LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday 6 September 1989

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

QUESTIONS

WORKCOVER

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Labour a question about WorkCover.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I refer to a recent case brought to my attention of a Rostrevor man who continues to work as a builder and contractor, but who unfortunately sustained a work injury. WorkCover has always insisted that this man pay insurance premiums for himself and his workmates, but after the injury told the man he would not receive any insurance or compensation payment for his injury because he was over the age of 65 years. I understand that the man also has a problem with reimbursement from Medicare, because Medicare sees that as a matter to be taken up by WorkCover.

A recent reply from WorkCover to a medical practitioner who has taken up this man's case says, in part:

> In general . . . the Workers Compensation Act 1986 states that under Section 35 (5) *(a) (b)*:
>
> (5) Weekly payments are not payable in respect of a period of incapacity for work falling after the later of the following dates—
>
> *(a)* the date on which the worker attains the age at which the worker would, subject to satisfying any other qualifying requirements, be eligible to receive an age pension under the Social Security Act 1947.
>
> or
>
> *(b)* the date on which the worker attains the normal retiring age for workers engaged in the kind of employment for which the worker's disability arose or 70 years of age (whichever is the lesser).
>
> With regard to the question of levies, these are still to be paid, even though the worker may not be entitled to income maintenance, as the worker will still be reimbursed for other expenses such as medical and hospital expenses.

In essence, then, what WorkCover appears to be saying is that this man is entitled to receive weekly compensation payments up to the age of 70 years or 'the normal retiring age for a worker engaged in the kind of employment' (which I imagine would be 65), whichever is the lesser, and that levies are still to be paid to WorkCover, even though the worker may not be entitled to income maintenance because he is over the age threshold, in this particular case over 65 years of age.

Can the Minister explain why a person who cannot claim from WorkCover is still required to pay a levy? Does the Minister agree that this is legislation which makes a person senile by statute and is a prime example of discrimination against the aged?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I do not know the answers to those questions, but it certainly seems to be a peculiar anomaly that the honourable member has identified. I shall be happy to refer that matter to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

MARINELAND

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: On 3 August my colleague, the Hon. Peter Dunn, asked the Minister a question about the conduct of the West Beach Trust and the domination of its affairs by its Chairman, Mr Virgo, a former ALP Member of Parliament. The Minister shrugged off the question and suggested an examination of the Auditor-General's Report would provide answers. The Auditor-General's Report, tabled yesterday, rather than answering the Hon. Mr Dunn's questions, raises other questions and makes damning criticism of the conduct of the whole of the proposed development. It points to incompetence at best, and deliberate cover-up at worst, particularly in relation to prospective patronage.

The facts are that Tribond Developments Pty Ltd was placed in receivership, the Auditor-General examined the arrangements and his report says, 'I am concerned by some aspects of them'. He expresses concern, first, about the quality of the submissions of the Department of State Development and Technology to the Industries Development Committee. In relation to that submission, he says: 'It seemed to be directed more towards justifying Tribond's financial and patronage projections rather than critically examining their validity.'

Secondly, the patronage projections were the subject of concern, and again he says that the forecast of 368 000 visitors to the new complex in its first year of operation quadrupled the attendance of the immediate past year, 1986, and trebled the attendance of the previous best year since 1980.

Thirdly, he expressed concern about the fact that there was no proposal for an independent engineering assessment to be made of the Marineland facilities in view of their run-down nature and the importance of those facilities for cash flow to sustain the project. A consultant's report in August 1988 concluded that, even at a reduced scale, the project appeared to be beyond acceptable commercial risk levels.

The West Beach Trust is the owner of the land and granted a 40-year lease to Tribond. Subsequently Tribond went into receivership and a new lease has been granted to another development company. One can only presume that the West Beach Trust or its Chairman would have been very much in touch with all these matters, although I am told that the Chairman was very much a 'one-man band' and frequently made decisions without reference to other members of the trust. That raises particular concern about the way in which decisions were made for and on behalf of the trust. The trust, under its legislation, is subject to the control and direction of the Minister.

My questions are, first, what was the extent of the Chairman's involvement in the incompetent handling of the arrangements with Tribond? Secondly, was the trust always fully informed of all prospective decisions before they were made, or were they made by the Chairman without reference to the trust? Thirdly, will the Minister establish an independent inquiry into this aspect of the Marineland saga?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: In relation to the third question, no, I will not establish an inquiry into past history. The comments which have been made extensively in another place and the questions which have been asked and responded to by the Minister of State Development and Technology fully cater for the aspects which seem primarily to be of concern to the honourable member.

With regard to the arrangements which the West Beach Trust made with Tribond and in relation to the other development, there is no indication whatsoever that the chair has behaved other than in the most correct manner. The

chair informed me that he does not regularly provide written reports to the trust.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Does he report to the trust?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: But he reports fully to the trust verbally at every meeting and will obviously answer any questions that any member of the trust may wish to put to him. He has offered to provide written reports if the members of the trust request them, but has pointed out that, if he does that, they will be less up to date than a verbal report and that no member of the trust has requested a written report from him.

As I understand it, the chair works closely with the General Manager of the West Beach Trust, consults fully with his members and has had any suggestions made by him fully endorsed by the trust at subsequent meetings. It would seem inappropriate for members opposite to suggest that he is behaving in other than the most correct manner, because there has been no suggestion to me from any member of the trust other than that they are completely satisfied.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: As a supplementary question, is the Minister then satisfied in every respect with the conduct of the West Beach Trust and its Chairman in the handling of the discussions and negotiations with Tribond Developments and the new developer?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I am not fully aware of all the details of the negotiations which have taken place. Obviously, commercial confidentiality is involved in a number of the discussions. I understand that on occasions, when negotiations have taken place, the situation has changed almost daily, but I have no reason to have other than complete confidence in all members of the West Beach Trust.

PETROCHEMICAL PLANT

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism, as the Acting Leader of the Government in the Council, a question about a petrochemical plant.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: For nearly 20 years there has been talk of a petrochemical plant in South Australia using feedstock from the Cooper Basin. The Redcliff petrochemical plant site, which is situated in an environmentally sensitive region of Spencer Gulf, was canvassed for many years during the 1970s by Dow Chemical before it was finally abandoned in 1980. In 1982 CRA, with Asahi Chemicals of Japan, considered a plant located at Port Adelaide or Port Bonython.

CRA withdrew from this proposal in 1984 and subsequently in mid-1986 Asahi also pulled out of the project. However, late last year there was again talk of the possibility of a petrochemical plant located adjacent to the existing Port Bonython liquids plant near Whyalla. In recent weeks we have become privy to the extraordinary shenanigans between the Western Australian Government and Mr Laurie Connell and Mr Dallas Dempster over a proposed petrochemical plant in Western Australia. As the Minister anticipated when I first raised this issue, there has been, of course, an expose of the most fragile nature of the transaction which was entered into between the Western Australian Government and those two gentlemen over the petrochemical plant in Western Australia.

It now appears likely that this petrochemical plant in Western Australia may not proceed. This could well provide an opportunity for South Australia to press its own claims for the establishment of a petrochemical plant located near Whyalla to take advantage of the existing infrastructure and the feedstock available from the Cooper Basin.

I am concerned that the South Australian Government should be alert to this possibility, which has arisen as a result of the likely shelving of the petrochemical plant in Western Australia. My question to the Minister is simply: will the Government increase its efforts to secure a petrochemical plant for South Australia?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: As the honourable member has indicated, numerous proposals or ideas have been floated at one time or another over a long number of years as to whether or not a petrochemical plant located somewhere in South Australia would be a feasible proposition, but for one reason or another none of those proposals has got off the ground. Whether or not the failure of the proposed petrochemical plant in Western Australia opens up a new opportunity for South Australia, I am not in a position to say but I am sure that the Minister of State Development and the Premier would certainly have been following those events very closely and, if they felt that there was some opportunity that that failure to proceed in Western Australia presented for South Australia, I am sure that they would be doing all in their power to take up that opportunity.

I am also sure that the Minister of Transport, who happens to be the local member representing the seat of Whyalla, would also be following these events closely and, as has been his practice, he is very active in pursuing any opportunity at all that might provide job opportunities and the chance of increased prosperity for the people of his electorate. If he thought there was something to pursue there, I am sure he would be doing so.

The honourable member asked whether there had been any further discussions on the question of a petrochemical plant in South Australia. I will refer that matter to the appropriate Minister and bring back a report.

HOUSING

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Housing and Construction, a question about South Australia's housing stock and the current state of housing within South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: My questions are based on data which have been extracted from the housing report of July 1989, the Commonwealth Bank and the Housing Industry Association. I have repeatedly sat in this place and listened to members on the Opposition benches make the wildest assertions on the position of housing, both public and private, here in South Australia. So I set out—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: Anybody who walks down a white line is always likely to hear it from both sides. Following, Mr President, are some of the facts which I have gleaned—

An honourable member: How long is the Housing Trust waiting list, then?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I will start again, Mr President. I have repeatedly sat in this place and listened to members on the Opposition benches make the wildest assertions on the position of housing, both public and private, here in South Australia. So I set out, Mr President, in an endeavour to find out what was Opposition fact from Opposition political electoral fiction. The following, then, are some of the facts that I have gleaned—facts, I might add,

which I have gleaned from sources which are basically not Party political.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: Fact number one—12 per cent of South Australia's housing stock is public housing, the highest proportion of any State.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: It's declining.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: The Democrats are declining, too. Fact number two is that South Australia, whilst ranked fifth among Australian States in population, is number two in public housing stock, second only to New South Wales. In respect to this fact, I draw to members attention that New South Wales' population is at least five times the size of South Australia's. The third fact is that South Australia—

The Hon. Peter Dunn: Are you saying—

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: Listen and you will hear what I am saying, Mr Dunn. The third fact is that South Australia's public housing stock is larger in absolute terms than Victoria's, yet Victoria has three times South Australia's population. Fact number four is that, in South Australia, mortgage rates have consistently been below those throughout the rest of Australia over the past 18 months.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I have difficulty hearing the honourable member's question.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Members will come to order.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: Finally, but by no means exhaustively, is a quote:

> The ongoing release of land for residential development by the State Government and its encouragement of housing development in South Australia has contributed significantly to the State's lower house prices.

In fact, one of the reports which I have just read while compiling these facts reads:

> The competitiveness of the State Bank has enabled first home buyers to obtain housing loans at up to a full percentage point interest less than in other States . . .
>
> Hobart is the only city where houses are cheaper than South Australia.

The same publication further states:

> The median price of a new dwelling in Adelaide as at June 1989 was $84 300.

For the information of this Council, this compares with Sydney, where the median price is $162 600; Melbourne, where the median price is $148 700; Perth, where the median price is $112 500; and finally, Brisbane, where the median price is $110 900. So members can see at a glance that Adelaide's median housing cost for new homes is $26 600 cheaper than the next cheapest mainland capital, which is Brisbane.

My questions to the Minister of Tourism are: what harm, if any, occurred to South Australia's public housing program by dint of the then Tonkin Liberal Government's decision to sell publicly owned land, particularly at Monarto? Why is it that the cost of public housing is so much cheaper in South Australia than in any other mainland capital?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: Finally, what efforts, if any, has the State Government undertaken to try to bridge the funding shortfall, brought about by the continuing reduction in real terms of Federal funding, particularly in the public housing sector?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I congratulate the honourable member on the extensive research that he has put into this question and, indeed, into every question that he asks in this place. It seems to me that he is capable of—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: —identifying the salient points on whatever issue he wants to address in this place, and he puts appropriate research into his topics. I do not have the answers to the questions asked, but I believe that the answers lie, to some extent, within the honourable member's explanation. In fact, it has been Labor Governments, both State and Federal, over a long period in Australia that have devoted much time and financial attention to the housing needs of Australians.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: They have certainly devoted more attention and resources to that area than have the people opposite when in government. However, I will refer the specific questions—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is too much conversation.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: —to my colleague in another place, and I shall be happy to bring back a reply.

SENIOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Education, a question about senior secondary schools.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: On 1 December last year I asked a question in this place about senior secondary schools, pointing out that that concept has been tried in Tasmania, Queensland and Canberra with real success and asking the Minister whether or not the setting up of such schools in South Australia had been considered. I received a four paragraph written reply, and as it does not appear in the *Hansard* record I will cite the last two paragraphs, as follows:

> The Education Department policy on Participation in Post Compulsory Education states that 'the concept of strategically placed re-entry centres on school sites is to be investigated and will involve consultation with schools and other groups'.
>
> In 1989, a re-entry school on the Elizabeth West campus of the Elizabeth Munno Para College of Secondary Education located in the northern area will be established. This will have a senior secondary focus and will be based on those elements of interstate practice which are most appropriate to the South Australian context.

I responded, pointing out that my question had nothing to do with re-entry schools and that I was considering senior secondary schools on a much wider basis. I also asked precisely what 'appropriate to the South Australian context' meant. I received a further reply from the Minister on 9 March this year which, regarding investigations interstate, stated in part:

> Reports of these investigative excursions have included the identification of disadvantages associated with the division within secondary education into junior secondary and senior secondary schools. In addition, information in South Australia is that generally parents in this State prefer the concept of an 8 to 12 neighbourhood school.
>
> As a result, the education department is actively pursuing alternative stategies to the establishment of senior secondary schools in order that the widest possible curriculum offerings can be provided to meet the needs of the range of young people wishing to participate in a full secondary education.
>
> The restructuring in the northern area with the establishment of the Elizabeth Munno Para College of Secondary education, shared curriculum between nearby secondary schools and the clustering of schools are all current examples where a significant restructuring in secondary education is occuring. It must be stressed

that this restructuring is designed to meet the needs of the widest range of students possible in a South Australian context.

It might be, however, that in a particular location a re-configuration of schools to include a senior school could be the most appropriate outcome. In which case, there would not be any objection to this proceeding, if it provided better use of resources and improved options for students.

