary situation we currently face and which, I have no doubt, will be outlined further in the budget when it is introduced next week.

The only thing one can say in that respect, of course, is that, had the Federal Liberal Party been elected, the amount of funds available to the States would have been even less than the current allocation. Even with this—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That is a furphy and the honourable member knows it. It is just not true. To make a statement like that is just grossly dishonest.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: There have not been 10 000 public servants added to the State's payroll in the past five years. That is blatantly incorrect and the honourable member should stop being dishonest.

The Hon. Peter Dunn interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Well, I have not got the figures in front of me, but I can assure members that there have not been 10 000 full-time equivalents added to the Public Service.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: You tell us how many were.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: When the budget is introduced I will be quite happy to give the honourable member the information, but he knows full well that there have not been the equivalent of 10 000 full-time public servants added to the payroll in the past five years. That is untrue.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: What is the truth?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: When the budget is introduced next week—I do not have the figures at my fingertips at the present time—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Certainly, I have that, absolutely, because it is something members opposite have pushed on previous occasions—and it is wrong.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: Well, tell us the truth.

The PRESIDENT: Order! This is a question about Kalyra.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member can pursue questions about public sector employment when the budget is produced, and there is no problem about discussing what has happened in that area. However, to put the record straight with respect to this furphy that members opposite have attempted to spread throughout the community, I can say that there have not been 10 000 full-time equivalent employees added to the public sector in the past five years.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: Well, how many have been?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: You have already asked that and I have already answered it. I am sure that the information can be elicited at the appropriate time when the budget is introduced. I just make that as a general comment. Obviously, there has to be some rationalisation of services in the health and transport areas and in virtually every other area of Government activity. As I understand it, in any event the service is not to be reduced—the service is to be provided from another facility which is under-utilised.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: How is it going to be cheaper if you provide the same service?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Because you are providing the same service from one location instead of from two. I would have thought that even the Hon. Mr Cameron could have worked that out. If a service is provided from one location it is likely to be cheaper than providing a service—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order!

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member really does not know what he is talking about. Surely, the fact is that, if a service is provided from an already existing facility which is under-utilised, and that is shifted and utilised fully, then there ought to be a saving. I would have thought that even the Hon. Mr Davis, with his economic training from the Adelaide University no less, would have been able to understand that. I make those remarks by way of general statements which, of course, all members opposite are fully aware of except possibly the Democrats, but one would not expect them to be aware of these problems that people with a chance of getting into Government have with respect to the budget. However, I would expect members opposite to have some understanding of the situation as they have on previous occasions, albeit for very brief periods, been in Government. The specific issues which the Hon. Mr Cameron has raised and which I am not able to verify I will refer to the appropriate Minister and bring back a reply.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, as Leader

of the Government, a question about the closure of the Kalyra Hospital.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: First, I should declare an interest in this matter as a member of the Southern Hospice Association. In the past few years, I have made speeches and asked questions in the Council about the hospice movement which has, as its role, the care of terminally ill patients after any hope of cure has gone. I have visited a hospice overseas and I have attended meetings of the Southern Hospice Association. Until yesterday I believed that there was a bipartisan approach to the hospice movement in South Australia.

The news that the State Government, without consultation, plans to close Kalyra and its 16 hospice beds (which are always fully utilised) and, without any consideration of the close network developed between Kalyra and the Flinders Medical Centre over the past seven years, has devastated the professional staff and the 30 volunteers at the Flinders Medical Centre. I have been advised that there are volunteers bawling their eyes out this morning at the Flinders Medical Centre, and that morale is appalling. I have spoken to Dr Ian Maddocks, Chairman of the Southern Hospice Association, and Mrs Helen Watts, the President of the volunteers, and they cannot believe that the Minister of Health would fracture the relationship, which has taken seven years to build, and effectively destroy what is generally regarded as the most successful model of hospice care in Australia.

Indeed, I understand that the Minister of Health himself has used Kalyra as a model for hospices in other metropolitan sectors. Dr Maddocks only recently addressed both the Prince of Wales and Westmead Hospitals in Sydney, which have resolved to follow the Southern Hospice model, as has the Melbourne City Mission Hospice. That is clear evidence, Madam President, that South Australia does have the leading model in Australia.

Flinders Medical Centre is currently seeking to establish a chair in palliative care, which builds on the widely acclaimed success of the Pain Unit, research and teaching at Flinders Medical Centre. That clearly relates closely to hospice care. Equally important is the fact that the team of 30 volunteers has taken to build up. Networking is not developed overnight.

Hospice care is specialised care of physical, financial, psychological and religious needs of the terminally ill, and there is bereavement counselling for relatives. The people involved with whom I have spoken cannot understand, and neither can I, why what has taken years to build up is to be knocked down without warning or consultation. Not only is their violent disagreement with the sneaky way in which this closure has been undertaken, but also with what is proposed. The Minister proposes to move Kalyra hospice beds to Windana Nursing Home and the convalescent beds to Julia Farr Centre.

It is argued by people at Flinders Medical Centre that the relocation costs involved will make any savings very marginal. Perhaps more importantly, moving to Windana is moving geographically in quite the wrong direction—northwards and away from the rapidly expanding southern suburbs. I am moved to say that this is a shabby, shameful, despicable, inconsiderate and inhuman approach to perhaps the most human of all issues. The Minister of Health's credibility is in tatters and he has just lost any pretence that he has had to being the great communicator. Therefore, my questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Will the Government immediately make public the costings it has used to justify the decision to close Kalyra?

2. Will the Government immediately undertake proper consultation with both the professional and volunteer staff involved in hospice care at Kalyra and Flinders Medical Centre?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Hon. Dr Cornwall, as the honourable member is aware, has a pair because of personal bereavement that has taken him to Queensland.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That is where he is.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That is where he was and he cannot get back.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am not bringing it in—I am just saying that the Hon. Dr Cornwall is away.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am sure that you will be able to fill up the time. Madam President, the Hon. Dr Cornwall is away. I have answered the first question asked by the Hon. Mr Cameron, who asked questions on specific issues which I was not able to verify but about which I had said they would be referred to the appropriate Minister so that a reply can be brought back.

With respect to consultation, I am sure that there will be consultation in this matter. As I understand from what the Premier said—and I think it was only raised in Parliament yesterday—the Premier indicated that whatever happened would happen over some period of time, so that, whatever happens, obviously there will need to be discussions with the parties concerned. Also, I am happy to refer the honourable member's question regarding costings to the Hon. Dr Cornwall, and I am sure that he will be able to provide the Council with the information on costings which is the basis for the decision that has been taken in this respect.

TEENAGE SUICIDES

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about teenage suicides.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: A report published this week indicates that there is an alarming increase in teenage suicide rates in Australia. The rates for boys aged 15 to 19 years has doubled in the past 20 years from a rate of 5.7 per 100 000 annually in the three years from 1965 to a rate of 12.1 per 100 000 annually in the three years to 1985. The absolute numbers for boys in 1965 to 1967 were 94 and in 1983 to 1985 were 240, while the absolute numbers for girls remained steady: 53 in 1965 to 67 and 50 in 1983 to 85, with the rate per 100 000 for girls actually falling. The study showed that the rates for other groups of young people had remained fairly steady.

The study is by Dr Robert Kosky, who is Director of Psychiatry at the Princess Margaret Hospital for Children in Perth. He has reported as follows:

There are doubts about whether the raw figures truly represent the facts—the apparent rise could be partly due to changes in coroners' classifications of deaths and in community attitudes to teenage suicide.

However, he concludes that the figures support 'an increase in suicidal behaviour among children and adolescents which should be a cause of great concern to health professionals and the community', and stresses that the underlying causes of suicide—mainly depression and family disturbances—must be understood. The report continues:

Depression is present in nearly 50 per cent of children referred to child psychiatry services, and it ought to be recognised more commonly, regarded more seriously and treated more actively.

He also says that the admission rates to hospital for attempted suicide have trebled for boys and doubled for girls since 1978. The rise is alarming. The observation was made that it will cost the community something like \$200 million annually in lost productivity and treatment of people who attempt to kill themselves. But that cold assessment ignores the human suffering. Questions do arise across a range of portfolio responsibilities about the capacity to detect early signs of suicidal tendencies, treatment facilities, capacity for support from families and peer groups and others, the impact of television and movies, unemployment, and hope for the future, and they are all questions which have to be addressed.

Some of those questions do, in fact, impinge upon the area of the Minister of Community Welfare, some on the Minister of Health and some on the Attorney-General in relation to television, more particularly, videos, pornographic and violent printed and video material, and in relation to the way in which young offenders are detected and brought to court. My questions to the Attorney-General, in his capacity as Attorney-General and Leader of the Government, are:

1. Will the Government undertake a study to identify the reasons for the alarming increase in teenage suicides, and the positive steps which must be taken to reduce the rate?

2. Will the Government review support facilities and services provided by the Government and private agencies for children and families and friends to ensure that, where teenage suicide is a risk, it is detected at an early stage and steps are taken immediately to deal with that?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member has raised a very important issue, although I think he was drawing somewhat of a long bow by suggesting that there existed, somehow or other, a matter which involved my portfolio to any extent. However, the issue is an important one obviously, I am not in a position to indicate to the honourable member whether or not the Government would undertake a study, but that is a matter that I will refer to the appropriate Ministers within the Government for a response, and I will advise the honourable member whether the Government considers that suggestion has any merit.

It is possible that sufficient information is already available about the causes of teenage suicides or, indeed, whether or not there has been an increase. In fact, as the honourable member indicates, it is possible that the apparent increase may be as a result of a different method of collecting statistics relating to such deaths.

It is quite probable that the Health Commission or the Department for Community Welfare would have information on this topic in any case and, if so, I am sure that the Minister would be happy to provide the honourable member with whatever information can be provided and to consider the honourable member's suggestions.