The letter was signed by the Minister of Education. I believe that the Minister has still not answered my question. He has still used rather vague terms like 'South Australian context'. I certainly would like to know what the Minister sees as being different about the 'South Australian context' which would stop senior secondary schools from working here while they have been successful in metropolitan and country areas in Queensland, Tasmania and Canberra.

The Minister said that the parents prefer an 8 to 12 neighbourhood school, yet in South Australia we currently have amalgamations and closure of schools happening apace. People interested in this area have informed me that schools up to year 10 can be maintained easily because the schools do not demand the wide resources demanded by senior secondary schools. The real pressure for amalgamation comes from senior secondary schools, where there has been an explosion in student numbers and where classes tend to be small. It makes an incredible demand upon the secondary schools, a consequence being that junior classes have expanded rapidly. I reiterate a concern I expressed last year—that with amalgamations contemplated now and sale of school assets proceeding apace, if schools are sold then the option of using those campuses for senior secondary schools will be lost without future large expenditure.

I ask the Minister again: what does he mean by the 'South Australian context' and why is it so different from interstate where senior secondary schools have been successful? Before schools are amalgamated or closed, is serious consideration being given to the use of senior secondary schools as a way of providing a good and cost effective education?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I am unable to respond directly to that question, but I will refer it to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply. I can assure the honourable member that all questions relating to education that he has raised will be seriously considered. Indeed, he may have noticed that complete attention was given to his question by all members on this side of the Chamber—unlike those on the other side of the Chamber who indulged in conversation throughout his question.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES OFFICERS

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Correctional Services a question about stress related illness among correctional services officers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I recently asked a question about the high incidence of stress related illness among correctional services officers. I also asked whether this indicated a problem and what was being done to solve the problem. I wish to quote the editorial of the August newsletter of the legal fund of the Correctional Services Officer Association which shows the concern over this problem and the lack of resolution of it. The newsletter states that it is a confidential publication of the South Australian correctional officers legal fund, and that the contents therein are for the information of members only and should not be divulged to any other person who is not a member of the legal fund. I believe this is another leak—as has been happening recently—because it appears to me that the Government has lost the confidence of the Public Service. The editorial states:

It is about time that someone spoke up about some of the major problems which are seriously afflicting this department. For some time now, a creeping cancer has been eating its way through this department, and as a result many officers have become so disenchanted with work that they have either taken time off, resigned from the department, or applied for reassignment to other departments.

On the surface the problem appears to be 'stress'. We are experiencing an abnormally high incidence of 'occupational-stress', and we almost daily see officers succumbing to this malaise. Yet I believe that most officers know that this high incidence of stress is not the real problem. The 'stress' is merely symptomatic of a much greater problem within the department. Most officers in this department seek to do their job, (an extremely difficult one at the best of times) to the utmost of their ability. In return, when problems arise, they look for some degree of support from management. Yet, what support can officers expect from the present administration? Rightly, or wrongly, the impression that most officers have is that this department sees their many officers as disposable 'cannon-fodder', to be sacrificed, rather than to deal with their occupational and personal problems. As a result, management has lost the loyalty of most of the officers. An officer summed up the problem recently, in the following words, 'they offered us karate classes, or gym sessions. All that has been tried. What, we really need is dignity.'

There is little doubt that the real problem is low-morale. I have been with this department for 17 years, and I can honestly say I have never seen morale at such a low level. We have suffered a continuous decline in morale during the past few years, and this has increased dramatically since the recent suspension of Dave and Barry. I personally believe that most of this morale problem can be attributed to officers perception of the top management of this department.The general impression, from all ranks, is that top management has deliberately, or otherwise, alienated themselves from the majority of staff, and no longer have an awareness, or even an interest, of the problems encountered by the officers in the institutions. Officers also believe that they have been abandoned by the Government. It is this apparent lack of appreciation of the problems of the officers which is creating much of the difficulties. Management appears to be totally unaware of how divisive and destructive their present management policies are. Current Department of Correctional Services policy appears to lack any interest in the welfare of the staff they are supposed to be protecting.

Few could argue that the suspension of Officers Nash and Smith exposed top management for what they really are, bureaucrats first and last. Their detached, emotionless handling of that issue brought the problem to a head. It is unfortunate that morale has fallen so low, particularly when it requires so very little, on the part of management, to make our job an agreeable one, and ensure the loyalty of staff. All we are asking for is proper leadership. Proper leadership requires management that we can respect and who in turn respect their staff. Responsibility for change is in the hands of the management. A few minor changes to policy, and the placement of capable, sympathetic managers, who are genuinely interested in the welfare of their officers, would revolutionise this department, and restore the loyalty, cooperation and dedication of all officers. I say these things without animosity. I have no personal quarrel with any member of departmental management. I believe that, in their own misguided way, some of them actually believe that what they are doing is good for the department. However, in all honesty, how many outside head office share their point of view?

A report on the subject is being prepared, but whether it recommends a workable solution is another matter. My questions are as follows:

1. Does the Minister acknowledge that there is a problem in regard to the incidence of stress-related illness among correctional services officers?

2. Does he acknowledge, as is stated in the editorial, that lack of consideration at management level is the root of the problem?

3. What steps does the Minister propose to implement as a matter of urgency to rectify the situation?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will be happy to refer the honourable member's questions to my colleague the Minister of Correctional Services, and bring back a report as quickly as possible.

MUSEUM EXHIBITION

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the Arts a question about the South Australian Museum exhibition.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I understand that the exhibition currently displayed at the South Australian Museum and entitled 'Ancient Macedonia' was originally not due to come to Adelaide. Why was this important exhibition not initially coming to Adelaide and, further, what arrangements were eventually made for it to be exhibited here?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I am very pleased to be able to respond to this question.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Perhaps unknown to members opposite, the exhibition 'Ancient Macedonia' is attracting enormous interest in South Australia, and it is extremely pleasing that it was able eventually to come to South Australia when initially it was not planned to do so. This exhibition is the Greek Government's contribution to Australia's bicentennial celebrations but, as initially planned, it was not coming to Adelaide. The Premier, who was then Minister for the Arts, having received a letter from the Pan Macedonian Association, took up the matter with the Director of the South Australian Museum, as well as with the Executive Director of the International Cultural Corporation of Australia.

From there it went to the Director of the Victorian Museum, Mr Edwards, as the Victorian Museum was the organising institution for this exhibition from the Australian end. The Director of the Art Gallery of South Australia lent his weight to this. At about this time I became Minister for the Arts and I contacted—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: —the Federal Minister for the Arts, Mr Holding, and the Premier contacted the Prime Minister, and negotiations proceeded.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The final negotiations depended on a letter of approval from the Ministry of Culture in Greece. At the time that this agreement was reached, elections took place in Greece. There was a change in Government and considerable political instability in that country as a result, and it was extremely difficult to obtain a response from the Greek end.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Eventually, the Prime Minister rang the Government in Greece, and this resulted in the necessary approval being given. There is no doubt that the exhibition is an enormous success in South Australia. I hope that all members present will endorse the enrichment that it is making to the South Australian community. It has been opened for only just over 2½ weeks, and already more than 11 000 people have been to the Museum to see it. There is no suggestion that the attendance levels are diminishing. If they continue at this current rate, nearly 40 000 people will have seen the exhibition by the time that it closes on 15 October. I can only suggest that, if any member here has not yet seen it, he or she should take advantage of it while it is here and add to the vast numbers of South Australians who are thoroughly enjoying it.

SOCIAL WELFARE

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Community Welfare, a question about the social welfare agenda.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I was interested to read Dr Cornwall's book *Just for the Record*, particularly the chapter on social welfare. I want to quote some passages from that book. On page 174, he says:

> In 1986, as we began our second term, I considered that it was prudent and necessary to begin the development of constructive long-term policies and programs in health and welfare. Ideally they would take us beyond the 1989 State election into the 1990s. Over the next 12 months Green Papers were developed outlining five year programs for Social Health, Social Welfare Health and Welfare Working Together and The Aged Strategy. . . . The Green Paper/White Paper process was designed among other things to give a chronically debilitated DCW an opportunity to get its act together.

The former Minister goes on to outline what his plans were for the department in relation to those papers. At page 176, Dr Cornwall states:

> By 1989 very little of this vision had been implemented. The Department for Community Welfare remained largely a story of missed opportunities. This was partly because of their determination to guard their patch from a 'takeover' and partly because management lacked the will to take up the challenge. Despite my persistence—

Dr Cornwall had been Minister for three or four years by that stage—

> I was unable to overcome many bureaucratic barriers . . . But even specific projects designed for better client services and efficiency were never begun. This was despite their endorsement by Cabinet in December 1986.

The Minister of Tourism would have been a member of the Cabinet at that time. Dr Cornwall goes on:

> Joint service planning and staff development programs never eventuated. There was active opposition to combined media liasion and public information services. Colocation and shared facilities with health services at local and regional levels never became a reality. It was a sorry litany of missed opportunity with the resistance movement apparently well organised.

The former Minister said:

> Some of this could have been forgiven if the department had been performing its primary statutory responsibilities well. However, what was by now largely a 'child protection department' continued to perform indifferently. This was especially the case in the vexed and difficult area of child sexual abuse.

The former Minister goes on to talk about the department's siege mentality and the need to change that. There is a little question that I would note in passing: the Minister's words since he left Parliament reflect the concerns that were expressed in this place by me on behalf of the Liberal Party over the years that Dr Cornwall held that responsibility.

Is the Minister satisfied that the Department for Community Welfare is performing its primary statutory responsibilities well? Will the Minister confirm whether the Cabinet endorsements for initiatives, such as combined media liaison services, public information services and the like agreed by Cabinet in December 1986, still remain valid and, therefore, still have the opportunity or potential to be implemented or whether the Government has taken action to reverse those Cabinet decisions?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: We can only be grateful to members opposite for saving us having to buy this book, because it seems that over the next few weeks we shall hear all the juicy excerpts from it. Unfortunately, we will not

have to wait after all until it is only 20 cents, which is what Norm Foster thought was a reasonable price. However, if the honourable member is serious about her questions, I shall be happy to refer them to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply on these issues.

HOMESTART LOANS SCHEME

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Housing and Construction, a question on the HomeStart Loans Scheme.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. WEATHERILL: The new HomeStart Loan Scheme launched yesterday by the Premier is a $1 billion program over the next five years. It would therefore be beneficial and of great interest to all members to hear from the Minister how the scheme will be beneficial to the building industry and the South Australian economy as a whole.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is too much noise in the Chamber.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: As honourable members, I hope on both sides of the Council, will be aware, the Government's HomeStart program was released yesterday by the Premier.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, Mr Cameron!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: It will make an enormous contribution to the lives of many South Australians during the next four or five years. It is a $1 billion program over the next five years and it is designed to provide home loans for about 16 000 people during that time.

As many members in this place will be aware, many people are unable to breach the deposit gap in order to achieve a home loan for their first home or, indeed, are unable to meet the repayments that would be required on a conventional loan. This program is designed to assist many of those people—many of them with young families—who otherwise would find it difficult to achieve home ownership.

It is a very important program that the Government has announced in the past 24 hours. Not only will it be of enormous assistance and significance to families, particularly in the middle to low income brackets, but also, as the honourable member suggested in his question, it will provide a boost to the South Australian building industry because, although it is not a prerequisite, many of the homes that people will be looking to buy will be new homes. That means that builders who are currently perhaps not working at capacity or who will be interested in new building opportunities will also benefit from a scheme of this kind as will all those people employed in the construction industry.

So, from many aspects, this new program will provide a major boost to South Australians. I am sure that at least members on this side of the Chamber feel very proud of the Government's achievement in this area. Anyone of reasonable mind would want to congratulate the Minister of Housing and Construction and the Government as a whole on the production of this program, which has been the culmination of 12 to 18 months of research and preparation.

ROAD SAFETY DIVISION

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I ask the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Transport, the following question about the possible resignation of Ivan Lees from his position as head of the Road Safety Division. Is it true that, as a consequence of the much touted reorganisation of the Transport and Highways Departments, the downgrading of the Road Safety Division has led to Mr Lees' resignation or his refusal to serve further as head of the Road Safety Division? Is it also true that this alleged resignation was brought about because of the alleged downgrading of reporting of road safety which will occur by virtue of the fact that, instead of having direct contact with the Minister as is now the case, the Road Safety Division will have to operate through a CEO of a department, through a divisional head and then eventually through to the Minister? In the Minister's view, is it a desirable and positive step in the cause of road safety to have Road Safety virtually downgraded to a minor department in a major division?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I will refer that question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

YATALA LABOUR PRISON

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Correctional Services a question about Yatala Labour Prison.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: Recently I was informed by employees of the Department of Correctional Services that the safety of Government employees working in the gaol system is at times seriously threatened. People are employed at the gaol to teach new rehabilitation skills to prisoners. These workers are also required to supervise prisoners who demand to use the phone in the workshops so that they can contact unknown people outside the prison. Some of the phone calls have been for a duration of up to one hour and the prison officers cannot do anything about it.

In the meantime, only one teaching staff member remains in the workshop with the rest of the prisoners. I have been advised that the workshop machinery is unsafe, because it does not have any safety guards and it does not meet the safety standards as set out in the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act. As a result, these employees could be injured.

In the past few months two zip guns have been found hidden in the kitchen and workshops. In view of these alarming reports, will the Minister confirm or deny the discovery of the zip guns or other weapons at Yatala? What steps have been taken to protect the prison officers?

The Hon. G. Weatherill: I think you should go around there and have a look.

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I have been there and had a look. Can the Minister advise how many outside calls have been made on workshop telephones by the prisoners during the past six months? Further, has the department checked the phone numbers called by the prisoners in order to ascertain the identity of the people contacted by the prisoners?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I do not believe that even members on the other side would agree with the tone at least of the last question asked by the honourable member, but I will certainly refer those questions to my colleague in another place and will bring back a full report on the practices at Yatala Labour Prison.

MOUNT LOFTY DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I move:

That this Council condemns the decision-making process adopted by the Bannon Government in relation to the proposed tourism development of Mount Lofty because, in selecting to enter into exclusive negotiations with the Mount Lofty Development Co. Pty Ltd in May 1986, the Government:

1. Selected a project that not only impacted most heavily on the Mount Lofty environment but also broke planning guidelines for the area;
2. Encouraged the developers to pursue a costly $2 million process for over two years, to then be informed the project, comprising a cable car, was unacceptable on environmental grounds; and
3. Rejected other tenders which submitted smaller, more environmentally sensitive proposals consistent with Hills Face Zone and Conservation Park planning regulations.

I was very pleased to note that, when I read this motion, it did not attract the same derisive comments from members opposite as was the case when I gave notice that I would move this motion.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Isn't it interesting that the Minister of Tourism has indicated that she did not interject on this occasion because she was not even listening.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: I didn't say that.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Yes, you did.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: No, I didn't.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Yes, you did. You said that you were not listening.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member must address the Chair.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: That is a further sad reflection on this Government, and on the Minister in particular, in relation to this project.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Don't misquote her.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I am not misquoting the Minister.

The Hon. Anne Levy: You are misquoting the Minister: I heard what she said.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is too much audible conversation. Members are making it very difficult for *Hansard*, for other members and for the Chair to hear what is going on in the Chamber. I would ask members to observe some silence and decorum.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I thank you for your protection, Mr President. I indicated that I was not surprised that this motion caused some discomfort to members opposite—and so it should because, as I will outline in a few moments, over 6½ years the Government's actions in relation to this project have been deplorable and deserve to be condemned by this Chamber. It is some 6½ years since the kiosk at the Mount Lofty summit burnt down, but there is still no development at that site, whether it be a kiosk or any other sort of restaurant or refreshment facility.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Not even a soup kitchen.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Not even a soup kitchen. After 6½ years, no development has taken place. This Government and Tourism South Australia have indicated that development of this site should have top priority and it should be a landmark in this State. Even after recent decisions of the Government to examine the feasibility of a joint venture project, we are no closer to a resolution of this matter.

I indicate also that this motion is consistent with the stand taken by the Liberal Party over a considerable period. In order to reinforce that statement, I will read from a press release which was issued by a former shadow Minister for Environment, Planning and Tourism, the Hon. Jennifer Cashmore. The press release is headed 'Government in trouble over Mount Lofty' and states:

The Government was digging itself into a hole over its failure to reconcile its conservation, planning and development policies, the Opposition has warned. The Shadow Minister for Environment and Planning and Tourism, Ms Jennifer Cashmore, said today the Mount Lofty development project was the latest in a series of Government-inspired projects which were arousing deep public concern.

'The Mount Lofty development runs foul of conservation objectives, breaches the planning laws and could threaten the Hills environment which is highly valued by South Australians and appreciated by visitors,' Ms Cashmore said. 'There is no question that development is needed at the summit to enable people to view the City of Adelaide under safe and pleasant conditions. The big question is whether what is proposed is appropriate. The Liberal Party had an open mind about this development when it was first announced. However, we refuse to be blackmailed into supporting development for development's sake, which is what the Government appears to be doing.'

Ms Cashmore said that in proposing major development, including a 3.2 kilometre 30-tower cable car system in Cleland Park, the Government had embarked on a fundamental policy change without warning, debate or discussion. 'The principle purpose of national parks is nature conservation. Yet the big push now, not only at Cleland but at Wilpena in the Flinders Ranges and Flinders Chase on Kangaroo Island, is development. This represents a basic change of direction. It's causing massive concern and no wonder. It's a Cabinet decision which is being implemented without any public demand and in the face of a great deal of public opposition.'

Ms Cashmore said other issues which were causing concern regarding the Mount Lofty project were:

1. The fact that the project breached a large number of the principles, objectives and planning controls set down by the Hills Face Zone Supplementary Development Plan. The cable car construction in Cleland Park, the tower at the summit and the hotel were clearly in direct conflict with the Supplementary Development Plan.
2. The essential change in the atmosphere at Cleland with the construction and operation of a cable car, together with its effect on native flora and fauna.
3. The fact that the project breached the Heritage Supplementary Development Plan of the Stirling District Council, which was opposed to the development.
4. The visual impact on Waterfall Gully of two large cable car towers located between the kiosk and the falls.
5. The impact of cable car construction on the water catchment area, especially the First Creek watercourse.
6. The effect on the South-eastern Freeway of a base station for the cable car near the Eagle-on-the-Hill Hotel with resultant traffic flow difficulties at that point.

Why did Cabinet go for an option which breaches planning laws when three of the four responses it had to its tender complied with planning laws? The three other options were low-key, environmentally sound and could have been under construction by now [May 1986] if the Government had used its collective head and realised how South Australians feel about Mount Lofty. We don't want flashy development which is not in harmony with nature. 'In a purely pragmatic sense, such development could ultimately help destroy the very essence of what draws people to South Australia and captivates them when they get here—that is, an unspoilt environment with appropriate facilities which harmonise well with nature.'

Ms Cashmore said that there were so many question marks over the Environmental Impact Statement prepared by the developers that the Government should rethink the whole project and listen first to the loud voice of public opinion.

That statement was made on 22 May 1986. It essentially reflects the motion I have moved today. The only trouble is that today we are three years on, and we are still at a feasibility stage in respect of this whole project. It is important for this Council, looking at this motion and the Government's role in planning policy and decision making for some facility at Mount Lofty, to go back some years and look at this saga of ineptness and incompetence. I would indicate first that in July 1984 the Government was considering a kiosk at Mount Lofty summit. This proposal was of some concern to the shadow Minister for Environment and Planning at the time, the Hon. David Wotton, who was anxious that the Government had not considered the opin-

ion of the local council or local residents. He considered the proposed project may breach the sensitive area of the hills face zone.

Later that month, however, the Government indicated that the $750 000 project—the restaurant and kiosk—would not be built because the Government had just heard that Federal funding for the project would not be available. The Minister at the time, Dr Hopgood, indicated in the *Advertiser* of 27 June:

> It was hoped the project, which also was dependent on funding through the Federal Government's natural disaster relief project, could be completed by the end of the year.

The National Parks and Wildlife Service indicated in the same article that it had spent a considerable amount of time and effort developing the summit proposal. So, a proposal was accepted by the State Government but rejected by the Federal Government because of funding costs, back in June 1984.

Moving a year later to 1985, we find that at that time the Government was being urged to buy two properties at Mount Lofty to use as part of a national park and to replace the Mount Lofty kiosk. The President of the Mount Lofty Districts Historical Society, Professor Horne, argued that the property 'Carminnow' was now up for sale and that the Church of England wanted to offer St Michael's House for sale as well, and that the Department of Environment and Planning was considering the properties as options in building a kiosk to replace the previous one at the Mount Lofty summit.

Some months later, on 4 December 1985, the *Advertiser* reported that the Government had plans for a major redevelopment of the Mount Lofty Summit and the historic St Michael's House. The *Advertiser* of that date indicated that the Government would also announce that it had bought the 7.8 hectare St Michael's property from the Anglican Church, for which it had paid between $375 000 and $400 000.

Dr Hopgood was quoted as saying that the Government would call that day for registrations of interest from builders to construct the restaurant/kiosk as part of the tourist development at St Michael's. He said that it was possible that a tourist information centre could also be built. Later that month the Minister indicated that, since he had called for registrations of interest, the State Government had been swamped with such expressions of interest, including 12 firm inquiries, some from interstate. Six months later, on 27 May, the Minister indicated that tenders which had been called had now been considered by the Government and that it would be organising an exclusive contract with one of four tenderers. The number of tenderers had been whittled down to four and the one that the Government favoured was that incorporating the cable car development. That was late in May 1986.

Apparently, one of the important things in the tender documents was the stipulation that tenderers for the proposals adhere to hills face zone regulations, taking environmental considerations into account. I suppose that one of the ironies of this whole action is that, although that was one of the stipulations in the document, the Government went ahead in May 1986 to agree with a proposal that was quite contrary to its own tender guidelines. However, one of the appeals of this project was the fact that no Government money was involved. In 1986, the Government was quite keen to ensure that it had no Government money or Government involvement in this project. This is rather an interesting irony with respect to the developments of the past month.

The result of the Government's negotiations with the Mount Lofty development company was received with great anger by a large range of people. For instance, the President of the Mount Lofty and Districts Historical Society said at the time that the scheme was breathtaking in its vast vulgarity and insensitivity. Other comments were received from the District Council of Stirling, which indicated that it was strongly opposed to the plan. Further comments were received from the Secretary of the Waterfall Gully Residents' Association, Mr Downs, who said that the whole idea sounded like a politician's pipe dream. 'I doubt whether it will get off the ground.' With hindsight, we can see how right he was.

The Waterfall Gully Association President, Mr Shearn, indicated that the project was 'tantamount to raping the hillside'. The Stirling council was strongly opposed to the project at that time when Mr Leah, the council's Chairman, indicated that the council rejected the scale of the buildings as inappropriate for a site with high visibility in the hills face zone, that the black pyramids were not sensitive to the site's heritage and character and that the plan itself appeared to have little regard for the Cleland Conservation Park Management Plan. The proposed project, which was claimed to have the potential to attract up to 750 000 people annually by 1990, was also questioned by the council, which indicated that it was most disappointed that the other three options were not publicised. The council called for an urgent deputation with the Minister of Tourism and the Minister for Environment and Planning. That was in 1986, when the cable car project was roundly damned on the very grounds that the Government had now pulled out of the project, some 3½ years later.

In June 1986 I note that the *Advertiser* carried a story quoting Dr Hopgood in relation to the first environmental impact statements where he indicated that the Mount Lofty tourist project could go ahead without the controversial cable car system, although he did indicate that it was the preferred option at that time. Already, however, he was indicating some doubts on the part of the Government, and essentially those doubts were expressed in response to statements by the shadow Attorney-General (Hon. Mr Griffin), who called on the Government to release the tender documents.

There was criticism not only by the State Opposition but also by the other developers who had tendered. Those developers believed that the Government should have released all the facts and figures so that the public was fully informed about the project and the range of options which were available to the Government but which were rejected in favour of the cable car project. The calls of the State Opposition were repeated a few days later. Even though a few days previously the Minister had said that he was wavering about the cable car being essential to the project, at that stage he was saying that he had a total commitment to the whole project, including the cable car element, and that he saw nothing irregular in the way in which the Government had selected the Touche Ross consortium for the project. He further said that there was no suggestion that the negotiations that were about to begin would result in the cable car proposal being dropped. The Minister also said that the Touche Ross proposal was the best, even without the cable car aspect.

Thus, within four days in June 1986 there were four conflicting statements by the Minister for Environment and Planning, essentially in response to pressure from the Opposition: there were conflicting statements about whether or not the project was viable, and whether it would go ahead with or without the cable car. At that stage the situation was a real mess, and it became more complicated and more astonishing as the months went by.

I would like to highlight the following aspect. In October 1986 a draft environmental impact statement on the proposed $40 million development of the Mount Lofty summit area was proposed. The developers indicated that it was expected that that statement would be handed to the Department of Environment and Planning by the end of the month. It was hoped that the EIS would be issued for public comment in November 1986, and a two month public submission period was anticipated. In the meantime discussions continued with a number of groups that were interested in backing the project. Nothing was said for about 16 months.

The draft environmental impact statement for that project was released to the public on 23 February 1988, and it was roundly criticised by parties such as the Conservation Council, which objected to tourist development in South Australian parks and in particular to a cable car being erected over the Cleland Conservation Park. Mr Marcus Beresford said that the 30 tower cable car was probably the greatest environmental threat in the project. He would not accept that it would not infringe on the Cleland Conservation Park. He further said that the Mount Lofty project reflected the trend to promoting private development within national parks. At the same time Mr Stan Evans, the then Independent Liberal member for Davenport, released a statement attacking the Government. In that regard an article in the *News* of 23 February, in which Mr Evans attacked the State Government's double standards on the project, stated:

> He said [Mr Evans] the Government regulations barred building two-storey houses on the hills face zone, yet the proposed summit tower would increase the mount's height by a third. 'Yet again the multi-millionaires are given the green light and privileges the average person does not have,' Mr Evans said. 'I will not allow double standards to crucify the little man while big business makes millions.'

Two months later a major public meeting, held at Stirling, to discuss the environmental impact of the development, was attended by more than 100 people. An article in the *Advertiser* stated that Mr Wayne Redman failed to answer questions regarding the planning for fire emergency, and CFS members indicated that they thought Ash Wednesday would have been a top criterion when planning for such a development. Mr Wotton, a Liberal member of Parliament, said it was incredible that the company had not been able to explain how evacuation would take place.

On Sunday 10 April a further public meeting held at Old Parliament House was attended by 60 community groups. Ms Jacquie Gillen of the Australian Conservation Foundation, who organised the meeting, said that the foundation objected to the fact that no public opinion had been sought on which building proposals of the four options should be chosen. Further, she said that, because the environmental impact process did not provide a public forum, the foundation had organised its own forum. The Stirling District Council held further meetings and indicated that, while it supported tourism development at Mount Lofty, it believed that the plan was not consistent with the heritage of the area. Likewise, the Burnside council indicated that its planning committee had raised several concerns about the project.

In May 1988 the Opposition released a major statement on the project, and I cited that statement at the beginning of my remarks on this debate. That brings us to May of last year, some 5½ years from the destruction of the kiosk—and still there was no project. However, there were major community doubts not only about the manner in which the Government had accepted the original plans but also about the environmental impact statement. Mr Redman, on behalf of the developers, indicated in May 1988 that the developers were most optimistic that a decision on the project would be made by the end of next year and that the project would be commenced in mid-1989.