NORTH ADELAIDE RAILWAY STATION

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General (who, under the circumstances, seems to be the most appropriate Minister representing the Government) a question about the North Adelaide railway station.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: The State Transport Authority has signed a 30-year lease relating to the North Adelaide

railway station as a restaurant, tavern bar and coffee lounge complex with Semaphore Foodland proprietor Mr Peter Nassaris, who admits that he has had absolutely no previous experience with restaurants. At a public meeting that was called last night by the Lord Mayor of Adelaide, the Hon. Steve Condous, to discuss the proposal, Mr Nassaris refused to disclose whether there is a clause under which either party can revoke the lease. There is a shroud of secrecy around the lease on the part of both the State Transport Authority and the developer.

The railway station is surrounded by parklands and the area involved is regarded as alienated parklands by all concerned, including the newly formed Adelaide Parklands Preservation Association, of which I am Deputy Chairperson. The City of Adelaide Development Plan calls for the return of alienated areas to parklands where they would be under the control of the Adelaide City Council.

At the public meeting last night, the Lord Mayor indicated very clearly that he believed that the council would reject the proposed plan for the railway station put forward by Mr Nassaris but, as the STA still had control of the railway station and its surrounds, the city council's decision would count for nought. He believed (and I agree with him) that the Minister of Transport and the government are the only authorities which could prevent this desecration of the parklands from going ahead.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: Very clearly, it is, but the trouble is that that land is not parklands as such. It is surrounded by parklands but it is alienated land.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner interjecting:

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I would like to explain the matter to the Attorney, who cannot be expected to be fully informed on everything. It is widely considered that the area that is currently being used by the STA for railway purposes is alienated parkland and that, when it is no longer required for transport or rail purposes, it should revert to parklands. Despite frequent requests for details of the lease, the STA has kept the matter very close to its chest, claiming 'fairness to the developer' as the excuse. My questions are as follows:

1. Does the Government believe that, where the STA does not require a facility for transport purposes, and that facility is on alienated parklands, the STA can lease it for commercial purposes, or should it revert to parklands?
2. Since the lease between the STA and Mr Nassaris involves property and land vital to the people of South Australia, would the Government ensure that the details of the lease are made public?
3. In particular, can the Government justify one of its authorities, the STA, granting a lease of 30 years for an area of alienated parklands?
4. Is there a condition in the lease which requires Adelaide City Council approval for the development, without which the lease would lapse?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I should declare my interest as a nearby resident of the North Adelaide railway station and someone who is torn between, on the one hand, the convenience that will be provided in my being able to stroll down the hill past the golf course on a pleasant summer evening and partake of whatever this new restaurant has to offer and, on the other hand, being kept awake at 2 a.m. by the raucous behaviour of the restaurant's clients (assuming that that is what happens). I think the honourable member has introduced something of a red herring by talking about alienated parklands in the sense of railway lines, railway stations or other areas where clearly it is virtually

impossible, in the present circumstances, to return those areas to parklands use.

I am not sure whether or not the honourable member is suggesting that we pull up the railway lines, and I am not sure whether he is suggesting that the North Adelaide railway station should be demolished and the area returned to parklands. I am sure that, if the Government had suggested that the North Adelaide railway station be demolished, the honourable member would have joined the picket line with the Aurora Action Group to protest about the destruction of a heritage item.

What is the honourable member going to say when the Adelaide gaol is closed? Will he suggest that it should be bulldozed because it is alienated parklands? No, I am sure that the honourable member will join those who want the Adelaide gaol retained as a heritage item. It seems to me that the honourable member must sort out just what he wants with respect to buildings on parklands. What is he saying about the Adelaide gaol? Is he saying it should be demolished? What is he saying about the North Adelaide railway station? Is he saying that it should be demolished?

The Hon. I. Gilfillan interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member is feeling a bit upset because he never has a consistent line on these issues. The honourable member picks one issue when it suits him and tries to make the best out of it for his own purposes, and I suppose that that is something that he is entitled to do. At least the Government is entitled to ask the honourable member some legitimate questions about whether his approach to these matters is in any way consistent. Of course, we never get any answers to the sorts of questions that I have just posed to the Hon. Mr Gilfillan. Furthermore, I think it should be pointed out that this Government has taken action which no other Government has taken in this State: to develop a plan to ensure that there are areas that can be returned to parklands. One is the Adelaide gaol, and another is a significant section comprising the railway yards next to the Morphett Street bridge.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Hon. Ms Laidlaw really is living in the past. What has happened on the ASER project site is that some reasonably pleasant buildings and a pleasant area have been created next to the railway station where there were some rotten old tin roofs which housed trains at the railway station.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: No, it is not that bit, and the honourable member knows that as well as I do. I am saying that, if that area had been parklands, presumably that development would not have proceeded. Surely the honourable member is not objecting to that, although Liberal members opposite do not seem to be able to make up their minds on this matter, either. In fact, the Hon. Mr Hill objects at every moment to the ASER development. I am sure that 95 per cent of South Australians would agree that what is there now is an asset to the State compared with what was there before—some daggy old railway yards and barns which were really an eyesore. That is the fact of the matter. They were not going to be shifted while we still had trains coming in to the Adelaide railway station. The railway station site has been completely redeveloped, and I would have thought for the benefit of the city and the State. Other areas to be returned to parklands include the Adelaide gaol and an area near the Morphett Street bridge, and plans have been drawn up for the Hackney depot.

The Hon. I. Gilfillan interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Government has developed a long-term plan. It is quite ridiculous for the Dem-

ocrats to be critical of that plan. This is the first time any Government in this State has taken up the parklands issue and said that there must be an attempt to return parkland areas to public use in a realistic way. This Government has done that. The plan is in place and obviously it is not something whereby you can click your fingers and have it done immediately. The plan that has been put in place will be implemented over a period of time and it includes returning significant parkland areas to public use, including the three sites that I have mentioned. That needs to be said by way of general introduction in reply to the honourable member's question. I do not know the particular details of the lease arrangement and what is intended with respect to that. I will refer that aspect of the question to the responsible Minister and bring down a reply.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I desire to ask a supplementary question. In the Attorney's answer he referred to the area of alienated parklands near the Morphett Street bridge which, I suggest, is similar to the site referred to in my original question. I ask the Attorney to agree or disagree that the proposal for the North Adelaide railway station and the area currently proposed for use as a car park are in the same category as the area of land near the Morphett Street bridge. These sites are no longer needed by the STA and, therefore, to be consistent with what has happened with the area of land near the Morphett Street bridge, the North Adelaide railway station and the area surrounding the proposed STA car park should return to parklands. The two areas are identical. Both sites were no longer required by the STA for railway purposes. In the first case the Government is rightly proud that the Morphett Street area has been returned to parklands. What is the difference between that and the land at the North Adelaide railway station?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The North Adelaide railway station is on it, apart from anything else.

DRUG CONSPIRACY

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Is the Attorney-General in a position to confirm a report in the *Sunday Mail* of 24 May this year that Federal investigators had questioned a senior South Australian State politician about drug related conspiracy allegations?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I know of no senior South Australian politician being so investigated.

AUSTRALIA CARD

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the Australia Card.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: On 10 January last year the Attorney-General, on behalf of the Government, wrote a three page letter to the Joint Select Committee on the Australia Card. The opening paragraph of the letter states:

I am writing to your committee on behalf of the Government of South Australia in order to acquaint it with major concerns and issues which this Government wants specifically addressed, both by your committee and any Commonwealth legislation that may emanate in consequence of its final recommendations.

The letter goes on to state that it will 'traverse the real concerns it perceives in the proposals'. The letter also implies that the Government will 'be reserving its final position and will direct its attention to the contemplated legislation as it is being drafted'. That contemplated legislation, as we all know, has been before Federal Parliament for some time,

and it was rejected on two occasions. So it is reasonable to expect that the State Government has now made up its mind or no longer reserves its final position on this matter.

The letter from the Attorney-General goes on to list 14 major concerns held by the State Government and seeks six guarantees and eight assurances. In the other place earlier this week the Premier replied to a question on the same subject and said that the submission to which I have just referred was received by the committee and 'the extent to which it has been taken account of is fairly limited'.

Does the Attorney-General accept that neither the joint select committee nor its minority or majority reports were unable or not prepared to provide the South Australian Government with the guarantees on all the 14 issues identified as real concerns to the South Australian Government in January last year? If the legislation does pass Federal Parliament, does the South Australian Government intend to insist that it is satisfied with the Australia Card legislation and that every one of the 14 concerns that were important to the Government last January have been addressed? On all those counts, is confidence in the Australia Card legislation conditional upon the State Government agreeing to cooperate with the Federal Government at a later stage if the legislation passes? If that is not the case, why not?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member has raised a number of hypothetical questions. I said yesterday that the Australia Card legislation has not passed the Federal Parliament. As far as I am aware, there have not been any recent discussions between State and Federal officers on the matter. The South Australian Government made its view known to the Federal select committee and also, I think, to the Federal Government. My understanding—and I am just talking generally now without having in front of me the specific point by point details the honourable member has raised—is that, in general terms, the issues that were raised by the South Australian Government have been addressed by the Federal Government in the legislation, in particular—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Just a minute! In particular, their proposals for privacy and data protection which, of course, was one of the major points taken up in the correspondence to which the honourable member has referred. I will not respond to hypothetical questions about the Australia Card. We will wait to see what the Australia Card legislation is. South Australia has made its submissions to the Federal select committee. There have been discussions at officer level between relevant Commonwealth and State Government departments, and that is as far as the matter has been taken at this time.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Whether the Australia Card proceeds is now a matter squarely with the Federal Government and, indeed, the Federal Parliament. If the Federal Parliament passes the legislation, then the South Australian Government will be in a position to respond to the questions the honourable member has asked.