That certainly has not proved to be the case because, as we know, when Mr Redman thought that the first building would go ahead, the Government decided to scrap the project altogether. It has now agreed to a smaller scale development, which opponents of the cable car option and concerned parties have advocated all along. The tragedy is not only that the developer, Mount Lofty Development Company, has lost $2 million because of the Government's indecision before it backed down on the project altogether but also that earlier tenders for a smaller scale, environmentally sound project that were rejected by the Government would have been successful, the development would have been completed by this time, and in this coming summer South Australians and overseas visitors would have been enjoying the facilities at Mount Lofty. But over this coming summer the Government will still be assessing the feasibility of the smaller scale development. Further, unlike the earlier proposals, the latest proposal of a smaller scale development will involve a large component of Government participation.

This is quite contrary to the Government's original objectives and it is quite offensive to all South Australians at a time when the Government has indicated that it can find no money for vital community services. The National Trust and the Conservation Council are two of a number of parties that have loudly damned not only the whole saga of the Government's handling of this development but also the latest decision by the Government to proceed with its involvement in the initiative. Those concerns are supported by the Liberal Party. I highlight part of a press release made by the Leader of the Opposition, John Olsen, on 28 August in response to the Government's latest indication of what it will do in this development. Mr Olsen states:

> This Government has been messing about with a development at Mount Lofty for at least three years. And, even now, it can't guarantee a development will proceed. All today's announcement guarantees is yet another feasibility study. Conveniently, the outcome of the study won't be known before the next election. In May 1988, the Liberal Party warned the Bannon Government about going for an option for Mount Lofty which breached planning laws when three other responses it had to its tender complied with planning laws.
>
> The three other options were environmentally sound. Any one of them could have been completed by now. But, yet again Mr Bannon has strung a developer along only to pull out at the last minute. I'm seriously concerned about how this latest decision is going to affect the attitudes of potential investors to South Australia. This decision gives further support, if any were needed after Jubilee Point and Sellicks, to the need for clear and predictable guidelines which developers and conservationists alike can follow.
>
> I've committed the next Liberal Government to establish an Environmental and Land Use Commission to provide this certainty and predictability. Our initiative has the support of developers and conservationists as a means of ensuring we don't have this sort of planning debacle again to jeopardise the reputation of South Australia as a good State in which to invest.

I believe that press release sums up the feelings of a great many people concerned about the Government's action in relation to Mount Lofty over a 6½ year period. However, this motion deals with the Government's procrastination and indebtedness only in relation to the Mount Lofty Development Company Pty Limited. I hope that I have provided this Chamber with adequate information to support this motion, and that it receives the support of the majority of members in this place.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES secured the adjournment of the debate.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ENERGY NEEDS IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended to Wednesday 27 September 1989.

Motion carried.

BLACK RIBBON DAY

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.F. Stefani:

That this Council recalls that 23 August 1989 is Black Ribbon Day and the fiftieth year of occupation by the Soviet Union of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania following the Hitler-Stalin pact and—

1. Requests the Prime Minister of Australia—
   (a) to appeal to the Soviet Union and the Governments of West and East Germany—
      (i) to declare the agreements, including their secret protocols, null and void from the original date they were signed;
      (ii) for the Soviet Union to restore independence to the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania which were occupied as a result of the secret agreements; and
   (b) to call upon the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the President of the European Parliament to recognise the aspirations to self-determination of the Baltic nations and to assist them by working for the restoration of their independence.
2. That the President convey this resolution to the Prime Minister.

(Continued from 23 August. Page 509.)

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: It is with sadness in my heart that I rise today to add my support to the motion moved by my colleague the Hon. Mr Julian Stefani, supported by the Hon. Mr Sumner, representing the South Australian Government, and supported by the Hon. Mr Gilfillan, representing the Australian Democrats, in relation to the fiftieth year of occupation of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania by the Soviet Union—sadness for the suffering that the people of the Baltic nations endured under the German and Soviet dictatorships, and sadness that their suffering continues today, 50 years after their freedom and independence was so brutally removed. I was hoping to have had the opportunity to speak on this motion when it was introduced by my colleague on Wednesday 23 August, but unfortunately the weight of parliamentary business precluded me from doing so. I am therefore glad to have the opportunity to speak in support of the motion today.

On 23 August 1939, Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Soviet Union sealed the infamous treaty that made the Second World War inevitable, and at the same time ended the independence of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. In a secret protocol, which was recently acknowledged by the Soviet Government, western Poland and Lithuania were assigned to the German 'sphere of influence' and eastern Poland, Latvia, Estonia and Finland to the Soviet Union's. A second secret German-Soviet agreement repartitioned Poland and reassigned Lithuania to Moscow's 'sphere of influence'.

These cynical and illegal agreements plunged the Baltic nations into years of darkness and tyranny under the oppression of, first, Nazi Germany, and then Stalin's Soviet Union. What the world should be reminded of is that hundreds of thousands of Baltic people died in the Second World War as a result of acts of war by occupying forces, brutal murder, deportation, illegal conscription, and forcible evacuation. Many hundreds of thousands more died in the post-war genocide carried out by Stalin's regime. Such horrific destruction of so many innocent lives must never be forgotten by people who value freedom and liberty.

It is difficult for many Australians to visualise our freedom and independence being removed from us by force with no thought given to our aspirations, yet that is what happened to the free and independent nations of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. The right to self-determination is an absolute right that all people have. It is a right that we take for granted, yet it is a right that was violently taken away from the Baltic people. It is a right that should be returned to the people of the Baltic nations immediately. It is a right being demanded by the Baltic peoples.

After 50 years of occupation the Baltic people's thirst for freedom was demonstrated with the linking of arms by over two million Baltic people to form a 590 kilometre human 'chain of freedom' across Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. This human chain—a chain against the chains of oppression—was an example of the hopes and aspirations for freedom in the Baltic states. At this point I would like to pass on my thanks to the organising committee of the Baltic communities in South Australia, for the kind opportunity they gave me to speak at their protest rally held on Saturday 26 August.

I would particularly like to pass my thanks to the Chairperson of that committee, Mrs Reinpuu, and the Secretary, Mr Tuul, for their invitation to attend and for giving me the opportunity to express the South Australian Government's solidarity in support of their just cause. In a sense, Mr President, the people at the Adelaide protest rally linked arms with their brothers and sisters in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania in their chain of freedom.

Freedom is a concept that will never die. It might be removed temporarily, but it can never be removed forever. The people of the Baltic nations' thirst for a return to freedom is as strong today as it was 50 years ago, in those dark years at the dawn of the Second World War. My fervent hope is that freedom is not far away. I commend the motion to the Council and strongly support the initiative by my colleague.

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I thank members for their contributions and support of my motion. Unfortunately, the Hon. Mario Feleppa adjourned the motion until today either under instructions or through a total lack of understanding of the importance of the date upon which I had moved the motion and the significance which such date had for many Lithuanians—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI:—Latvians and Estonians living in South Australia, Australia and elsewhere in the world, including their home countries. The motion will now be presented to the Prime Minister of Australia (Mr Bob Hawke) for his action and attention. I only trust that the Prime Minister will give serious consideration to the motion and will act upon the request contained in my motion, which has received the support of this Council. I would like to inform members that I received 359 letters of appeal from South Australians of Baltic origin, seeking our support and commitment to join them in their continuing efforts to seek freedom for Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania and their peoples.

I will forward these letters to the Prime Minister, together with my written request for his personal commitment to this just cause which is seeking to achieve the freedom, independence and self-determination of the Baltic people.

Motion carried.

PINNAROO AREA SCHOOL

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. M.J. Elliott:

That this Council urges the Government to retain the secondary component of the Pinnaroo Area School with the provision of adequate teaching staff.

(Continued from 23 August. Page 513.)

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I rise to oppose the motion as put by the Hon. M.J. Elliott, not because I have any axe to grind about whether or not the Pinnaroo Area School exists in its present form but to support a restructuring of education in the area so that a broader curriculum can be delivered to the people in the area to enable their children to be educated to take them into the next century.

I will need to go back into history a little to illustrate some of the consolidations that have taken place. In 1935 over 1 100 public schools were spread across the State, with half the number of students that we have today. Many of them were in very small schools. Today 710 schools serve twice as many students as there were in 1935, and nearly 400 schools have closed in the past 50 years. Many of those were too small to remain viable. Those small schools left over from the first wave of educational expansion in South Australia have now been consolidated.

Schools were being built to follow the patterns of settlement, for example, along the railway lines to the north, and they served the purpose of educating the children of fettlers and workers who built the railway lines that linked us with the east and the west. Hundreds of small one-teacher schools sprang up to cater for children in small, developing communities. In the second wave, there was a consolidation of land ownership, and improvements in transport and communications, which led to small communities consolidating into regions.

In other areas it was realised that small local schools could not adequately cater for the needs of local children in the range of educational experience and curriculum that they could offer, so the concept of area schools was introduced to serve the educational needs of children from several communities in the general area. This necessitated children travelling but it was necessary to consolidate these schools to allow the consolidation of curricula and improved educational services. We are now in the third wave, which is being characterised by continuing enrolment decline because of demographic factors and because of a continuing drift of people from the land to larger centres of population.

Now even some of the area schools and country high schools are experiencing very small secondary components—too small to offer a full range of curricula. We are moving into a situation where the concept of an adequate secondary education being provided for a single community is difficult to sustain. There have been a number of contributions in another place on the consolidation of urban schools and some of the difficulties that go with the dislocation caused by school shifts and the trauma associated with the closing of secondary and primary schools. There is a certain amount of pain, in the first instance, but, particularly in city areas, the consolidation of curricula and the broader range of educational facilities generally lead parents to cooperate in those moves and there is the reward of a higher standard of education which comes from these consolidations of facilities.

I know in the city it is very difficult to envisage what some of the country children and their parents have to put up with when they travel distances ranging from 10 to 15 kilometres out to 40, 50 or, even, 60 kilometres sometimes. The Pinnaroo Area School is a case in point, since the proposal is for the consolidation to take place at Lameroo, and children from Geranium and Pinnaroo will have to travel there. The people on the north, east and west of Pinnaroo will have to travel 40 kilometres, and that is very disconcerting. However, there will be consolidation of curricula and the guarantee that the primary sector of the school will have a consolidation of teachers. Hopefully, educational opportunities will broaden with a wider range of subjects being taught at the Lameroo school. This will somewhat compensate for the dislocation. In the short term, changes may be unsettling and upsetting, but in the long term such changes will benefit the students.

I am very conscious of the discussions that are still going on in the area. I have spoken to people who live in the area and some have indicated to me that they are still opposed to the consolidation at Lameroo. At a public meeting held recently some members of the community expressed very strong feelings about the issue and the role of the school council. The school council voted to accept the consolidation proposed by the Education Department. There are still areas of discontent within the Pinnaroo area because people can see a resource that they have had for so long being lost to them. I have sympathy with those feelings.

Following careful and thorough examination of all the documents that were prepared and presented by the three schools working party on cluster, distance education and consolidation, the Pinnaroo Area School Council accepted with regret that the cluster, distance education and stay-as-we-are proposals would not provide Pinnaroo's secondary school students now or in future with the high standard of schooling that their district demanded. They understood the difficulties. They were torn between the inconvenience of moving their children into another area school and having a look at the long-term effects of consolidation. The school council chose the consolidated curriculum with the broadened opportunities that that presented.

Clearly there is a division in the community still, particularly among those who see a school as a potential resource not just for having secondary school teachers residing in the area and the benefits that brings to small communities with their presence on local committees, sporting bodies and the whole fabric of local communities. Teachers play a vital role in the consolidation of those fabrics. The school council has with regret opted for the broadening of the educational opportunities. I suppose that to some degree it is at odds with others in the community with regard to the future of education in the Pinnaroo area.

The figures on enrolments illustrate the dilemma with which the school council had to wrestle. The current enrolment figures are as follows: at reception they have 12 students; year 1, 26 students; year 2, 17 students; year 3, 18 students; year 4, 28 students; year 5, 7 students; year 6, 22 students; year 7, 13 students; year 8, 16 students; year 9, 13 students; year 10, 10 students; and there are four mature age students taking one or two subjects, making a total enrolment of 186.

On 24 July 1989 the estimated enrolments for the Pinnaroo Area School, based on an assessment done on the future trends of potential enrolees, were: year 7 into year 8, 11 students from 12; year 8 into year 9, 13 from 16; year 9 to year 10, eight from 13; plus a mature age equivalent of one. One can see from that table that 33 students are moving through from year 7 to year 10 from the current figure of 41. That represents a loss of eight students, which is 20 per cent of the potential enrolment. Four students have changed their minds since that census, so the potential enrolment now is only 29.

Traditionally, many students leave school during their secondary years, which increases the poor retention rates.

For example, since 1987 the following retention rates from year 7 to year 10 in the Pinnaroo Area School are as follows: in 1987 there were 16 from 23, which is a 70 per cent retention; in 1988 there were 10 from 25, which is a 40 per cent retention; and in 1989 there were 10 from 18, which is a 55 per cent retention.

One can only project in the next three years what those figures would be. On current enrolments, one can see that there is a downward trend in a retention rate that is less than would be hoped for in a school that is under pressure because of the numbers. A number of children go to the city to continue their education in the private school area and a number of students go over the border to the Murrayville school in Victoria which offers an all-round curriculum that appeals to some parents in that area.

Currently, the 7.2 secondary staff cover the eight curriculum areas of environmental science, health and personal development, human society, language studies, mathematical studies, science and technology, the arts and transition education. The curriculum development is as good as any curriculum at a city school.

The new consultation document 'Educating for the 21st Century' will replace the current eight curriculum areas with seven which include language, mathematics, health and personal development, science, society and the environment, the arts and technology. In order to cover all these required areas of study, the school would need a minimum of six secondary teachers.

It is also important to realise that the reduction in student numbers at Pinnaroo and other rural areas is the result of demographic changes. Any reduction in educational facilities is a result of these changes and not the cause. It is up to Governments to come to terms with the demographic shifts of population in country areas and to ensure that the all-round education that has been provided by the department is adequate for the needs of those who are leaving school. They will need the educational skills required not just to equip them for rural-based economies; if they want to broaden their education and understanding or take up tertiary institutional studies, they will need a good grounding in the areas that will be offered at the new Lameroo consolidated school.

It is with regret that I oppose the motion, but I point out to honourable members and to the people of the community that in the long term the educational facilities that will be provided by the consolidation at the Lameroo Area School will benefit all people in that area. The Government will have to provide the services that are required to support and back up those who will have to travel (that is, buses adequate for travelling in the heat and the cold), and it will have to look at the roads. In some cases the roads are not what are required in districts such as Pinnaroo, Lameroo and Geranium. The teacher requirements will have to be guaranteed not just at the secondary level, but also from reception to year 7. Guarantees will have to be given to people in those communities that the teachers to teach the courses outlined will be guaranteed. It will be up to members on both sides of the Chamber, and the Democrats, to ensure that the Government maintains its commitment to the community on all these matters. I urge honourable members to oppose the motion.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES secured the adjournment of the debate.

NURSING HOME STAFFING

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I move:

That regulations under the Health Act 1935 concerning nursing home staffing made on 22 June 1989 and laid on the table of this Council on 3 August 1989 be disallowed.

I note that during Question Time today the Hon. Mr Elliott referred to this topic. This is an extremely important motion, because it deals with the nursing and personal care of elderly South Australians. All members would appreciate not only that this State has the highest proportion of elderly people in Australia but also that it is forecast that to the year 2001 we will continue to have an increasing proportion of elderly people.

South Australia should be proud of its record in the care of the aged and infirm. This record was built by the former Liberal Government when Jennifer Cashmore (then Adamson) was Minister of Health and also by the former Minister of Health (Dr Cornwall). Ms Cashmore initiated a review of standards of care in South Australian nursing homes. That review was completed during the period when Dr Cornwall was the Minister. Both Ministers concluded in 1984 (as I presume did the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation and Parliament because the regulations were not disallowed, as I hope will occur with this motion) that under the Health Act the hours of nursing home care should be increased substantially to provide older people in this State and in Victoria with the highest standards of nursing and personal care in nursing homes.

However, since the Hawke Government decided to review and revise funding standards for nursing home care, that situation has changed. I will not canvass that issue, because I did so in relation to a previous motion which called for this Council to deplore the lowering of standards in South Australian nursing homes, but I will highlight a number of points. The Federal Government has decided to decrease funding for nursing home care. That move stems from a desire by the Federal Government to establish national equity in terms of nursing home standards. As a consequence, the very high standards of nursing home care in South Australia and Victoria, which average about 22 hours a week, will have to be reduced to about 17.8 or 18 hours per week so that elderly South Australians are not treated any better than are older people in other States.

My regret, and that of the Liberal Party, is that, in seeking equity in this matter, the Federal Government has moved to the lowest common denominator rather than increasing funds so that nursing home standards throughout Australia can be increased to the level applying in South Australia. As a consequence, South Australia has been placed in a most invidious position. South Australian nursing homes seek to maintain high standards as set out in our Health Act regulations, but they are not receiving the funding to maintain those standards, or we are faced with a situation where the State Government must amend those Health Act regulations to accommodate the decreased Commonwealth funding.

I believe that it is incumbent on all members in this Chamber to protest about the Government's actions in this regard, because of its impact not only on elderly people in nursing homes but also on the staff and administrators of those nursing homes, as well as on the families of people who are in the nursing homes and who are witnessing a lowering of the standard of care to their loved relatives.

I should also remind members that we all have a vested interest in the care of the aged because, whether or not we like it, we are all rapidly approaching the time when we may well need nursing home care, I would have thought that, even if we were not prepared to defend that principle

for our grandparents and parents, at least we should ensure that, by the time we reach old age, South Australia's high standard of care is maintained.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: That's right; the Hon. Mr Lucas suggests that we are not voting for self-interest, and I would quite agree. However, we should be most concerned about the impact of the Federal Government's actions on aged care and the plight of older people in our nursing homes. I am concerned that, if we accept this lowering of standards as envisaged by Health Act regulations which were laid on this table on 22 June, essentially we are saying to the Commonwealth Government that, whenever it lowers funding to South Australia, either now or in the future, we are quite happy to accept lowering of standards and that we are prepared to accommodate that move by adjusting our health regulations. That situation is intolerable and we should stand up to the Federal Government when it seeks not only to blackmail this Parliament but also to compromise the care of older South Australians.

I would highlight that it is certainly an enormous worry to the nursing home care providers in this State, who believe that what the Federal Government is doing is equally intolerable and they see, on a daily basis, the impact of the lowering of standards on the people who they so actively seek to support and care for.

Before closing my remarks on this disallowance motion, I would like to read this advice from Mr D.R. Filby, the Executive Director, Planning and Policy Development Division of the Health Commission. The advice reads:

> The minimum level of nursing and personal care staff in a nursing home is determined by regulation 135aa under the Health Act. This regulation has previously stipulated the number of staff per resident for each of the morning, afternoon, evening and night shifts, and a requirement for at least one registered nurse to be on duty at all times.
>
> Changes to the Commonwealth funding arrangements in all States, operative from 1 July 1988, has meant that in some nursing homes the level of Commonwealth funding does not allow that home to meet all of the specific requirements laid down in regulation 135aa. Under the new arrangements funding is determined by the assessed relative nursing need of each resident in the nursing home, and not just by the total number of residents.
>
> On average the Commonwealth is funding 19.1 hours/resident/week compared with the current minimum requirement of approximately 17.8 hours/resident/per week. However, individual nursing homes, particularly small ones or those where the majority of residents have a low dependency, may be funded for less than 17.8 hours/resident/week.

Many smaller nursing homes are in country areas where we would hope that, in providing for the older people in our community, we could guarantee that older people in country areas could remain within their community in an area with which they are familiar, and where they have other relatives and care providers for company and support, rather than moving those older people to a larger nursing home which would be generally well removed from their own community. For instance, it has been suggested that with these new Federal Government arrangements older people in Wallaroo moved to Berri.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: Not far!

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I do not know how many kilometres exactly, but 275 km, perhaps, away from the community in which they were born and generally lived the whole of their lives. Yet in their old age when we should provide, in their last few years, nursing home care within their own community, it would appear that that will not be acceptable to the Federal Government. By changing regulations to the Health Act, we are essentially agreeing to that position. Mr Filby's minute further states:

> The purpose of these changes to regulation 135aa is to bring the South Australian minimum staffing levels in line with the level of resources provided under the Commonwealth funding arrangement. It recognises that nursing homes cannot be required to employ staff for which they receive no funding.

Essentially I agree with that last remark and that places members in a dilemma. Unless we can find State funds to cover the shortfall, in a way we have no room to manoeuvre other than to accept the new regulations. That is blackmail by the Federal Government. I find it abhorrent and the Liberal Party deplores it, yet it is essentially condoned by the Labor Party in this State, otherwise it would not have supported such an initiative.

However, I would say that the Federal Government wants it all ways. Not only is it cutting its direct funding for such staffing hours but it is also cutting the funds to this State, which is making it difficult for this State to make up the shortfall. We are in an invidious position. As a matter of principle, we should protest strongly and one of the ways we can do this is by seeking to disallow these regulations.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES secured the adjournment of the debate.

BRIDGEWATER RAIL SERVICE

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. M.B. Cameron:

That this Council calls on the State Government to reintroduce a rationalised rail service to Bridgewater with the aim of providing an effective commuter facility plus support for the tourist industry in South Australia.

(Continued from 23 August. Page 517.)

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I oppose what I believe is an amazing proposition to reconstitute the Bridgewater-Belair rail service, which was truncated in July 1987. This appears to be another one of these amazing instances we see from time to time where the Liberal Party gets amongst its constituents. In this case, however, they are not actually Liberal Party constituents, but the constituents of Mr Stan Evans, the person whom the Liberal Party rejected and who then went out and did them over in the community. So, in a desperate attempt to curry favour with these people in the Hills, the Liberal Party has regurgitated this hoary old proposition, trying in its normal fifth columnist way to create problems within the community with people who have genuine concerns by raising issues that do not really exist.

The service was truncated at Belair in July 1987. Following public disquiet and with the support of the rail unions, the Commonwealth Bureau of Transport Economics agreed to act as referee in the matter. Its report, dated September 1987, offered no justification for restoring the pre-July 1987 service. It also absolutely dismissed the suggestion that trains be extended to Mount Barker.

A private organisation called 'Train Tour Promotions' is currently considering running tourist trains to Aldgate at certain times of the year, probably on Sundays. This is to compensate for some of the tourist potential which the Hon. Martin Cameron referred to in his contributions in this place. I point out that the company is talking about providing the service only on Sundays. It is investigating it; it is not rushing forward to do it. It is not intending to run a commuter service. Before the cessation of the rail service, most public transport passengers residing in the rail catchment area beyond Belair chose to travel by bus, presumably believing it to be quicker, which it is.

The Hon. J.F. Stefani: You come down from Port Pirie by bus. Why don't you catch the train?

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: I do not come by bus—I come by car. The cars are the little ones; the buses are the

big ones. They presumably believe that the service is more frequent and provides a better distribution in the city, as in the residential parts of Stirling. Little can be done to make the train quicker than the bus because of the circuitous nature of the rail line. The BTE found that, of the approximately 6 000 people travelling to Adelaide each week day morning, 81 per cent chose to travel by car, 18 per cent chose to travel by bus and just over 1 per cent chose to travel by train. All this daily use of the railway on a typical weekday amounted to only 300 passengers in each direction, spread over 11 inbound and 12 outbound trains.

Clearly this volume of riders does not warrant the cost of a rail service and can easily be coped with by the existing bus services, which in fact have absorbed the increase. Additional school buses have been provided from Blackwood to Aldgate. Mr Cameron in his contribution on 16 August, referred to a number of aspects and said:

> It was always a shame to see a Government stepping in to remove services from the community because of a presumed loss of revenue from such a facility.

I can assure the Hon. Martin Cameron that there was no presumed loss; there was a factual loss, as was borne out by the findings of the Bureau of Transport Economics. In fact, on investigation it was easy to conclude that it would cost the Government $10 to subsidise passengers from Belair to Bridgewater on every trip. It is important to remember that it was also costing the Government—or the taxpayers of South Australia—$2 to subsidise every bus fare. So there were two services running conjointly, one being efficient and 20 minutes quicker from Adelaide to Belair, 10 minutes quicker the other way, and the other—

The Hon. M.B. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: About 1 per cent of the people who live in the Hills area chose to travel only by train. Members opposite have referred to the quality of the railcars that were provided for that service, stating that that was one of the major reasons why the service was not used. If that were true, many other services would not have been patronised because the same infrastructure and hardware—the little red hens and the series 2 000 trains—were used on the Belair to Bridgewater service and on other services. Thus, another argument has not been substantiated.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: That is exactly right. The little red hens could go up into the Hills, as they could be used on the plains. Mr Cameron also referred to the platform of the State Labor Party which states:

> The aim of a public transport authority shall be to provide a public service which meets the need for accessibility to activity centres as required by users.

That is exactly what the Government has achieved. That aim has not been met by a rail service in this case, because the Government does not believe in wasting $10 per passenger when it can provide more services, more regularly, more comfortably, and much more quickly by bus. Mr Cameron also referred to a letter that he had received from a business house at Bridgewater which stated:

> People used to come up on the train during the week to spend a nice day in the Hills. We used to open the restaurant . . . now we only open on Fridays. 'We lost $1 000 a week—that's $52 000 every year, from one business,' Mr Edmonds said.

It is distressing for any business to lose $1 000 a week. If that case was taken in isolation, one would be more concerned, but the same number of commuters are travelling to these areas and being accommodated, although people who travel by bus do not necessarily stay in the hotel where one would stay if one travelled by train. Mr Cameron believes it is outrageous that one business can lose $52 000 a year but he has no trouble reconciling the fact that, if the Government was to continue to provide this inefficient and cost ineffective service, the taxpayers of South Australia would lose far more than that. In relation to the complete withdrawal of the Belair to Bridgewater rail service, the Bureau of Transport Economics states:

> This option would save the STA three to four rail cars, and two drivers, two guards and one collector. This option translates to savings of $6 million in 1987 prices (for the 20 year period . . .) in other words, it saves $580 000 per year for the next 20 years.

And Mr Cameron talked about $52 000! Further in his contribution of 16 August he referred to a letter written by the Minister of Tourism to the Hills Transport Action Group in which the Minister stated:

> I reiterate my colleague's statement that the railway line itself is not closing and the potential for tourist trips to Bridgewater and beyond will remain.

In other words, the infrastructure is still there and private enterprise, such as Steam Ranger or Train Tour Promotions, can become involved if they believe it is economical. One would have thought that a Party that supports private enterprise would encourage people to rush forward to make all this money that is available. The truth of the matter is that that option does not exist: it is a fabrication of a fertile imagination, probably of the imagination of Stan Evans, who was holding the big stick over the Liberal Party to ensure that he got a bit more than he was entitled to get.

The Liberals in their desperate bid to try to grab power at the next election—a futile bid, I might add—were able to put the pressure on Martin Cameron to introduce this Bill. Unfortunately, at that point in his contribution Martin Cameron choked up. One might believe that that was probably due to pneumonia, but others have suggested that he choked on hypocrisy. However, he took up the debate again on 23 August and cited another Labor Party document entitled 'Transport moving ahead', pointing out the very nice photograph of the Premier on the front cover. Obviously, Mr Cameron has an eye for beauty. That document stated:

> The Australian Labor Party's transport policy acknowledges the principle that South Australians should have access to safe, coordinated, efficient and economic transport, so as to reduce the isolation that occurs in urban and non-urban living, and to provide ready access to goods and services. The Bannon Labor Government is committed to public transport as a social service and recognises that, for many people, it remains the only means of transport, particularly for people at home, the aged, the young, the handicapped and the less affluent.

Mr Cameron was obviously trying to draw the conclusion that the Bannon Government was failing in its obligation as compared with its platform, but that is obviously not the case. If there was no rail service and no bus service in that area, there would be some cause for argument. Due to the decision-making process of the Australian Labor Party we have actually done away with an inefficient, cost-demanding service and replaced it with one that is more efficient.