DANGGALI CONSERVATION PARK

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing everybody today, a question on the Danggali conservation park.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I have in this place on other occasions asked questions about the staffing levels of national

parks in South Australia, and the responses I have received from the Minister for Environment and Planning indicate that something like a quarter of all ranger positions at any one time are vacant. The Government has this steady rotation: one vacancy is filled, a vacancy occurs somewhere else, and the Government appoints the staff so slowly that the tumble-through effect means that at any one time a quarter of the ranger positions are empty. So, parks are understaffed.

I had a letter from a personal acquaintance in the Riverland about the Danggali conservation park, which is 70 or 80 kilometres north of Renmark. It was in the news the Christmas before last, as I recall, because of a large bushfire which used a tremendous amount of human and material resources and was most expensive to this State. It is a park with which I am familiar, having taken school groups camping there on a number of occasions. Danggali was set up as a biosphere park, I believe using Federal money, and is recognised by UNESCO as a biosphere park. It is, in fact, the only one in South Australia to have such recognition.

It was to act in part as a protective gene pool, in particular for red kangaroos but also, being so large (2 500 square kilometres) it was protecting a major habitat and many species within it, including little known and fairly rare species such as the ningai. That park was set up as a two ranger park. It incorporated four sheep stations, and two of the houses were so dilapidated that they were pushed over. A ranger was put in each of the other two, and there was a proposal for a third ranger to go in, except that the Government did not have the money to erect a house.

For the past six years or so, that park has struggled along with one ranger much of the time, because of this slow position shuffle which has been going on. It has been brought to my attention that the Government, in an attempt to save money, instead of putting a second ranger on the park put in a maintenance person. Instead of hiring a maintenance person from outside, as well as the two rangers, they now had a maintenance person instead of the ranger.

The most recent information I have received is that the one ranger who is there has been transferred and it is the Government's intention not to replace him. In other words, this 2 500 square kilometre unique park in South Australia will not have any qualified ranger on the park at all. As a matter of interest, I think it is the second or third largest national park in South Australia. There has been very little work done within the park in terms of biological interrelationships, but the rangers who have been there have been coordinating work done by a wide range of people. Many ornithological and other groups stay there. There are shearers' quarters next to one of the homesteads, and they have been used. I am told they are about to be closed as well, due to a lack of maintenance, partly because of a lack of staff but also a lack of willingness to spend money.

So, the understanding of the biological interrelationships of that park is not improving at all. Those rangers have been very involved in putting fire tracks around the edge of the park and keeping a close watch on fire potential. Without any ranger, very grave risks are being taken that we could have a major bushfire—not 'could' but we probably will, would be a more accurate assessment.

I ask the Minister the following questions which, I expect, he will have to refer. Why is this unique biosphere park, the only one in South Australia and one of only 12 in Australia, to have no rangers, let alone the three previously considered justified? Is it now policy that the allocation of ranger positions is determined solely by visitation rates; in other words, parks are there solely for tourists and conservation is of low priority? When will the Government fill all

ranger positions in this State, rather than continuing the vacant position shuffle?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will refer the questions and bring back a reply.

TAFE CENTRAL OFFICE

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Tourism who represents the Minister of Employment and Further Education in this Council, a question on the subject of the TAFE central office.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Members will be aware that at a time of savage cuts in sources of funding in TAFE colleges in South Australia there has been much animosity among TAFE college staff at what they see as the bloated bureaucracy of the TAFE central office. TAFE staff point out that that central office has grown from some 70 staff members to over 300 in just over a decade, at a cost to the State budget of many millions of dollars.

On 11 June this year the Minister of Employment and Further Education wrote to the Director-General of TAFE asking for the Director-General's response to, first, a \$1 million cut to the central TAFE budget and, secondly, a \$1.5 million cut to the central office TAFE budget. On 7 August, some two months later, in a confidential memo from the Acting Director-General of the Department of TAFE to the Minister, it was stated that, in effect, the cuts could be made to the tune of only \$529 400 and that those cuts would be obtained by axing positions such as base grade clerks, librarians and research officers.

One might note that there is no cutting of senior management positions in the central office of TAFE. Staff who have spoken to me about this matter have informed me that they and their colleagues are outraged at the response from the TAFE central office to the request of the Minister. Those staff believe that there is much more fat in the system, particularly at the senior management levels in the central office of TAFE. They tell me that the central office of TAFE should not be allowed to get away with its response to the Minister. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Is it correct that on 7 August the Acting Director-General of TAFE wrote that the sum total of the cuts would be \$529 400?

2. Will the Minister reject that response and insist on more substantive cuts into the bloated bureaucracy of the TAFE central office?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will refer that question to the appropriate Minister and bring back a reply.

FIRE TECHNOLOGY COURSE

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Tourism who represents the Minister of Further Education, a question about TAFE cuts.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I wish to raise with the Minister the question of the certificate of fire technology course at the Gilles Plains college of TAFE. The certificate of fire technology course at that college was commenced in 1985 and I am informed that before that there was no opportunity for formal and theoretical basic training in the areas of fire technology. I am told that consequently decisions and the implementation of regulations, advice and design relied

heavily on interpretations of interstate practices, that there were few formally qualified people in South Australia and that those who were here were almost exclusively within the fire service.

The course was established as a combined effort of the Australian Fire Protection Association, the Institute of Fire Engineers, the Fire Protection Industry Association, the Insurance Council of Australia, and the Standards Association of Australia, and those organisations negotiated this course with the Department of Technical and Further Education. I am further informed that the students who participate in this course come from a wide variety of industry areas in the fire protection industry, including firefighters from both the Metropolitan Fire Service and the Country Fire Service, fire protection engineering firms, the insurance industry, and local government and State and Commonwealth departments. The reason for that background is to indicate the importance of this course.

Last week I was advised that the first year class of students at the Gilles Plains college of TAFE doing the fire technology course were told that the course would be abolished at the end of this year; that is, some students will have completed one year of their two year fire technology course and, under the proposed cuts, will not be able to complete the course that they have commenced. My questions are:

1. Is the Minister concerned that essential courses such as this course are being abolished as a result of the cuts that he and the Bannon Government are instituting in the Department of TAFE?

2. Will the Minister ensure that, if he insists on continuing with these savage cuts, students who have commenced a course at the very least can complete the course they have undertaken?

3. Is the Minister prepared to cut, even more heavily than he has already publicly indicated, into the TAFE central office budget in order to preserve courses such as these in the TAFE colleges?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That is a question specifically related to TAFE and I will refer it to the Minister and bring back a reply.

COURT DELAYS

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about court delays.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Yesterday, I addressed two questions to the Attorney-General in relation to a particular case involving a charge of manslaughter against a person whose name and all details have been suppressed by the judge, and this includes the name of the young woman who died as a result of the incident and all her details, as well as the circumstances surrounding her death. In the context of that case, I am informed that it took about 2½ years for the matter to ultimately come on for hearing in the Supreme Court. The committal proceeding took about 18 months, and then there was a delay of some eight to nine months after committal until the trial commenced on 14 July this year. One of the concerns expressed to me is that that delay created difficulties for witnesses in terms of the recollection of events, and that the delay played some part in the ultimate decision of the judge to acquit the man who was charged with manslaughter.

Will the Attorney-General, in the context of the investigations that he undertook to carry out yesterday, also exam-

ine the reasons why this matter took so long for the committal proceedings to come on and to be dealt with? Will he also examine the reason why it took so long after committal for the matter to come to trial? If there are specific reasons which suggest that this case has been treated differently from others, will the Attorney indicate, after that investigation, what courses of action he may take to ensure that it does not happen again?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: If the honourable member is correct in his facts as to the 2½ years delay, I can indicate quite clearly that that is not the norm. In fact, presently in the Supreme Court for criminal cases there is normally a delay following committal of only some two or three months, which is generally considered to be satisfactory, given all the things that have to be got together—prosecution, defence counsel and witnesses—for a case to be heard. Further, there is certainly not 18 months delay for a committal hearing.

The problem in this case (and I am aware of some of the circumstances of the delay relating to the committal) is that the committal extended over a number of days and that a number of adjournments were unavoidable. I am not aware of the reasons for the delay in the higher court, but I can make some inquiries about that and let the honourable member have a reply. The situation, as I recall it, is that the delays that occurred were peculiar to this case and partly because of the nature of it. However, I can assure the Parliament that the delays normally are nothing like 2½ years. This was an exceptional case. The delays were exceptional and peculiar to this case. As I said previously, delays in the courts are not as long as that. In the normal course of events one would expect that, at the outside, from the time the offence was committed until the time the case was heard in the Supreme Court would be within nine months in a criminal case, and slightly longer in the District Court. Many cases should be dealt with within those periods.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 19 August. Page 322.)

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: Yesterday, in this debate I touched on the specific matters of Aboriginal affairs and the Department for Community Welfare. Today, I would like to spend time looking at a more general but equally important matter, that is, the role of this Parliament in determining the future of our society. I am extremely concerned that we do not see in this Parliament a coherent philosophy from any of the Parties in terms of where we want to go. Parliament seems to be spending most of its time tinkering at the edges.

Almost all of our legislation is of the reactive type, where we wait for something to go wrong and then do something to try to patch up the whole job. Child sex abuse is one such example. We are really doing nothing in this Parliament to solve the underlying problems which lead to it. So many arguments in this Council involve what the Government can or cannot afford, whether it has the money for the personnel, the facilities, etc. We in this Parliament are run by the economy rather than running it.

It is time that the whole direction of our economy and our society was brought into question. Our society is becoming increasingly materialistic and its individuals increasingly self-seeking. Australia has never been materially healthier,

but I question whether or not we are any happier. If we look at indicators such as drug and child abuse, murder and robbery rates and marriage breakdown, all of which are escalating, we can see the trend.