The Hon. T. Crothers: We have applied the principles of commercialisation.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: Yes, incentivation, because the line is still there for the private operator.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: We have provided the sort of service that the people demand. Mr Cameron further referred to the Government's objective of 'the provision of adequate passenger services to provide reasonable opportunity for mobility for all members of the community'. Again, that aspect of the proposition has been met.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS: Obviously. The Hon. Mr Cameron went on to say:

Since then the Government has closed the railway line to Bridgewater. The Government has moved in and said, 'This is uneconomic; we will no longer have a railway service to Bridgewater.'

And that is precisely correct. The Government does not step back from the fact that it made that decision. The Government could not live with a situation where taxpayers were being asked to subsidise travellers from Bridgewater to Belair at $10 per time when it could provide a system whereby adequate, efficient and comfortable transport could be made available and where commuters from those developing areas could travel to the city and back more speedily.

It is interesting to note that the Bureau of Transport Economics study, when it referred to saving $580 000 per year for the next 20 years, also pointed out that it 'would not strain alternative transport modes, as less than 1 per cent of all travellers to Adelaide from this area use the train service'. It continued:

During peak hours, the extra loading per bus is estimated at six people, if all the train travellers went by bus.

As we know, 80 per cent of travellers go by private motor vehicle, anyway. So, we have a more cost efficient, and indeed effective, service which is less of a burden on taxpayers. I have here a letter from persons in the transport industry who operate in the Bridgewater area. It is a letter that was sent to the Hon. Frank Blevins, MP. It states:

I congratulate you upon your forthright statement recently that there was no prospect of the re-introduction of the Belair-Bridgewater Passenger Service.

Whilst I have a vested interest as the licence holder for the Mount Barker-Bridgewater-Adelaide coach service, nonetheless there can be no economic justification for this loss-making rail link being reintroduced... From a perusal of all the relevant timetables there are the following services.

He then sets them out, as follows: Aldgate to Adelaide: daily 40, weekly 200; Aldgate to Adelaide via Uraidla: daily 11, weekly, 55; and from Stirling to Blackwood rail: daily 2, weekly, 10. On Saturdays there are 22 daily services and on Sundays there are 13. Private licensees, with services from Bridgewater to Aldgate and on to Adelaide, run 13 daily services and 65 each week. On Saturdays there are three services, and on Sundays there are two. In total, therefore, there are 370 weekly services in each direction.

The correspondent goes on to say that that should be pointed out to people in future. That is a fair summary of what is being provided. The Opposition has said that we ought to provide this service and apparently think that, because some of these people in the past have supported their particular Party, costs should be of no consequence. However, it is interesting that, in all the submissions made by the Hon. Mr Cameron, he pointed to the Australian Labor Party's platforms on transport. It is difficult to point to the State Liberal Party's platforms on transport, because I do not believe it has one. It is still grappling with where it will put in the water troughs and the tie-up rails for the horses and carts. This is the sort of mentality it is using in relation to this matter.

What does their Leader, John Olsen—the inimitable or intimidated Leader of the Liberal Party—say? He talks about cost efficiency. He is concerned about the cost of goods and services to the State. In a contribution he made in the *Advertiser* of Wednesday 6 September—which still could be accurate—he said:

... the Labor Government had done nothing to seek productivity and efficiency gains which would reduce their operational costs and ensure charges could be contained in the longer term without raising deficits and borrowing to cover them.

Clearly, the Leader of the Opposition is fully in favour of doing away with wasteful, cost-negative services being provided which will rip money from the taxpayers—a message, apparently, he has not been able to deliver to his members in this place. He went on in this article to say:

... a Liberal Government would ... strengthen checks on Government spending, apply productivity targets to Government departments, give public servants greater freedom to act and carry out a comprehensive audit of Government assets.

In other words, one must assume that he agrees with bodies such as the Bureau of Transport Economics examining services that are provided by the Government, and ensuring that they are cost efficient.

So, in a vain attempt to find something the Liberal Party will do in South Australia, I had to go to its 'new directions' policy to find out exactly what the Liberals think about rail transport. What does it say about rail transport? Lo and behold, it says that the Liberal Party in Government would encourage the expansion and use of bus and coach passenger transport rather than rail. In other words, it would do precisely what the Labor Government in South Australia has done.

The South Australian Labor Government has not abandoned the people in the Hills. It has provided them with more and faster services, and has left the infrastructure for private companies to utilise. The Government has not said, 'We are going to be dog in the manger and pull out all these tracks.' It has said that it is a fair proposition for the people of South Australia to be provided with adequate transport systems, but it is not fair for the taxpayers to pay exorbitant subsidies to people to travel on trains. This service involves 300 passengers per week, representing 1 per cent of the travelling community.

When one examines the Liberal Party's policy in this exercise, one can only assume that it is for cynical political purposes, trying to grab every single vote the Party can grab from the electorate. It has no compunction about raising these issues which affect 1 per cent. The Liberal Party gets out there with a fifth columnist attitude, with its McCarthy principles. It creates an idea, then has a whispering campaign and a little advertising—'Write some letters to your member of Parliament; write some letters to the Legislative Council; let us create a problem that does not exist.'

There is no problem at present with transport facilities within this area. As I said, I looked at the 'new directions' policy—and this is the Federal transport policy; the Liberals do not even have one for Sout'h Australia. The Liberals are saying—and I am glad that the Hon. Mr Cameron has returned to the fold—that they will encourage the use of bus and coach transport rather than rail. The Hon. Martin Cameron has suggested that, as a country member, I ought to have some concern. Certainly, I have some concern: I have concern for the rail workers at Port Augusta and Port Pirie whose jobs are on the line. There are not 370 bus services running up through Port Pirie and Port Augusta. I am concerned for the jobs of those people when the Liberal Party's national platform is to do away with railways and encourage the use of buses and coaches.

This motion is hypocritical: it runs against what the Liberal Party says. It is cynically and ruthlessly calculated to try to grab votes in the Hills area, trying to buy back the people who rejected the Liberals at the last election and who will reject them at this election. The Liberal Party kicked out Stan Evans because it did not think he was a winner. The people up there kicked out the Liberal Party because it was not a winner. God only knows how the people at Bridgewater and the people of South Australia will judge members opposite when they want to bring back these antiquated, non-useful processes of subsidies of $10 per passenger for elitists to ride on trains from Belair to Bridgewater.

The Bureau of Transport Economics says that it would take some 20-odd years to get anywhere near breaking even with the cost of putting the service back in. This is a cynical, dishonest, calculated and ruthless policy, and it has no place in the best interests of the people of Bridgewater. I urge the Council and all members to reject this as a cynical, vote-catching gimmick with no benefits for the people of South Australia, including those of Bridgewater and Belair.

A caring Labor Government has adequately covered their transport needs. They are getting a much more efficient service. The people at Bridgewater are not being burdened with exorbitant costs and taxes, as every South Australian will not be burdened with extra cost. That will enable this State Labor Government to reduce costs and charges and still provide efficient public transport for the people in the Hills and the people who live down on the plains. I urge members to reject this cynical motion put up by the Hon. Mr Cameron.

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

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 August. Page 523.)

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I rise today to place on the record my opposition to this so called Freedom of Information Bill which has been introduced for the fourth time by the Hon. Mr Cameron. From the outset I would like to state that my opposition to the Bill is due to the fact that it serves no useful purpose in improving the performance of government in South Australia. It provides nothing that is not already being provided by the privacy and access principles that were introduced on 1 July this year in relation to State Government bodies.

My view is that privacy and access by individuals to personal records held by the State Government should be the primary purpose of the freedom of information philosophy. My view has been shared by the Government in its implementation of the 11 privacy and access principles. These 11 principles cover the areas of collection of personal information by State Government authorities, storage of that personal information, access to records of personal information, correction of those records, use of personal information, disclosure of personal information, and maintenance of anonymity in research.

These principles give all South Australians the opportunity to view records held by State Government authorities and also to alter any record which is incorrect or inaccurate. These principles are a result of intense study over the past 10 years of the whole issue of freedom of information and have taken into account the experience of Federal legislation and similar freedom of information legislation in Victoria.

The Victorian and Federal experience has given the South Australian Government an insight into the needs of the community in relation to freedom of information matters, and in both of these instances it has been found that the vast majority of requests for information come from individuals requesting access to personal documents or files held on them by Government authorities. Over 55 per cent of freedom of information requests in Victoria relate to requests for personal information from departments such as the Victoria police, the Health Commission, the Department for Community Welfare and the Metropolitan Fire Board.

At the Federal level requests for personal information account for over 90 per cent of all requests and these generally relate to access to information held on individuals by departments such as the Departments of Social Security and Veterans' Affairs and the Taxation Office, to name just a few.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: You certainly lack understanding.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I know that you lack understanding. If you listen, I will endeavour to inject some understanding into your soul.

Another large number of requests included in the 90 per cent have been requests from Federal Government employees for access to information held in relation to personnel matters: in other words, employees wishing to see files held by their employer, the Federal Government.

In the light of this experience in Victoria and at the Federal level, the South Australian Government embarked on a course of providing access for individuals to information held by State Government authorities. It also recognised a genuine community concern in relation to the accuracy of records held by Government departments and the privacy of those records. The 11 information privacy principles, which came into force on 1 July, are binding upon the public sector in South Australia.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: In what way?

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: Whilst the Hon. Mr Cameron may claim that there is no legal basis for enforcing the principles, he is clearly wrong. If he will listen instead of interjecting, he will find out why.

Whilst the rights established by the administrative procedures which administer the privacy and access principles are not enforcable by an individual in the sense that they can take the matter to court, there is an obligation placed on public officials as a consequence of the procedures to ensure that an individual's general or moral right to the information, and to change that information if it is incorrect, does exist.

Regulations under the Government Management and Employment Act require officers of public agencies that fall under the responsibility of the Commissioner of Public Employment to carry our the administrative instructions which are legitimately and properly issued by Government. Non-compliance with those regulations, which now include the privacy and access procedures, constitutes an offence under the GME Act and enables action to be taken against any officer who does not comply with them. Therefore, Mr President, the individual citizen is guaranteed that officers in the public sector will comply with the principles established in relation to access to public documents.

There are some areas not covered by the GME Act, most notably the police, but again they are subject to similar procedures. Legitimate instructions issued under the Police Regulation Act require police officers to comply with requests for information made by members of the public. If a request from an individual for access to information held by the police or another public sector authority is not complied with the individual can refer the matter to the Ombudsman, or, in the case of the police, to the Police Complaints Tribunal.

The rights of individuals to have access to information held on them and the right to ensure that that information is correct is protected by these mechanisms, without the need for legislation and without the need to establish a costly new bureaucracy to oversee its operation. I should have thought that Opposition members would agree with that as they are always cutting crook about the Public

Service and the charges that it imposes on South Australian citizens.

Whilst people have a right to obtain information which is held on them, they also have a right to ensure that the information is correct by having the right to amend any information that is inaccurate or misleading. People also have a right to exercise some control over how personal information is used and to whom it is disclosed, and that is why the Government has also set up the Privacy Committee to monitor the operation of the privacy and access principles. The Government, in establishing the privacy and access principles, has given emphasis to the rights of the individual in our society.

The experience in Victoria and at the Federal level has indicated that this is the area where there has been a real need in the broad community. Rather than establish a costly legislative bureaucracy that would pander to the voyeuristic fantasies of politicians and journalists, this Government has established a mechanism for ordinary people to obtain the information which is of most concern to themselves.

The Hon. Mr Cameron has argued that his freedom of information approach will provide the public with knowledge of what the Government is doing and uses the report on corruption in Queensland by Commissioner Tony Fitzgerald to back up his arguments.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Hear, hear.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I hope you say 'Hear, hear' in a minute, Mr Lucas, when I carry on with what I have to say. It seems from Mr Cameron's speech in this place on 30 August that he is less concerned with the rights of individuals to access to information and privacy, but is more concerned with uncovering some scandal or another that will be contained in Government papers. He quotes extensively from Mr Fitzgerald that freedom of information legislation is essential for good government in Queensland.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You do not agree with that obviously.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: If you listen, sonny, you will find out. Quite rightly, Mr Fitzgerald exposed the weaknesses of the Parliamentary system in Queensland and exposed the abuses of that system by an entrenched Government that placed itself above Parliament and the people. Mr Fitzgerald correctly identified that Parliament in Queensland was ineffective because insufficient resources were made available to the Opposition to research topics and to evaluate Government proposals. But a major observation of Mr Fitzgerald's, an observation that went right to the core of corrupt practices in Queensland, was totally ignored by Mr Cameron in his speech.

That observation is that corruption and abuse of executive power was a direct result of a distorted electoral system that continually returned a Government which was not representative of the Queensland population and one which was not accountable to the majority of the population. It was not the lack of information which prevented the abuses of the Queensland Government from being exposed, but, rather, the fact that Parliament rarely met, the fact that there was no parliamentary Public Accounts Committee until very recently, the timidity of the media in Queensland and the ineptitude of the Opposition Parties.

In South Australia Opposition Parties and groups within the community have a strong and healthy parliamentary system which provides a check on the excesses of executive power. We have committees established by the Parliament which investigate and expose the misuse of power by the executive. These include the Public Accounts Committee, the Public Works Committee, the Industries Development Committee and the various select committees established by this Chamber to investigate matters of public importance. Other checks on abuses of power include the Auditor-General's office and the normal Westminster parliamentary procedures such as questions without notice, questions on the notice paper, notices of motion, and so on.

But in the final analysis, a Government must be accountable to the people at regular, fairly held electoral contests, which is not the case in Queensland, and is one of the reasons why that State's affairs have been managed in such a shabby and shameful manner.

There is no evidence to suggest that Mr Cameron's Freedom of Information Bill would have any affect at all on a situation such as that which existed and continues to exist in Queensland. The fact is that all the shabby decisions, decisions which should have received scrutiny in the parliamentary processes, were made under the cover of Cabinet and Mr Cameron's own legislation makes Cabinet papers exempt from the provisions of his Bill. If Mr Cameron's Bill had been in force in Queensland under the Bjelke-Petersen Government it would have made absolutely no difference to the way in which that State was operated. All Cabinet papers would have been exempt from the provisions of the legislation and, therefore, the legislation would have served no purpose other than to provide a veneer of respectability to a corrupt Government.

Parliament is the check on the excesses of Government—not freedom of information legislation. I am not so cynical as to believe that the Hon. Mr Cameron, by introducing this legislation, is basically attempting to establish a mechanism by which he can obtain information at great public expense, for instance, in relation to the number of rolls of toilet paper used at the Lyell McEwin as compared with the Royal Adelaide, but one must ponder the reasons why this legislation has been reintroduced when the vast majority of its content has been covered by the privacy and access principles outlined earlier.

He claims that the Executive in South Australia has something to hide by not supporting the legislation. I have clearly shown that the Hon. Mr Cameron's legislation is useless in exposing any supposed abuses of power by the Executive. I suggest that Mr Cameron look at the mechanisms established within our parliamentary system in South Australia to check the abuse of power and begin using those mechanisms so that the people of South Australia can have an effective Opposition for the next decade or so.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It is with much pleasure that I rise after the Hon. Mr Crothers—

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: Is he Mr Sumner's alter ego in this matter this time?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: He may well be his alter ego.

The PRESIDENT: Order! If members address the Chair, they will do much better.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I have the same 10 minutes as Mr Roberts had—which went for 30.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Lucas will address the Chair.

The Hon. Anne Levy interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: That's fine; Mr Roberts went for 30 minutes.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Lucas will address the Chair.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Thank you, Mr President. We do not want any sniping from the Government benches—they have not even started. It is with much pleasure that I rise after Mr Crothers to support this Bill. Before turning my attention to the Attorney-General and his attitude to free-

dom of information, I will canvass some of the comments made by the Hon. Mr Crothers, I suppose on behalf of the Government, in his appalling contribution. I suggest that, if the Hon. Mr Crothers is familiar with the Parliamentary Library, during the dinner break this evening he might like to take a little stroll down to the library and look in a little box which is labelled 'Labor Party platform and policies'. He should look at the inside cover of the most recent edition of the 'Labor Party platform and policies' where it is boldly emblazoned 'Party President of the Labor Party, Mr T. Crothers'.

The Hon. T. Crothers: You're out of date.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No, the latest and most recent edition, which is the 1986-87 edition, states, 'Mr Crothers, President of the Labor Party'.

The Hon. T. Crothers: It's not the most recent.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: With its updates.

The PRESIDENT: Order! There are too many interjections. The Hon. Mr Lucas.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The most recent edition, together with attachments and updates which have been provided since 1987, provided by the good graces of the President of the Labor Party—the then President, Mr Crothers—sets out the Labor Party platform.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: What does it say?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: What does it say? I think that the Government should have found someone better than Mr Crothers to read that previous speech onto the record.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Come back and take your medicine.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Lucas.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Convention does not allow me to say what I was going to say. What does the Labor Party platform say? At pages 80 and 81, under 'Legal and penal reform', it states—

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles: What date is this?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: If the Hon. Ms Pickles indicates that this is not the most recent edition—

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles: I asked what date this was.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It is the 1986-87 edition with attachments and updates provided during 1988 and 1989. The Hon. Ms Pickles can disown her own Party platform if she so wishes. Let *Hansard* record no response from Ms Pickles.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: On a point of order, the Hon. Mr Lucas is trying to write into the record some inference that I did not wish to respond to his interjection. However, I place on the record—

The PRESIDENT: Order! This is a personal explanation, so there is no point of order.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I look forward to the Hon. Ms Pickles' personal explanation. We have the most recent edition of the Labor Party platform, and pages 80 and 81 state, 'Labor is committed to the following legal reforms'. There is then a list of 26 legal reforms under the legal reform section. The first one states, 'Enactment of laws ensuring rights of personal privacy'. The second one states, 'Enactment of laws ensuring freedom of information'.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Yes, quite separate. We are not talking about administrative principles or procedures which public servants and Public Service mandarins know how to avoid. We are talking about freedom of information legislation. That is the Labor Party platform provided to the Parliamentary Library by the then President of the Labor Party (Mr Crothers), who all of a sudden has obviously had a massive change of heart since he found himself in this Chamber having to read speeches on behalf of the Labor Government, trying to justify or defend the indefensible.

Mr Crothers also mentioned the introduction of privacy principles for public servants. As the Hon. Mr Cameron interjected during that contribution, obviously Mr Crothers, having been given that speech, did not take the opportunity to read all the State and Federal reports that have been provided relating to freedom of information legislation. All those reports agree that, unless there is some firm legislative base for enforcing freedom of information legislation, public servants and Public Service mandarins will very easily slide around those guidelines and principles.

Under the privacy principles that Mr Crothers indicated have been introduced, and as Mr Sumner has indicated have been introduced on previous occasions, how does Mr Crothers suggest that someone who believes that they are aggrieved can enforce action against a public servant under the Government Management and Employment Act as suggested by Mr Crothers? How does someone in the community know whether or not a public servant has refused to provide information retained about that person in departmental files? How does a person know whether all the information has been provided, or whether it has not been changed or altered before it is provided to that person?

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: They trust them.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: As the Hon. Mr Cameron suggests, the people of South Australia would trust the public servants. Clearly the privacy principles of the Attorney-General and the Hon. Mr Crothers are unenforceable and are designed only to try to get the Labor Government off the hook in relation to freedom of information legislation.

The second amazing point is that the Hon. Mr Crothers in his contribution tried to rebut the arguments developed by the Hon. Mr Cameron in relation to the Fitzgerald inquiry into matters of corruption in Queensland. The argument being developed by Mr Fitzgerald, as someone who is held in great esteem by all political Parties, as I understand, in Queensland, but obviously not held in any esteem at all by the Bannon Labor Government, was that freedom of information legislation was important for good government in any State. I will not go through all the arguments that the Hon. Mr Cameron put in his contribution. The Bannon Government obviously rejects that view of Mr Fitzgerald and argues instead that the problem in Queensland was that the Government there starved the Opposition of research facilities. If we want to talk about Governments starving Oppositions of research facilities now is not the appropriate time. Certainly, however, members on this side of the Chamber have developed a most convincing and persuasive argument on a number of occasions about the Bannon Government starving the Opposition of research facilities.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Any Government that provides to a Legislative Council Opposition of 10 members just two staff persons—two secretaries—and then has the effrontery to argue that the problem in Queensland was a Government starving the Opposition of research facilities really is arrant hypocrisy and ought to be revealed for what it is. I do not want to develop the research argument other than to put the lie to the statement made by the Hon. Mr Crothers.

Having dismissed Mr Crothers, I now turn to the attitude of the Attorney-General. I have argued before in relation to the Attorney-General that he is not and never has been what I would term a reforming Attorney-General. Indeed, I was very interested to read in that soon to be best seller, *Just for the Record: the Political Recollections of John Cornwall*—

The Hon. R.R. Roberts: Did you get it for free?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No, not at all.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is too much interjection across the Chamber.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: What did John Cornwall, who knew very well the Attorney-General and the inner workings of the Bannon Government, say in relation to the reforming nature of the Attorney-General? Later, I want to look at John Cornwall's attitude to freedom of information legislation. Dr John Cornwall says:

> Sumner's innate conservatism was to irritate me almost as much as it comforted John Bannon. Unlike his reforming predecessors, Attorneys-General Dunstan, King and Duncan, Sumner is essentially a competent but colourless craftsman.

That view is held not only by John Cornwall but is also shared by the Hon. Susan Lenehan, who has expressed in the past that the Attorney-General is not a reformer.

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles: That's outrageous!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It might be outrageous, but it is what she said. The Hon. Susan Lenehan has expressed this view on previous occasions.

The Hon. G. Weatherill: Where did you get that from?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Read the *Advertiser.*

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles: When?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Do your own research.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: You have staff—you have dozens of them.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is too much interjection across the Chamber. If the Hon. Mr Lucas addresses the Chair he will do much better.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Thank you, Mr President. That attitude is shared, not only by John Cornwall and the Hon. Susan Lenehan, but also by a number of other members of the Parliamentary Labor Party caucus. A number of other members of that caucus share exactly the same view and say exactly that in their little faction meetings in the corridors and in meetings in Parliament House. If one talks to the lefties in this Chamber and in another place, one knows that that view is shared not only by the Hon. Susan Lenehan but generally by the left. If one talks to members of the left wing faction of the Labor Party in the Federal Parliament, one will hear this attitude being expressed.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is too much audible conversation across the Chamber. The Hon. Mr Lucas has the floor.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: We have looked at the Labor Party platform. Let us now look at the attitudes expressed by the Attorney-General on behalf of the Bannon Government over the past few years. An article in the *Sunday Mail* of 27 April 1980, under the heading 'Sumner demands policy on privacy,' reads:

> The Opposition Leader in the Legislative Council, Mr Chris Sumner, yesterday called on the Government to state its policy on privacy and freedom of information.

Then, in an article in the *Sunday Mail* of 7 January 1984, by Randall Ashbourne, we read:

> The Attorney-General, Mr Sumner, said from West Germany late yesterday—

It was so important that he talked about it in West Germany—

The Hon. G. Weatherill: He didn't understand him.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Did you say that the Attorney-General did not understand it? This is quoting the Attorney-General as follows:

> The Attorney-General, Mr Sumner, said from West Germany late yesterday that the Government was committed to freedom of information legislation. He said the Bill probably would go to Parliament early next year—

that refers to 1985, four years ago—

> but freedom of information rights would be introduced on an administrative basis this year.

That is in 1984. So, what happened then, in mid-1984? In the *News* of 10 July 1984, 'A new law will free Government files.' headed an article written by Craig Bildstein.

The Hon. Carolyn Pickles: He's a Liberal.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Hon. Ms Pickles is attacking a journalist of 1984 for reporting the words of her own Leader, the Attorney-General. All the poor fellow was doing was reporting the attitudes and views expressed by the Attorney-General on behalf of the Bannon Government.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: All this poor fellow was doing was reporting the words of the Attorney-General on behalf of the Bannon Government. And what did he say?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Council will come to order. The Hon. Mr Lucas has the floor.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The article stated:

> South Australians will have greater access to Government files under legislation outlined today [9 July 1984]. The Attorney-General, Mr Sumner, announced today freedom of information laws would be introduced next year.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: Is this the article by Craig Bildstein?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Yes. It further stated:

> A Bill is being drafted for Parliament.

I remind members that this was the Attorney-General speaking on behalf of the Government, but Government members are now telling us that we cannot believe the Attorney-General.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Miss Laidlaw will come to order.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Members opposite are saying that we cannot believe the word of the Attorney-General. We have known for many years that we cannot believe the Attorney's word, but members on the Government benches—

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I take a point of order, Mr President. Standing Orders prevent members from making derogatory remarks about other members. I take a point of order on behalf of the Attorney-General.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I cannot believe that the remark was that derogatory and I do not see that there was a point of order.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Mr President, how thin skinned are members opposite when—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: The left wing.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Yes, the left wing. All we say is that we cannot believe the word of the Attorney-General. I have just cited that in July 1984 on behalf of the Government the Attorney-General was drafting legislation for freedom of information.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts: He probably was.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Probably was! The Hon. Mr Roberts is a new boy in the Council, so we will leave him alone on this occasion.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Lucas would do better to address the Chair rather than—

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am, Mr President; I am looking directly at you.

The PRESIDENT: —answering interjections.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: We have indicated this evening that the Labor Party platform states that freedom of infor-

mation legislation should be introduced; the Attorney-General said in January 1984 that such legislation would be introduced; he said again in July 1984 that we would have freedom of information legislation, so members might understand why we say that we cannot believe the word of the Attorney-General. Quite clearly, five years on, the Attorney-General—particularly over the past 3½ years—is steadfastly digging himself a hole in his own little burrow trying to find excuse after excuse to oppose freedom of information legislation. When we remind members opposite of their platform and of their policy as announced by the Attorney-General, we hear the bleating that we have heard during my contribution this afternoon. On previous occasions when trying to justify his not supporting freedom of information legislation the Attorney has developed a range of excuses in his various contributions, and a few more excuses were offered by the Hon. Mr Crothers this afternoon. I do not want to go through all those excuses from the Attorney, but I will address one, that is, that freedom of information legislation should not be introduced until the review of the Commonwealth freedom of information legislation has been conducted. We now know that in December 1987 a committee chaired by Senator Nick Bolkus, which involved a prominent member of the centre left (Senator Christopher Schacht, a former Labor Party secretary in South Australia), reporting on the operations of the freedom of information legislation, found as follows:

> The committee remains committed to the concept of freedom of information.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: Those two?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Exactly. It continues:

> The inquiry revealed that there is widespread support for the FOI Act, and little criticism of its object to make available information about the operations, of and in the possession of, the Commonwealth Government, and to increase Government accountability and public participation in the process of Government.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: The President of the ALP!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The President of the ALP and a leading number cruncher for the Centre Left. He would be interested to know that one of his factional colleagues, Senator Christopher Schacht, who would see himself as another leading number cruncher in the Centre Left on the national arena whereas the Hon. Mr Crothers is just a big fish in a little pond, being a number cruncher in the State branch of the Party, reported that that faction loves the Act; it thinks it is great and that is good for the Government and for the people. Not for them the hypocrisy of privacy principles which hide behind the skirts of public servants and which public servants can slither around. They support legally enforceable freedom of information legislation. What else did that committee say? What else did Senator Schacht say on behalf of the Centre Left and the Hawke Labor Government? It stated:

> Nothing which emerged during the committee's inquiry caused it to doubt the overall value of the FOI Act. The committee wishes to emphasise that it is firmly of the view that the operation of the FOI Act has proved to be a net benefit to the Australian community. In the committee's view, much information has been released as a result of the FOI Act which would otherwise never have reached the public.