Earlier today the Hon. Trevor Griffin asked a question about suicide, but even then the information that he gave in support of his question did not probe the underlying causes. The Hon. Mr Griffin talked about trying to intercept possible suicides and did not question why people were getting into that state of mind to start off with. It is time for this Parliament to have the courage to take the lead. This has nothing to do with socialism or capitalism. Indeed, I suggest that the problems that we have relate to another 'ism'—materialism.

We must define what progress means. I foresee an alternative society to that of our high tech, high consumption, and that is a high tech low consumption society. Technological progress must and will occur because, if for no other reason, the population of this planet continues to increase and there are many people on the planet already who have insufficient material goods behind them to guarantee housing, health, and so on. There is no returning to the Stone Age: we must use technology and science. But we must be in control and not be controlled.

Our society tends to treat gross domestic product (GDP) as a holy cow. Front page news for us concerns what has happened to our trade figures and whether our economy has grown or shrunk. It is time that people asked what gross domestic product really means. If a car crashes and is taken to a car repairer, the repair bill is part of GDP. If a person is injured in an accident, the hospital bill is part of GDP. In fact, if a person dies, the burial and the service are all part of GDP. The sales of tobacco and growing it make up our GDP. Ill health and its cost are also part of GDP. Clearly, increasing GDP does not mean that our nation is progressing in any sense of the word.

Australia has the productive capacity, if it was properly directed, for there to be no poverty. Certainly, I noted that the Prime Minister guaranteed that within three years there would be no poverty in Australia. I honestly believe that he is not going to achieve that because he is not getting down to the underlying causes. There is no need for poverty or hunger, but there will continue to be those ills in our society as long as we do not control the economy and do not decide where we are trying to go.

I spoke about having productive capacity. A simple illustration is that we have a great deal of productive capacity making unproductive items. For example, if a bottle is made for soft drink it may be used 10, 15 or 20 times. If one manufactures a soft drink can, it is used and put in the bin. The can on that one trip uses a vast amount of our resources, and much more is used for 10, 15 or 20 trips. What if the productive capacity of can making was used for the production of roofing metal, for instance, using exactly the same material? Instead of producing waste, which immediately goes into the bin, it could be used as a form of protection for people. It is really a question of directing productive capacity so that all people get to share in it.

We need look only at the front of our house on rubbish day to see how much home waste has increased. As a child, I remember that if we half filled the bin we were doing well in a week, yet these days many houses have three rubbish bins on collection day, unless they have the monstrous green things which many people can manage to fill within a week. That is all simply manufactured waste. Much of it has a short useful life and the waste is avoidable.

At the moment we seem to be taking for granted inbuilt obsolescence. Many people got upset at one stage when their

refrigerator did not last as long as the first Kelvinator that they owned. My father still has his out in the garage doing a useful job. Without reflecting on any current brand, modern refrigerators do not have that long life built into them because it is not in the best economic interest of the individual companies, and we seem quite happy to allow that to occur.

We have a wait and see attitude to matters of great environmental concern. There is a growing awareness in our community now about the greenhouse effect and about the effect of chlorofluorocarbons and acid rain, but we do not see Governments taking a leading role in this area. They wait for things to go wrong and then they try to remedy the ills—usually too late. The present focus on deregulation coming from both the Government and the Opposition is an abrogation of responsibility. Certainly, it can be demonstrated that some regulations are not needed, but too many people in our society believe that to have no regulations would be healthy. I believe that Governments must be willing to make strong regulation legislation in the long-term interests of this country. Deregulation in Australia has allowed the rapid accumulation of wealth in the hands of just a few.

I was reading an article just the other day about the wealthiest 200 people in Australia, an article originally in the *Australian Business Review*. It was interesting to note the type of business in which these people were involved. An incredible number of those people were not doers, doing anything constructive for our society—they were dealers, property developers and speculators. One had to search the list for a long time before one found people of the calibre of Ralph Sarich, who had produced motors that were more efficient than existing motors. He produced a good product and was doing something productive for the country and the world. The others were wheelers and dealers.

What was even more frightening was that the top 200 managed to double their wealth inside 12 months. They managed to do that in a time when two million Australians were living in poverty and when the Prime Minister is saying that no-one will be living in poverty at the end of his term of government. That is absolute arrant nonsense. While much of the economy is in the hands of the Federal Government, the State Government and State Parliament are not without influence. They should be playing their role to care for all members of our society and not just a chosen few.

I wish now to deal with development, because a couple of development matters have been of great interest over the past 12 months or even longer. The first is Jubilee Point. We have a classic example here of a Government not knowing what it is doing. The Jubilee Point proposal has been a harebrained scheme from beginning to end. It looks very nice on a model. I have seen both the first model and the revised model and, seen in isolation, it is a lovely looking complex. Models can be made to look extremely good; architect model makers are to be congratulated. However, Jubilee Point will not provide any useful service for South Australia that cannot be provided in another way. For instance, the Jubilee Point buildings can quite clearly be put elsewhere. There are well located vacant sites within the Glenelg area which are capable of accommodating the hotels and various other developments that are to comprise the Jubilee Point proposal.

The Jubilee Point would not be a viable proposition if it were not for the fact that the Government was being asked to donate a massive gift of public land to begin with. There is some question of a location for the people who will get

to live on it, and for those few privileged members of the yacht club it will be a great thing.

A large stretch of beach has been removed. More importantly, every beach north of Glenelg is being put at great risk. The environmental impact statement process pointed out grave inadequacies, but I am concerned because the environmental impact statement process itself worked very poorly in relation to Jubilee Point. Also, the recent total environmental impact statement process, not just for Jubilee Point, quite clearly pointed out that the current process is not working. Jubilee Point is an excellent example of that, and there is a need for radical change. I hope that the Government will introduce in the present session of Parliament legislation that will do something about it. I will welcome the chance to discuss that proposition at some length.

My real concern about Jubilee Point is that, although the Department of Environment and Planning is gravely concerned about what may occur if the Jubilee Point project goes ahead, we have a working party inside the Premier's Department which has no interest, no knowledge and no understanding of environmental and social matters, particularly environmental matters, and it has decided that it wants this project to proceed. So, we will have a political decision, not an environmental decision, made. It would seem that that is the way in which this State is to be run. If you want something, you can simply have it; you can build it. If it is labelled as progress, then it must be good. We need a redefinition of what 'progress' really means.

I move on now to the East End Market proposal, which is another classic example of developers largely controlling the Government rather than the other way around. I believe that we had essentially in place a plan that would limit the scope of buildings in the East End Market area. What we had was an ambit claim from the developers for 12 storeys. I do not think anybody really believed that they wanted 12 storeys, but I guess that part of the game was that, if they asked for 12 storeys, they might get eight. I think that is probably what they will get, because that is what they wanted in the beginning.

I am gravely concerned about the weakness of our Minister of Environment and Planning in not tackling those people head on and making it clear from the very start that that proposal was not acceptable. The sorts of arguments that were put up in support of the East End Market, which suggested that such a scale of building was necessary for the project to be economic, are nothing short of nonsense. One has merely to look at the Citicom development, which is now approaching completion, and which is being built in a far more desirable location in terms of office accommodation to see that the buildings are running only to three floors. That development, which is being built on Hindmarsh Square, just off Rundle Mall, is an extremely economic development. We are told that we need an extra nine floors to make the East End Market development a profitable concern. That is simply not believable. Quite obviously land values in that area of the city would be far less, so I cannot give any credence to that suggestion at all.

I wanted to refer to a number of other matters during this Address in Reply. I feel, though, that I cannot do them justice because of the inadequate support services that this Government supplies to members of Parliament. I had a very long list of matters which I felt needed addressing.

I think it must be recognised that the State of South Australia is not run as the Government would like to believe it should be run, namely, by the Government. Rather, it is being run by the Parliament. It is important that the essential role of parliamentarians in the process of democracy is

recognised. For that role to be recognised, parliamentarians need to have sufficient support services so that, when information is directed to them on issues that are claiming their attention, they then have the capacity and the facilities to follow through.

It is indeed handy for a Government to give a minimum of resources to members of Parliament. After all, if you give resources to the Opposition they might actually start acting like an Opposition because they will have researched their topics in a better way. If you give resources to Government backbenchers, they might actually start doing something! The Government merely wants its backbenchers to supply the numbers: they are there to put their hands up when their hands are needed. The Government does not want backbenchers who have had a chance to make an opinion of their own. God help us if that actually started to occur—if they dared to bring into question anything that the Government was doing. This Government works in entirely the same fashion as the Federal Government, where one or two people make all the decisions and everybody else goes along for the ride.

The State Labor Government is fearful that, should they lose Bannon, all will be lost, and they will be doomed. So, Bannon manipulates them, in a similar fashion to the way in which Hawke manages to manipulate the Federal Labor Party. They are so intent on maintaining power, just being in Government, that they are kicking their own philosophy out the door.