And therein lies the rub. The South Australian Government does not want that sort of information to reach the public. Let us see just who the Hon. Mr Crothers and the Attorney-General are hopping into bed with in relation to their attitude to freedom of information. Let us just see who their political bedfellows are.

The Hon. R.R. Roberts: Let us not get into this subject.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Yes, let us consider it. The Federal committee notes that only one submission to the review recommended repeal of the legislation. Let us guess where that submission came from.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: The League of Rights.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No, not the League of Rights; it came from the Queensland Government and Premier Joh Bjelke-Petersen. The only submission that argued for the repeal of the FOI Act was from old Joh, Premier Bjelke-Petersen. He is the political bedfellow of the Attorney-General and the Hon. Mr Crothers—if they could all fit in. The three of them were in the same political bed, opposing the freedom of information legislation. They were the only ones who opposed it. We know the real reason for the Bannon Government's steadfastly opposing freedom of information legislation.

The last matter to which I refer relates to a former good friend and colleague of members opposite, the Hon. John Cornwall as he then was or, as now, Dr John. At page 91 of his book regarding the problems that the Government faced with market research in 1983 and 1984 and what subsequently happened, Dr Cornwall stated:

> In practice the guidelines [the market research guidelines] enabled the development of a sophisticated use of market research which simultaneously monitored community issues and Government performance. However in almost five years since the 'scandal' I am unaware of any survey questionnaires or the full results produced by them being circulated to Cabinet, tabled in Parliament or released for publication.

Let us just listen to the sting in the tail from John Cornwall. There is this lovely paragraph:

> It has been fascinating to watch John Cain's legal struggle to resist their release under Victoria's freedom of information legislation. The Bannon Government has resisted the introduction of comprehensive freedom of information legislation in South Australia.

No more need be said. That paragraph was inserted by John Cornwall, and for a reason.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is too much noise in the Chamber.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It was inserted in there for a reason, and he knows the reason: confidential market research is conducted by the Liberal Party—not to measure community issues, but to do its own private polling at the Government's and taxpayers' expense. The Government refuses to release the survey questionnaires and the results of these surveys, yet it will provide the information to its own State Liberal Party Secretary. The Hon. John Cornwall inserted that information because he knows why the Bannon Government has opposed FOI legislation: to prevent taxpayers, Opposition members and the Democrats obtaining access to the sort of information which would reveal an absolute scandal in expenditure of over $1.2 million on Government, Party, departmental and Public Service research, and a range of other scandals.

An honourable member: With Rod Cameron.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: With Rod Cameron—in health, education and in a couple of other portfolio areas. It does not want that information to get out and as long as the Government can oppose freedom of information legislation—unlike Victoria where the Government has had problems—it believes they will be able to protect their hide for a little longer.

With all the strength that I can muster late on a Wednesday afternoon, I support strongly this freedom fighting legislation proposed by the Hon. Mr Cameron.

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

ANTARCTICA

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. Carolyn Pickles:

That this Council strongly supports—

1. The principle of Antarctica becoming a world heritage wilderness park and opposes the notion that Australia should become a signatory to the Antarctic Mining Convention.

2. The Federal Government's proposal to negotiate a comprehensive environmental convention for Antarctica.

(Continued from 23 August. Page 523.)

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I am pleased to be associated with this motion, and I move the following amendment thereto:

In paragraph 1 after 'park', insert 'under the auspices, of the Antarctica Treaty'.

I will speak to this amendment in a moment. I have been keenly interested in the fate of the continent since my first political involvement with the Liberal Party in 1972, when I joined the Davenport Young Liberals. I recall that in that time a resolution was carried by that branch and the Young Liberals' council urging the Government to take a much greater interest in and a commitment to research funding in Antarctica because I (and subsequently the Young Liberal Movement) was anxious that, if there was not an enhanced research effort by Australians in Antarctica, we would have considerable difficulty in 1991 substantiating our current claim to 42 per cent of the continent.

That 42 per cent equates to an area of some 6.09 million square kilometres, a substantial area of a most remarkable continent. My interest in respect of the research component remains keenly held, because I and other Liberals have voiced concern that under the current Government the research effort has been substantially pulled back and there will be some difficulty, I suspect, in 1991 in substantiating our claim and, therefore, in remaining a significant partner of the Antarctic treaty. However, those remain matters for another day. I am also pleased to be associated with this motion because the Federal Liberal Party in coalition with the National Party has been party to leading the political debate in Australia opposing Australia's signature on the proposed convention relating to the regulation of Antarctic mining resources.

The Hon. Anne Levy: It was the Wilderness Society that led the debate.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I said the political debate. The coalition announced its decision on 2 May this year to urge the Government of Australia to oppose the signing of that convention. Certainly, to that time the Hawke Government had not made up its mind what it would do. In fact, it was all over the place, as the Hon. Ms Levy would be aware, with Mr Keating opposing the signing of the convention by Australia, but the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade and the Minister for the Environment both advocating enthusiastically its signing. My use of the word 'political' relates to Political Parties, because in that respect the Liberal Party had led the way in coming out with a decision to oppose Australia's signing the convention.

It certainly made it much easier for the Government to make up its mind on this matter, which eventually it did. It announced its opposition to the signing of the convention. Until now, the Antarctic land mass and wilderness environment have been saved from exploitation by the harsh environment and also by the lack of any framework for exploitation to occur. The convention on the regulation of Antarctic mineral resources activities threatened this situation and, therefore, the fragile wilderness of that continent.

Australia, however, had and still has the capacity to save the continent from such a threat for in Antarctica, unlike most international forums, Australia holds a trump card to influence other nations in determining their environmental and developmental policies. I will outline some of the international arrangements in relation to Antarctica, because they are relevant to my amendment. Antarctica is 'regulated'—by a series of quite unique international agreements which mix aspects of claims of sovereignty with the policies of States which have actually rejected the validity of claims such as that of Australia.

In all agreements, decisions are made by procedures involving the consensus of the various parties. I emphasise that unique part of this Antarctic agreement—the consensus basis on which decisions are made. The main international instrument is the Antarctic treaty of 1959, which was subsequently restated in 1960. This treaty provides for such matters as the use of Antarctica exclusively for peaceful purposes; the freezing of all territorial claims; the exclusion of nuclear explosions or waste from the continent; the promotion of scientific activity and the establishment of a management regime. The treaty can be renegotiated after 1991 if the parties agree, but there is no requirement for renegotiation unless the parties so desire.

There are three classes of party to the treaty. I refer, first, to the original consultative parties—and these are broken up into three categories: first, the States with a territorial claim (and these include the United Kingdom, Norway, France, New Zealand, Argentina, Australia and Chile); secondly, States with scientific claims but no claims to territorial sovereignty (these are South Africa, Belgium and Japan); and, thirdly, the States maintaining a future right to make territorial claims but which currently do not recognise the territorial claims of others (the United States of America and the USSR).

There are subsequent consultative parties to the treaty, namely, Poland, West Germany, East Germany, Brazil, Uruguay, Italy, China and India. Thirdly, there are acceding States or non-consultative or contracting States comprising Czechoslovakia, Denmark, the Netherlands, Bulgaria, Romania, Papua-New Guinea, Peru, Spain, Hungary, Sweden, Finland, Cuba, the Republic of Korea, Austria, Ecuador, Canada and Greece. One can see that a large number of countries take a very keen—but often competing—interest in the fate of Antarctica.

The different status gives the parties different rights as to the formal decision making under the treaty but, in effect, decisions lie with the 12 original parties, Australia being one of those 12. In relation to the minerals convention, negotiations on a minerals regime began in June 1982, and they have been complex. A range of interests have had to be accommodated: the super powers, the seven Antarctic treaty parties claiming territorial sovereignty and the other Antarctic treaty consultative parties. It also involved the acceding countries, the treaty parties, and the rest of the world, as well as the development-first conservation interests. The drive behind the development of an Antarctic minerals resources convention was to provide a framework within the Antarctic treaty system for the control of activities concerned with prospecting for and the exploration and development of mineral resources in Antarctica before such activities caused irreparable environmental damage or become the cause of serious disputes between the Antarctic treaty consultative parties or nations.

The Australian delegation has involved quite a number of officials from various departments, including Foreign Affairs and Trade, Arts, Sport, Environment, Tourism and Territories, Primary Industries and Energy, Treasury, the Attorney-General's Department and the Tasmanian Government, representing Australian States, as well as represen-

tatives of non-government environmental organisations and the mining industry.

The negotiations for a convention to regulate any future minerals activity were signed by all the consultative parties and a number of non-consultative parties at Wellington on 2 June 1988. Each of the 11 international meetings to negotiate the regime were chaired by Mr Chris Beeby of New Zealand.

One significant departure in these developments of the convention was that the traditional Antarctic principles of consensus were replaced with a complicated arrangement whereby decisions were made by a 75 per cent majority. In the absence of this convention, I would highlight that there is no formal prohibition of mining activity on the continent, but there is in place a moratorium on such activity agreed by all the parties which, in the absence of this convention, has been agreed to be left in force.

It is not my intention to go through the various provisions of the convention. However, I would highlight the fact that there are a number of concerns which the Liberal Party, both Federal and State, has expressed in relation to the convention. The key concern was in relation to climate and the greenhouse effect which the Hon. Ms Pickles and the Hon. Mr Elliott highlighted.

We had other objections; for instance, consistency with the Antarctic Treaty and the potential for conflict. That matter has not arisen under the terms of the current treaty, but there was potential for such conflict to arise under the terms of the convention and therefore put in jeopardy the cooperative arrangements that have so significantly marked the scientific developments to date. The loss of Australian sovereignty was of major concern to the Liberal Party, as were the associated loss of revenue, the subsidised mining aspects and the limited liability provisions.

Oil pollution, as the Hon. Ms Pickles highlighted, was and continues to be a major concern of the Liberal Party. Natural hazards occur daily in this region, which many of us know so little about. One has only to look at the alarming situation in Prince William Sound in Alaska in March this year to recognise the dangers of large-scale or any exploration for minerals or other products in Antarctica.

In opposing the convention, the Liberal Party, both Federal and in this State, has supported a move to establish a world heritage wilderness park. However, we are not confident that the proposal put forward by the Prime Minister is in Australia's best interests or is necessarily in the best interests of the continent itself. The Prime Minister, when he went on his recent trip overseas trying to galvanise support for his proposals, was told without qualification by the United States of America, the United Kingdom and Japan that they would have no bar of the system, and it would require their support to succeed.

It is also important in the Liberal Party's view (and this view was strongly put forward by Mr Keating in opposition to Australia signing the convention) to note that the Prime Minister's proposal would mean that Australia would no longer have the signatory rights that it enjoys today and, therefore, veto rights over proposals forwarded for consideration whether of a scientific nature or otherwise. We believe it is very important that Australia should maintain its sovereignty rights because, if this Government and future Governments believe strongly in maintaining and protecting the fragile wilderness of Antarctica, we have the ability to do so if we remain as a signatory of the Antarctic Treaty.

That is why we have proposed the amendment that, after the reference in the motion to the world heritage wilderness park, the words 'under the auspices of the Antarctic Treaty' be added. That will provide for a super national park or a total wilderness area within Antarctica. However, it means that it will be firmly based within the scope of the Antarctic Treaty and there would be no derogation from the sovereignty claims of the relevant national parties. Within such a regime adequate arrangements could be made for the management of issues such as proper conservation practices, scientific research and possibly controlled tourism.

I am pleased to be associated with the motion, but I think that it could be strengthened by the addition of the amendment, because it would keep it within the terms of the Antarctic Treaty. I remind members that the original convention was negotiated within the terms of that treaty. It would seem that only because it was negotiated within the terms of that treaty Australia, by refusing to sign the convention, has been able to ensure that the environment is protected from mining and mineral exploration. It seems desirable that we should maintain that principle and the power which Australia has in relation to Antarctica. We can do that only if we seek to negotiate a world heritage wilderness park within the auspices of the Antarctic Treaty.

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA secured the adjournment of the debate.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 August. Page 111.)

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: Members on this side of the Chamber support the principle that generally people should be protected against discrimination on the basis of their age. In fact, the Government has already announced in the Governor's Address that it intended to introduce legislation in this current session of Parliament to amend the Equal Opportunity Act to provide protection against age discrimination. The Government has now released for public discussion the report of the task force to monitor age discrimination. The task force comprised Ms Jo Tiddy, Commissioner for Equal Opportunity, Dr Adam Graycar, Commissioner for the Ageing, and Mr Glen Edwards, Director of the Office of Employment and Training.

The Government's draft Bill has been released also to ensure full public discussion and consultation prior to the Bill's introduction later in this current session of Parliament. When I spoke on Ms Laidlaw's proposed legislation on aged discrimination on 5 April 1989, I made it quite clear that the Government intended to introduce legislation and that it believed wide consultation should take place. The process of that wide consultation is now taking place with interested parties, including employers, unions, service providers and older people's organisations. Comments and views expressed in the consultation phase will be considered by the Government before the final legislation is introduced.

The Government wishes to make it unlawful for people to be treated less favourably because of their age, for example, at work, in education, in the provision of goods, services and facilities, in accommodation, clubs, associations, sport, application forms or advertisements. The Government wants to promote community awareness to break down negative and discriminatory stereotypes. I believe that it would be unfortunate if an important measure such as this were to be pushed through Parliament without the benefit of consultation and input from a wide range of individuals and organisations. The Government now has that consultative

process under way and I believe that we should await its results.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

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

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

A message was received from the House of Assembly requesting that the Legislative Council give permission to the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner), the Minister of Tourism (Hon. Barbara Wiese) and the Minister of Local Government (Hon. Anne Levy), members of the Legislative Council, to attend and give evidence before the Estimates Committes of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That the Attorney-General, the Minister of Tourism and the Minister of Local Government have leave to attend and give evidence before the Estimates Committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill, if they think fit.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.11 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday 7 September at 2.15 p.m.