The Labor Government, I believe, had an anti-privatisation policy, but that was only during the last election campaign. I believed that Labor was anti-uranium, but of course I was mistaken. I believed that the Labor Government, even if it did allow uranium to be sold, certainly would not have sold it to France, because they had a strong and principled stand on that. But, I was wrong. Yet, I talk to individual Labor parliamentarians and discover that they agree on so many things; and I agree with them. I see people who are committed to causes of social justice and the environment. However, as soon as a Bill is brought into Parliament they lie over and have their tummies tickled. They are doing as they are told. I believe that that is, in part, because they are there purely to supply the numbers, and that is one of the reasons why we will not see support staff given to Government backbenchers.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: They sign the pledge.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: They sign the pledge. There is also the danger that, if they have research staff, even if they behave themselves in Parliament, they may not do it in Caucus; and that would be a terrible thing. I would find it hard to believe that there is in Australia another Parliament which so inadequately looks after members of Parliament. Having visited New South Wales recently and having seen the support services and staff that Federal members of Parliament receive—

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: And the billion dollar building.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I do not really care about the building—as long as you have enough room to move in and have the facilities in which you can do your job adequately. I support the motion.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON (Leader of the Opposition): There are a number of issues in the health area which I wish to discuss today and which cause me a great deal of concern. For instance, I should mention hospital waiting lists, which have now increased to about 6 000 or more. Despite the fact that we were promised that there would be regular updates, that has not occurred. People are forced to wait for surgery literally for years in some cases. Or I could mention the two telephone calls I had the other day about

people in need of operations who simply cannot get into a public hospital because of overcrowding. One man who rang me told of how, in great pain and in need of an appendectomy, he was turned away from Modbury Hospital because there were no available beds and he had to find his way to a private hospital at 10 o'clock at night. While he was at the hospital he was aware of a young man with a broken collarbone who had to wait four hours to be treated. The other caller told of a case involving a 17-month-old baby who has suffered a number of ear infections, causing him great pain and distress. He needs an operation to rectify the problem. But when his mother took him to the Mount Gambier Hospital on the advice of his doctor, she was told there were no beds for elective surgery and that he may have to wait three months to have the operation.

I have numerous examples of people in pain and in need of surgery whose names have been put on waiting lists, and one common comment I hear when people ring me to complain is, 'You just don't realise how bad it is until it happens to you.' Of course, more and more people are realising just how severe the problems in our public hospitals are under the present Government and the present Minister of Health. And things will not get any better, despite vague promises to reduce waiting lists. In fact, the coming budget will be disastrous for public hospitals, and I predict at least a 3 per cent cut overall. We will have to wait and see whether or not there is a 3 per cent cut for every institution. I believe that public hospital funding will again be reduced and we will see an acceleration of present problems.

Speaking of funding, I would like to draw the Minister's attention to a quote attributed to him in the *News* of 29 June 1982. He said:

The immediate task of a State Labor Government will be to halt further cuts in the State health budget.

What a farce! And what an embarrassment for the Bannon Government. It is, of course, well known now that slashing hospital budgets is one of the Minister's favourite pastimes. However, I do not intend to dwell on these problems today but to focus on two issues, the dreadful plight of the disabled in this State, and the Queen Victoria-Adelaide Children's Hospital amalgamation proposal.

First, I refer to the disabled and the disgraceful way in which they have been treated by this Government. The litany of broken promises from both Mr Bannon and Dr Cornwall could fill a fairly hefty book, and they should be ashamed of themselves. The disabled in South Australia, and their families and support organisations, are disgusted and very disillusioned with the way in which this Government has made commitments and then ruthlessly cast them aside. The Minister and the Government have chosen to leave high and dry those who find it hard to speak up for themselves. I guess they are easy targets. They will not make any trouble. But quietly they have lost all confidence in this Government, because time and time again they have been let down. Their needs must be addressed urgently. There are serious deficiencies in the disabled area which require immediate attention, including a lack of respite care facilities and the appalling state of Ru Rua, to name just a couple.

Let me concentrate on the head injured for a moment, and look specifically at the broken promises made by Mr Bannon in his two election campaigns. And these documents and notes were provided to me by the Head Injured Society of South Australia: they are not my own notes. I make quite clear that they come from a very genuine group. The notes on 1982 pre-election Labor promises state:

A Bannon Labor Government will initiate a new deal in long-term rehabilitation services and facilities for young brain injured victims in South Australia.

Further:

A State Labor Government will make an annual grant of \$200 000 for three years to act as a catalyst in initiating and coordinating these long-term rehabilitation projects.

But what happened? I quote:

1983: Instead of initiating its policy the Government realised that a complex problem the head injured represented. A committee would look into the problem.

1984: A working party was alleged to be looking into the problems. Its findings would be implemented in 1985.

In fact, in *Hansard* of 31 October 1984 the Hon. John Cornwall said:

The undertaking to provide a new deal for the young brain injured in our community is as valid now as it ever was and we will most certainly be putting a series of initiatives in train during 1985 that will meet the commitments given in 1982.

The Head Injured Society says that the working party did not address itself seriously to day centres, respite care and accommodation. It was further stated:

1985: Election year again. The same promises as in 1982 were made again. The *News* published some articles about the broken promises. Professor Andrews (then head of the Health Commission) replied in the *News* of 3 December 1985: 'South Australian head injury service fully operational by mid-1986.' He did not mention respite care, day centres, or accommodation.

1986: In June, the Head Injured Society of South Australia wrote to the Premier outlining the history of broken promises and the desperate situation of many families. The Premier sent the letter to the Minister of Health. The usual reply by no action.

1986: August. A meeting was sought with the Minister of Health and it was requested that members of the Head Injury Service Implementation Committee be present. When the Minister of Health arrived at the meeting ... [he] said he favoured the establishment of a pilot day centre.

1986: December. At a meeting about another matter in that month he stated that a pilot day centre would be in place in 1987.

1987: In July inquiries elicited that there were no plans about the establishment of the day centre.

1987: 7 August: Ray Sayers of the Health Commission telephoned to say that funds had been reserved for a pilot day centre in 1987-88. Still no date, no location or other details—this after six years, of waiting, of broken promises.

This disturbing resume was compiled by Mr Frank Quigley, President of the Head Injured Society. I would also like to quote Mr Quigley from the society's newsletter of July this year, in which he mentioned a conference in Canberra last year on the brain injured. He said:

... delegates from all other mainland States detailed what services were available in their respective States. While all these States highlighted gaps in services, the delegate from South Australia had to admit that, while we could offer excellent hospital treatment, there were no services at all for the 2 000 plus head injured who had gone home to lives of frustration and misery after hospital and (perhaps) some attempts at rehabilitation. In all other States there is an awareness of the complexity of head injury and the problems peculiar to those who have suffered brain trauma.

How different in South Australia! Since 1982 the present Government has professed to have an interest in the problems of the head injured and has made a most interesting list of promises which have not been honoured. There seems to be a resolve by both the South Australian Government and the Federal Government not to become involved in improving the lot of the head injured.

To sum up: the services delivered to the head injured at Payneham Rehabilitation Centre are not as good as those delivered previously by the Commonwealth Rehabilitation Service. Nothing has been done about a pilot day centre to provide respite for some and an improvement in the quality of life for others. The day centre would be the only social outlet for many head injured. No attempt has been made to enter on the case registry those injured before July 1986. That was a promise. The problem of accommodation has not been addressed at all. Respite accommodation is very limited and is selective.

Mr Quigley also provided me with some case histories, which illustrate these points very clearly. I will mention one which is indicative of the problems faced by many families

in this State. I refer to these case histories because the families have become so frustrated and so sick of waiting that they have given me permission to use their names.

Mrs M. Doubleday's son Jonathan had an accident in June 1984, in his matriculation year at Kidman Park High School. He was in a coma/semi-coma for eight weeks. His mother took him home rather than sending him to an institution. There was no improvement for six months. He was in a foetal position and had four operations to relieve this. He attended the Payneham Rehabilitation Centre in June 1986 and showed definite improvement because of this. There is no transport supplied by Payneham—it would cost \$36 a day to send Jonathan to that centre. Both mother and Jonathan are pensioners and cannot afford this. He now attends a day centre once a week—all the other clients are aged stroke victims. He watches television there, and once a week his mother pays for him to have a session with a neuro-hydrotherapist. The family has suffered greatly due to the stress of Jonathan's state. Respite for a few days a week is urgently needed, and ultimately suitable accommodation.

I do not think that there is anything I can add to that comprehensive summary of the plight of the head injured in this State. Clearly, they have been utterly neglected by this Government since it was first elected in 1982. The sad thing is that every day young people are added to that list because of the number of accidents on the roads of this State. Yet, despite the addition of people to that list, nothing has been done. Quite frankly, I think that that situation is disgraceful.

I would also like to mention Ru Rua. Last Friday I met with a core group of parents from Ru Rua and they are an extremely dedicated hard-working group of people who attempt to form a support mechanism for Ru Rua residents. What is Ru Rua? It is an institution for intellectually and physically disabled people. It has been the subject of several promises by none other than the Minister of Health over a considerable period of time. The residents are people who cannot lobby for themselves and rely on either their parents or the support group to do that for them. But they have been badly let down by the Minister of Health since 1982. In 1982 the Government indicated in its election speech that the intake of patients would cease. In 1985, the Labor Government's pre-election health policy said, Labor will:

Progressively relocate residents from Ru Rua Nursing Home into more appropriate community housing; and

Provide further group housing to meet the needs of the adult intellectually disabled.

None of this has occurred. I have visited Ru Rua, as I have said, and I must say that I believe that it is an absolute disgrace that nothing has happened. The residents there are confined to areas that are totally unacceptable from a staff point of view and from a resident's point of view. I challenge members to visit this place and see the sorts of conditions that these people are expected to live in. The bathroom floors are worn out, the lino is cracked through, they are dangerous and disgusting. The building itself is fast falling down, the majority of pipes all over the place are rusted, window frames are falling out, the wards are dangerously overcrowded, the working conditions are disgraceful and it has been like this for some time.

The sad part is that no money is being spent on maintenance because of the promise to shift the residents out. We have a situation where a promise has been made that they will be shifted out, so that cuts out the need for maintenance, which means that conditions only get worse. Virtually all spending on maintenance has stopped since 1982 because the Minister has continually promised to deinstitutionalise the residents, yet what happened last year

when there was a 1 per cent cut in real terms on all health institutions? Ru Rua faced the same cut, so not only did it not have additional funding to provide for deinstitutionalisation, but it had a further cut. What a dishonest Government! These people were used by the Bannon Government in 1982 and 1985 as an election gimmick and have now been thrown down the plughole.

We as a society should be ashamed of ourselves for not keeping the Government up to its promise to these people, who should be given a little dignity of life. As a society we should be ashamed of ourselves. One ward that I visited had 27 residents in it, and many of these people have disruptive habits. So virtually the whole night in some cases it is almost impossible for people to sleep. Staffing is at a minimum level and staff there do a wonderful job and are extremely dedicated, but the Minister and the Government are breaking their hearts. They know that deinstitutionalisation is inevitable and they do not know what the future holds for either them or the residents because the Government is sitting on its collective backside doing nothing. They have purchased four houses, but nothing has happened and I understand that now this year they are being told they have to cut their costs by a further $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent (.75 per cent) in real terms. The Minister and the Labor Government have no heart.

As the Minister has already visited this institution, as I understand he has, I think the time has come for the Premier himself to go and see for himself the disgraceful conditions in which he is allowing the physically and mentally disabled to live, and the conditions in which he is expecting the staff to work. Then he might do something about it. To ask them to find a further cut is just not on. They were promised by this Government that action would occur in 1982, and I can tell the Government that its credibility among people who know Ru Rua, and the parents, is not at rock bottom, but below the surface.

I invite the Minister and the Premier to go to Ru Rua, and I extend an invitation to all media to go with them. And I challenge him to do that tomorrow before he can arrange a big clean up, or cover up. I would invite the media to take the initiative themselves to roll up at the door and request access, not to the residents, but to the institution itself, and they should take a copy of the Minister's words of 1982 and 1985.

What needs to be done is for the Minister and Mr Bannon to set about immediately purchasing the homes that are needed for deinstitutionalisation and provide the necessary funds for staff to run these places, as has happened in Victoria. In Victoria there is a very different method of handling these people. I seek leave to table the December 1985 report on a visit to the Victorian St Nicholas project by a group of parents of residents of the Ru Rua Nursing Home and dated December 1985.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I will quote several paragraphs from that document describing what the parents saw while they were in Victoria. I quote from page 5, part 3:

During the study tour, the team made the following observations:

3.1 The Residents—Without exception, residents were clean, well-dressed, relaxed, comfortable and appeared to be very happy in the normal home environment. No more than five residents were placed in one home. We were advised that initial placement of residents involved application of the criteria as under: (a) proximity to parents' home; (b) proximity to day centre; (c) compatibility of residents; (d) maintenance of former friendship patterns; (e) maintenance of former resident/staff relationships; (f) foster grandparent scheme (Victoria only); and (g) age appropriateness—chronological and functional. Residents having the same/similar physical disability or from the same ethnic group are not generally placed in the same home.

Because some of the criteria may be incompatible, great care was taken to give emphasis to those that best combine to meet each individual resident's needs. For example, if a resident's parents are no longer living, proximity to the parental home may not be relevant to that resident's current needs.

3.2 The Houses—Generally, the homes provided for residents were large, roomy, bright and contained all modern conveniences. They were often located in quiet streets with no through traffic (that is, culs-de-sac). Special attention had been given to modifying the bathroom/toilet areas to make them suitable for use by the staff when bathing/toileting the residents.

Doorways and passages were large enough to accommodate wheelchairs. Ramps were required in a limited number of cases (for example, sloping blocks). Light switches were designed and located for potential use by residents. Storage was allowed for wheelchairs, special equipment and for a mini-bus (with hydraulic lift), which was housed under a carport to give protection when loading and unloading residents.

3.3 Staffing—The staffing establishment of homes comprised one house supervisor, live-in five days per week; one relief supervisor, live-in two days per week; and five home staff, two days on, two days off, with 12 hour overlapping shifts, including night duty. In addition, a regional support team was established to oversee and monitor the setting-up and operation of all the homes. These teams included staff from a wide range of professional groups (for example, physiotherapists, registered nurse, occupational therapist, etc.).

3.4 Support Services—Support services include the full range of services necessary to support the residents living in normal home settings. They were provided through use of generic services available within the local community, such as doctor, dentist, chemist, optometrist, physiotherapist, occupational therapist, etc. In most cases, close liaison existed with staff of the nearest community hospital and ambulance service.

All residents were able to attend local facilities for day-time activities. These included schools (for school-age residents) and training centres for adults which were vocational and recreational. Every resident had a personalised development program which was developed and maintained by the regional team in consultation with support services staff, and was coordinated by the House Supervisor.

That is somewhat different from the situation with Ru Rua residents. There are no such facilities available for Ru Rua residents at this time. The administrator of Ru Rua has set up two day care centres, but he has been given no money for staffing, etc. He is somehow supposed, I gather—and he has not informed me of this, although parents have—to meet the funding out of his existing budget, and that is just not on. It is quite clear to me that the Victorian Government has shown a lot more heart and sympathy in this area, and do not forget that the final report of the Intellectually Retarded Persons Project, set up by the Health Commission, says among its recommendations, and this is 1982, not last year, and I quote:

22. That a program of replacing the existing beds for totally dependent people at Ru Rua (Estcourt House) with 10-25 bed units strategically placed within the community should be commenced within 12 months and completed within five years. No new admissions to Ru Rua should be accepted after December 1982.

23. That negotiations should be commenced with the Commonwealth Department of Health in order to develop acceptable proposals for an altered basis of funding residential accommodation for totally dependent persons.

This litany of broken promises to these people is unequalled in my time in politics. I think that the Hon. John Cornwall, the present Minister, is one of the most deceitful Ministers of Health who ever set foot in this State, because he has continually promised these things election after election and nothing happens. I do not know how he can face up to himself each morning, when he has left these people waiting and waiting in spite of his promises.

I am not saying this off the top of my head. I have actually been down and seen the situation, and I can tell the Attorney-General that it is absolutely disgraceful. I do not think he has a real conscience—I am not talking about the Attorney-General, but about the Minister of Health. He is doing an excellent job of destroying the health system in

this State. He seems to want to destroy the morale of the health system with vicious and unprovoked attacks, and no-one in the health system is allowed to tell the public what is really going on for fear that he will be on the end of the phone, hurling abuse.

The Attorney should sometimes hear what people say when they ring me: 'Please don't disclose my name or that man will be after me.' That is exactly what is said almost every time. He has people in absolute fear. But enough about the Minister. All these items on the disabled clearly indicate a very real abandonment of people in need of help in our society by the Minister and the Bannon Government. Their motto seems to be: 'If you're not fit under a Bannon Government, you're forgotten.' And I find that very sad and quite unacceptable.

I would like to briefly focus now on the Queen Victoria-Children's Hospital amalgamation proposal. It was in 1984 that a campaign was undertaken to save the Queen Victoria Hospital, to keep it on Fullarton Road at Rose Park. And who were the campaign leaders, the heroes, the great friends of the hospital? None other than the Hon. John Cornwall, MLC, and the Chairperson of the Queen Victoria, Mrs Judith Roberts. The end result was that the Queen Victoria was indeed saved. There was no proposal coming forward for its shifting to another site. (One was never sure that it was to be closed, but nevertheless it was saved.) Great credit was taken by both Dr Cornwall and Mrs Roberts and they were seen as the saviours of the hospital. Let me quote from an article in the *Advertiser* on 9 May 1984, headed 'Hospital to stay at present site'. It says in part:

The Queen Victoria Hospital will continue to care for mothers and babies and will stay at its present site at Rose Park, it was announced yesterday. The 83-year-old, 170-bed hospital will be renovated, upgraded and improved over the next few years. The decision, announced by the Chairperson of the hospital's board of management, Mrs J.M. Roberts, ends more than four years of speculation about the hospital's future.

The Minister of Health had let it slip on Monday night at a meeting discussing the future of the Adelaide Children's Hospital that the Government intended to 'preserve the integrity of the (QVH) hospital at its present site'. Mrs Roberts said: 'I am very grateful to Dr Cornwall for his sincere support throughout the public debate on the future of this hospital.' She said both Dr Cornwall and the Premier, Mr Bannon, had supported the plan to save the hospital when they had been in Opposition. 'A final decision has been made by the Government, and the hospital will never shift,' Mrs Roberts said.

How things change! Please note that the Hon. John Cornwall's 1986 attitude to anybody who dares suggest he might be considering closing the Queen Victoria was quite hostile. In fact, in an article in the *News* of 5 August 1986—just last year; not 12 months ago—he described the speculation as 'at best, mischievous; at worst malicious'. And Madam President, it might have been, but it was certainly true.

While the Minister's voice was echoing these words in public, in private he was moving towards closing the hospital. He was deceiving the public. How the mighty have fallen! Mrs Roberts and the Minister have certainly changed their minds. It is a shame they do not make decisions and stick to them. We, the Opposition, made a decision about retaining the Queen Victoria at its present site in 1981.

What made the Minister and Mrs Roberts change their minds? The answer is the Minister had overspent on the Health Commission, had to find money from somewhere and had to flog off the site of the Queen Victoria to provide himself with the funds. If the Minister denies that that is the case, why not build the new hospital on the present site? Why does the Minister need to shift it to the Children's Hospital site? We have now heard the Premier say that the Queen Victoria may become a hospital, hotel, shopping centre or whatever! I wonder what the residents of Rose

Park would think about a multi-storey shopping centre? The Government is clearly considering selling it as a private hospital. Well, why close it at all? What an extraordinary situation!

And what an amazing turnaround by Mrs Roberts, who gave an absolute guarantee, and I echo her words again: 'A final decision has been made by the Government and the hospital will never shift.' And they say we politicians can not be trusted. She has set a new standard which not even politicians could match, and I remind the Council again of her words, not mine, 'the hospital will never shift'. I understand she has told the staff the move is only at a feasibility stage, and that is deceptive again. I have a copy of a present report which shows the depth to which the feasibility study is going. It was prepared by Kay Thomson and Associates, management consultants and planners, and it is a very detailed report on the proposed amalgamation of the hospitals, right down to virtually every square metre of floor space involved. It certainly shows that the Minister and Mrs Roberts are determined this move will proceed.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: You're not being too hard on Mrs Roberts, are you?

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I do not think so. After all, as the Hon. Mr Hill would know, Mrs Roberts led the charge to save the hospital, and I believed her. I was most impressed by her support of the Queen Victoria Hospital and when I first heard that she was leading the charge to get rid of it I was somewhat bemused and shaken in my belief in people. A letter from the Director of Building Services at the Health Commission, Mr John Milliken, to the Valuer-General, which in stark words indicates that the sole purpose of this shift is to flog off the site, states:

Re: The Queen Victoria Hospital—160 Fullarton Road, Rose Park 5067.

The Health Commission has commenced a feasibility study into the amalgamation of the Queen Victoria Hospital and the Adelaide Children's Hospital on the site of the latter. The proposal has been approved in principle by Cabinet. If this amalgamation proceeds, the existing Queen Victoria Hospital site will no longer be required. A vital key to the funding of the new scheme is to raise as much money as possible by its sale to the private sector.

Would you please advise as to the most appropriate way of disposing of the property and provide a valuation which can be used in the feasibility study. You may be interested to know—

listen carefully to this—

that there have been some expressions of interest from the private sector since the project was first mooted in the press—mainly from private hospitals. Although the Health Commission would prefer not to have a hospital on that site, it is the financial return which may decide the matter.

It should be borne in mind that vacant possession would not be available until 1992. In the first instance, would your nominated valuer please contact Mr G. Sam, the Chief Executive Officer, the Queen Victoria Hospital.

That letter speaks for itself. What it indicates is that it is quite likely that the Queen Victoria Hospital will be closed as a public hospital and reopened immediately as a private hospital. What is going on? This situation seems to me to be somewhat ludicrous. Why not leave the hospital where it is? Of course, the real answer is that they want the money in order to take it somewhere else. I seek leave to table the minutes of the Medical Staff Society, which is the only group I have been able to find which is looking at the problems of traffic and parking.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Who in this Council can imagine that it will be easy for a father or relative to find his way through city traffic with an expectant mother in a hurry? What a shambles it will be in peak hour traffic and when sport is on at Adelaide Oval. There are roads blocked off everywhere around the Children's Hospital as recognition of traffic problems in the area. A parking station away

from the hospital will not be the same as the access people have to the Queen Victoria. Helicopter access will be difficult because it will have to land on the sports oval, whereas at the Queen Victoria helicopter access is very simple. It seems to me that the addition of a high-use obstetrics hospital on a parklands site where there are already traffic problems is an act of absolute madness, and it surprises me that there has not been more protest from the Adelaide City Council.

As well as these numerous problems there is, of course, the problem of cross-infection at the Children's Hospital. I know that people are trying to allay the fears of parents. Nevertheless, my phone has been running hot on this subject and it leaves me with a somewhat puzzled feeling. I have been somewhat concerned at what seems to me to be an acceptance of these problems by the Government. The Minister of Health has said many times in the past week or so that the cross-infection problem is no worse than it has been in the past few years. Well, it may be normal for a children's hospital to have a problem with cross-infection, but it is certainly not normal for an obstetrics hospital to have this sort of problem.

While I am not a medical person, I would have thought that it was absolutely essential to make it impossible for any cross-infection problem to occur between newborn infants, nursing mothers and young children. The thought of the potential for cross-infection when there are shared facilities by a children's hospital and an obstetrics hospital seems to be frightening. It may be that that is incorrect. Nevertheless, I would certainly want those fears to be fully investigated. There are careless people in the world, despite all the training they get.

I think that the letter from the doctor who first wrote about the Adelaide Children's Hospital gave a clear indication of that. I recall the last passage of his letter when he said that he observed a registrar (that is, a trainee doctor) walking out of an infectious ward to a telephone, picking up the phone, answering it, and going back in without washing his hands or removing his gloves. One would only need to have that happen anywhere near a nursery in an obstetrics hospital with somebody coming across from the Children's Hospital and the results could be somewhat horrifying.

Can any person guarantee that there will be no cross-infection problems for newborn infants and nursing mothers? I do not believe that they can, and this is a serious problem. Dr Cornwall and the Premier fought valiantly to retain the Queen Victoria Hospital and took full credit for it both before the 1982 election and afterwards. They gave absolute guarantees that the hospital would never shift, and now they have turned their backs on the women of South Australia and the guarantees of keeping it at that site for the sole purpose of flogging off the site. They reversed their stand and are now the chief instigators of a move which will deny the women of this State the opportunity of having an easily accessible obstetrics hospital at Rose Park. It was bad enough with Mrs Roberts and her unequivocal guarantee about the hospital's future, but by the Minister's actions he makes true that old saying that politicians cannot be trusted. I do not believe that the public of South Australia will be fooled by some cooked excuses as to why the shift may be beneficial. It is clearly a cost-saving measure, nothing more. If the Minister wishes to build a new hospital, let him do it on the present site where the hospitals are separated, and where, way back, he guaranteed that it would be situated. I support the motion.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I take this opportunity to thank His Excellency for the address with which he opened the

third session of the forty-sixth Parliament, and to reaffirm my loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen. I also take the opportunity to offer my condolences to the families of the late Hon. Don Simmons and the late Hon. Ron Loveday. There is always a sadness in the passing of any former member of the State Parliament, regardless of the political affiliation of that member. What many members of the public do not appreciate is that, although on a policy basis there are great divisions between members of a Government and Opposition and many public battles are fought, there is, out of the spotlight and away from the cut and thrust of parliamentary and public debate, and at a personal level between members, a willingness to get on with each other. If there were not, Parliament would be unworkable.

I want to use this opportunity to contrast the Labor Party's professed concern for openness in Government and respect for civil liberties with the Bannon Labor Government's practice. For all the Bannon Government's rhetoric about concern for openness and the protection of civil liberties, the performance does not match that rhetoric. So-called expediency prevails. That expediency reflects the classic Labor socialist response to situations of difficulty—legislate and direct; the Government knows better what is good for a citizen than the citizen knows himself or herself.

The wide gap between rhetoric and practice is reflected in areas such as compulsory acquisition, in respect of the powers of inspectors and authorised Government officials which are wider than those of the police, with the Australia Card, and in relation to major developments. Members will know that the powers of the police to enter and search premises, to seize goods and to require answers to questions is limited. To enter premises and conduct a search, a police officer must have a search warrant. It is not required to be issued by a magistrate, although that is the position in some other States. It is, though, sufficient if it is issued by the Commissioner of Police. But not all police officers carry a general search warrant. A warrant is used when there is a reasonable suspicion that an offence has occurred or is about to occur or that where there may be information which might lead to the apprehension of a person who has committed an offence, a police officer may not require answers to questions. A person who is being asked questions may decline to answer those questions on the ground that they may tend to incriminate that person.

Although in respect of offences under the Companies Code (such as fraud) the Corporate Affairs Commission's officers have wider powers to require the answers to questions even though they may tend to incriminate, the fact is that the answers to those questions may not be used in evidence against the person who gave them if the person being questioned does object that the answers may tend to incriminate. They can be used in evidence against other persons.

In the most recent session of Parliament we saw legislation introduced by the Government to deal with fair trading. The Opposition supported the bulk of the fair trading legislation. One of the major areas of disagreement was in respect of the powers of an officer authorised by the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs to enter premises, even domestic premises, to make inquiries on a wide range of matters related to prices and business matters. The power is a wide ranging one, but no warrant is required to enable entry to occur. The power is much broader than that given to the police. There is a protection which was written into the legislation as a result of our amendment to protect a person from the consequences of self-incrimination, recognising the long established principle of the common law against self-incrimination.

Occupational licensing legislation contains wide powers of entry, inspection of documents and papers and seizure of documents and papers. Such legislation as consumer credit, builders licensing, travel agents, second-hand goods, second-hand motor vehicles, tow-truck operators, commercial and private agents, land and business agents and land valuers, all contain wide powers vested in Government officials. These officials are relatively untrained in the area of respecting individual rights. This legislation is under the control of one Minister. And there is a mass of other legislation with similar wide powers vested in Government officials under the control of other Ministers—all the taxing legislation such as stamp duties, payroll tax, land tax, business franchise (petroleum products); waste management legislation, woods and forests legislation, egg marketing, tow truck licensing, workers rehabilitation and compensation, trade standards, prevention of cruelty to animals, deerkeepers and children's services. They all provide wide powers of entry to premises, inspection of books and records, and to require answers to questions (although most now provide a protection against self-incrimination). Some even allow forcible entry to premises, even domestic premises. Some allow the stopping of vehicles with power to search and to seize and, in some instances, to give directions. A cursory perusal of the Statute Book would make one turn pale when one realised the extent of Government officials' powers.

There is an argument that, at least with occupational licensing legislation, because persons apply for a licence, they then subject themselves to the law which relates to those licences and accept and must live with the prospect of significant intrusion into their affairs. That, of course, is a perverse argument because it takes no account of the desirability of licensing and, in my view, ignores the fact that, regardless of whether or not a licence is required, the principles of civil liberties should apply equally. Certainly, there is some requirement for proper surveillance of activities where consumers may be exploited, but the powers need to be weighed against that objective.

In the Clean Air Act, for example, passed in 1984, authorised officers have the power to enter premises in relation to which the holder of a licence carries out a prescribed activity, but also to enter or break into at any time any premises in which he suspects on reasonable grounds that an offence against the Act has been or is being committed. Wide powers are given to an authorised officer once he or she breaks into those premises. The critical factor in this legislation is that a warrant issued by a justice is necessary to break into the premises unless the authorised officer believes on reasonable grounds that the circumstances require immediate action to be taken. There is also a provision which allows a person to refuse to answer a question if the answer would tend to incriminate him or her.

Under the South Australian Waste Management Commission Act passed in 1979 by a previous Labor Government, there is power to enter any premises (not being a dwelling house) to make any inspection or test relevant to the administration of the Act. The authorised person can direct the driver of a vehicle to stop the vehicle or to drive it to a place nominated by the authorised person to enable an inspection to be carried out, and the authorised person may direct the driver of a vehicle to dispose of waste in or upon the vehicle at a place nominated by the authorised person. That direction is not reviewable by any person, and no rights of action accrue to a person who has been the subject of an improper direction by an authorised officer.

There are a growing number of statutes which give wide powers of entry and apprehension to public officials, and such extension of powers crossing a wide range of human

endeavour must be the subject of close scrutiny. One of the most disturbing pieces of legislation rushed through Parliament at the end of last year was the tobacco licensing legislation which showed a dramatic widening of the powers of government over individuals. As part of a scheme to put itself in a stronger position in any High Court challenge, the Government sought to require individuals who acquired tobacco products to obtain a consumption licence. My criticism of the Government on this Bill is not to be taken as any support for tobacco smoking. I am a non smoker and would encourage smokers to kick the habit, but the extent of the harassment of individuals going into and out of a shop run by a Mr Bryan Stokes who was unlicensed, was quite unforgiveable. There was no protection for individual rights. The interests of the State were put way ahead of the interests of individuals. Of course, I have no sympathy with Mr Stokes. He is a person who is in business. He knows what the law may be and he has the capacity to stand on his own two feet.

There are many other areas where legislation has been introduced over the past five years which have added significantly to the powers of Government officials over citizens. It is a trend at State and Federal levels which raises many questions, gives cause for concern, and must be the subject of constant vigilance.

I turn now to questions of compulsory acquisition. The most recent outrageous proposition by a Government agency was the proposal on behalf of the Grand Prix organisers that there be mandatory booking of all hotel and motel accommodation during the period of the Grand Prix through the Grand Prix Board. Remembering that the Grand Prix Board is an agency of Government, such a proposition is outrageous. It is, in fact, compulsory acquisition, if only for a period of six or seven days. But, it impinges quite significantly upon the individual rights of hotel and motel operators. It is not acquisition in the traditional sense of property being required for an obvious Government purpose such as a hospital, school or road. I was surprised, when I asked a question of the Attorney-General on the subject, that he was rather placid in his response, almost suggesting in defence that it happens, he thought, in Monaco. It does not matter what happens elsewhere. The principle is important, and in South Australia it would be quite a blatant and a gross breach of individual rights for any Government or Government agency to act in this way. How can anyone justify the compulsory acquisition of accommodation for any event, in fact, taking over assets from the control of their owners, and ignoring the many others who may wish to use hotel and motel accommodation for some other purpose than attending the Grand Prix? In relation to this event, nothing could do more to alienate support than compulsory acquisition of a person's business. The other and most recent—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner interjecting:

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: It was suggested. It was compulsory acquisition of hotel and motel accommodation.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: It was not acquisition of a person's business.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: It was. For a period of six or seven days a person was not free to deal with his or her own property as the law would allow. That can be nothing else than compulsory acquisition.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: It was not acquisition of a business.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: It was certainly tantamount to that. The other recent and most prominent abuse of individual rights arose out of the Premier's pre-election stunt to promote the building of an entertainment centre at Hind-

marsh. Members will recollect that just prior to the State election in 1985 the Premier rolled up on the median strip on Port Road opposite the site of what he proposed would be the Entertainment Centre. There was no prior consultation with any individual property owners, nor were they informed that that was to be the site until the Premier made that announcement. Since that time, compulsory acquisition notices were issued, proprietors were forced out of premises, and inadequate compensation paid—all so that a Premier could carry out a stunt with taxpayers' money.

The lives and businesses of many South Australians were disrupted by this political stunt which now has fallen in a great hole. The use of the compulsory acquisition procedures and the way in which the Government went about getting vacant possession of the site is to be deplored and raises important questions about any Government's power to acquire land compulsorily. The generally accepted principle, as I have already indicated, is that if land is required for a public purpose, then a Government may exercise the powers of acquisition. In this particular case they abused it.

Another instance of the Labor Party's dramatically changed attitude towards civil liberties comes with the Australia Card or national system of identification. I will address more comment on this issue when I speak on the motion of the Hon. Diana Laidlaw on this subject in the next week or two. It must be said that this is a gross breach of individual liberty for purposes which are quite obnoxious and, although the Australia Card is promoted by the Federal Government on the basis that it will prevent fraud, it seems that, in this instance, the Government is looking at the end and suggesting that that end will justify the means, even though the end is dubious in any event. It puts everybody on a national computer and requires that card to be used for a wide range of purposes which up to the present time in our history, all Australians have regarded as being free from interference from governments. But now the Federal Labor Government without any regard for civil liberties, rushes headlong to enact a scheme which would be invaluable to a big brother Government. It is pleasing to note that there is now a developing groundswell of opinion among supporters of the Labor Party, as well as in the wider community, against the ill-conceived card, and I suggest that even if the legislation passes a joint sitting of both Houses of the Federal Parliament, the card is unlikely ever to see the light of day.

I want now to turn to the issue of openness in government. I focus first on the Grand Prix. I have no doubt that if I make any observation on the way the Government is running the Grand Prix, the Government will interpret it as opposition to the Grand Prix, but I make it clear, as I have made it clear on many occasions that I support the Grand Prix. It is a good thing for South Australia. In raising questions about aspects of its legislation from time to time, I have been interested in maintaining principle and drawing attention to sloppiness on the part of Government and its disregard for principle. It is important that whatever the event or occasion, principles be maintained and individual rights not be trampled on. Compromises do have to be made in any society, but if one tramples on individual rights and ignores the minority, democracy is threatened.

In the context of open Government, it is important that information about contracts which have been let and the terms and conditions of those contracts be made available publicly; not to prejudice the contracts or to criticise those who participate, but rather to ensure that the way in which contracts have been let is not open to any public criticism. But the Premier hides behind the concept of confidentiality preventing disclosure of that information. There is no aspect

of commercial confidentiality in the bulk of those contracts. Why, for example, should there not be disclosure of the names of licences of any of the Grand Prix logos? What prejudice is that to any of those involved commercially with the Grand Prix? What commercial confidentiality is involved in disclosing the names of those who have been awarded contracts in relation to the Grand Prix? What confidentiality is necessary in relation to those who are participating in the profit-making exercise of the Grand Prix? There is absolutely nothing in the Premier's argument that suggests this is bound up with questions of commercial confidentiality.

The taxpayers' money is subsidising the Grand Prix to the extent of a \$2 million loss each year. It is arrogant to suggest that there should not be public accountability for that money and for information to be disclosed about contractual arrangements. There are other areas where the Premier hides behind the veil of commercial confidentiality. In relation to the ASER development he will not disclose the latest cost estimates or the amount which it will cost the State in supporting that development. He says that it is commercially confidential. It cannot be prejudicial to those who are involved in a commercial context for information to be disclosed about cost over-runs, and costs to the taxpayers of South Australia.

With the Electricity Trust refinancing arrangements, while the detail of the names of companies involved in creative financing could be of a confidential nature, it is not a matter of commercial confidentiality that the scheme which the Government adopts through ETSA and the South Australian Financing Authority should not be available publicly for scrutiny. Creative financing is a matter of public interest and it is appropriate that details of it, although without identifying the players, should be available. When the Opposition tries to get information, the Premier's open book slams shut. The public has a right to know what it will ultimately cost. When the Opposition tries to get information about the South Australian Government Financing Authority, an authority which is an arm of Government investing hundreds of millions of dollars of money that belongs to the people of South Australia, the Premier's lights go out.

Once again, the Premier draws the curtain of commercial confidentiality. But all that is a nonsense: the players do not necessarily have to be identified, the schemes do. Probably, the Premier does not understand the schemes or the issues. After all, he has had no experience of the real world outside politics. All his life has been in school, university and the union movement. I do not suppose one can really have a grasp of the detail of creative financing or commercial reality in that cloistered lifestyle.

All these matters indicate quite clearly that what the Government does is at odds with what it says it believes. The public of South Australia needs to be alerted to that very serious chasm and to recognise that, when any Government becomes arrogant, thumbs its nose at the public and covers up information, it is a serious threat to our democratic system. The public clamour for the Premier to come clean should grow to a crescendo.

But all he does is say that, until recently, we have never had it so good. And now he tells us that we have to pull in our belts. As with the Dunstan decade, the glitter is only on the surface while underneath weakness lies. South Australia is a great State, but not because of the ALP and its policy and mismanagement; it is a great place because of its people and their endeavours. And while the Bannon Government may try to ride on the backs of those people's hard work, more people are realising the inherent weakness of the Premier and his Government.

Our population under the Bannon Government is growing at a slower rate than that of any other State or Territory—0.75 per cent, compared with the Australian average of 1.37 per cent a year. In net migration terms, the level here is the worst in Australia; in employment growth, we are fifth in Australia; in the number of bankruptcies, we are the most seriously affected; and in private investment, we rank fifth. In a number of key economic indicators we are at the bottom, or towards the bottom, of the pile. The Government tries to blame external influences. Maybe that is correct to some extent, but those external influences are largely those imposed by a Federal Labor Government—of the same political persuasion as the Bannon Labor Government. There comes a time when the public gets tired of a Government which will not face facts or face up to reality, that blames everyone else but itself for our ills. That time for the Bannon Government is rapidly approaching. I support the motion.

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

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.40 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 25 August at 2.15 p.m.