

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 7 September 1989

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

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Tourism (Hon. Barbara Wiese)—
Advisory Committee on Soil Conservation Report, 1988-89.

South Australian Health Commission Act 1976—Regulations—Lyell McEwin Health Service.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. Anne Levy)—
South Australian Totalisator Agency Board Report, 1989.

CHAMBER DECORUM

The **PRESIDENT**: Before questions, I should like to appeal to members to see whether there can be a little more decorum in the Chamber. It is very hard for me in the Chair to hear what is going on with all the noise during Question Time. I do not know how *Hansard* copes with it. Yesterday I appealed several times for order. On reflection, it is quite unfair for members to conduct themselves in the Chamber in the manner that they have. I could not name anybody, because you are all as bad as one another. I ask and appeal to you to conduct yourselves with more decorum in the Chamber.

QUESTIONS

SGIC HEALTH INSURANCE

The **Hon. M.B. CAMERON**: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister representing the Minister of Health about SGIC health insurance.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. M.B. CAMERON**: Members will no doubt be aware that in recent months the Opposition, the media and staff working within the State health system have come in for strong criticism from the Bannon Government for highlighting acute problems with the public hospital system.

While it is true that the Opposition has used terms such as 'crisis' to describe these problems, it has not been alone. Doctors and health professionals at our largest hospitals have used similar terms to describe emergency measures which have been taken to counter large budget overruns at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, Flinders Medical Centre, Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Children's Hospital. The media, too, has used words such as 'crisis' when describing mass cancellations of elective surgery, closures of more than 100 hospital beds, bans on staff replacements, and so on. It seems that everyone connected with the health system was aware of the crisis in our hospitals—that is, everyone except the Bannon Government and the Health Minister.

For example, the Health Minister was reported in the *Advertiser* on 29 May as saying that talk of a crisis was utterly ridiculous. He said:

I think the situation is that people have been panicked by a short-term funding problem in some of the hospitals. It seems to me that a lot of this is about position in the health service pecking order rather than about actual services to the patient.

When Mr Olsen, the Leader of the Opposition in another place, had earlier that month gone to inspect the Royal Adelaide to listen to staff about their problems (and I accompanied him) this was the response of the Health Minister as reported in the *Advertiser* of 5 May 1989:

The Health Minister, Dr Hoggood, said Mr Olsen's tour of the Royal Adelaide Hospital had been a 'cynical attempt to cash in on the alarmist predictions of a small handful of hospital administrators and doctors'.

Even our illustrious Mr Bannon was not above playing down the perceived crisis in our health system on 17 June. After the Premier had belatedly announced additional funds for our ailing hospitals, he 'called for an end to the current hysteria' about the current state of the South Australian health care system.

It seems that the Premier's call has gone unheeded by at least one-quarter of Government enterprise, and now the State Government Insurance Commission is echoing claims that the Opposition, health professionals within our public hospitals, and the media have been making for months. I refer to an SGIC leaflet now being circulated to households which says in part:

Can you afford to run the risk of being without private health insurance any longer? The public health system is under pressure. Long waiting lists, ward closures, staff resignations, anxiety over whether your medical problem will be classified as elective or essential surgery . . . it all adds up to uncertainty and insecurity.

The **Hon. J.F. Stefani**: This is a Government department!

The **Hon. M.B. CAMERON**: Yes. This is a copy of a pamphlet that has been sent to all people in every suburb, and I can give the original to anyone who wants it. The SGIC leaflet continues:

There is really only one answer if you don't want to risk having to wait for a public hospital bed for treatment deemed to be 'non-essential'—take out private hospital insurance. Private hospital insurance need not be as costly as you think if you join SGIC Health.

It goes on to describe the amounts that it will cost.

The **Hon. R.R. Roberts** interjecting:

The **Hon. M.B. CAMERON**: They are very good, actually. The final sentence is 'Then you can forget about hospital queues forever.' On the back of this pamphlet is a series of headlines from newspapers including 'Hospitals will take months to recover', 'Vikki says surgery wait is agonising', 'Hospital cost cutting "has failed"', 'Emergencies for the RAH', and 'RAH heads meet over cuts.' There is a montage of headlines from various newspapers. The one thing that is missing is the classic headline from the *Advertiser* of 29 May which states 'Hospital claims are ridiculous: Hoggood'. I wonder why they did not put that in.

Does the Minister believe that the leaflet put out by SGIC, stating, among other things, that our health system is 'under pressure' is a fair reflection of the system in South Australia? If he does, will he now admit that he was wrong in strongly criticising both health professionals, the Opposition and the media for referring to problems in our hospitals (which problems are now highlighted by the SGIC) and, if he does not, what steps will he take to ensure that SGIC ceases to use what he has described on our part as scare tactics to recruit new members to its private health fund?

The **Hon. BARBARA WIESE**: I understand that this question has already been asked by a member in another place today and has already been ably answered by the Minister of Health. However, I will be happy to refer these questions to my colleague. I am sure that he will also provide a suitable reply to the Hon. Mr Cameron.

SCRIMBER

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make an explanation before directing a question to the Minister of Tourism, as the Acting Leader of the Government in the Council, on the subject of scrimber.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Just two years ago a select committee of the Legislative Council was established to examine the effectiveness and efficiency of the South Australian Timber Corporation (otherwise known as Satco). In moving for the establishment of the select committee, I made particular references to Satco's 50 per cent interest in the scrimber plant being built in Mount Gambier. The other 50 per cent interest is held by SGIC.

At that time, September 1987, the estimate for the scrimber plant was \$22 million, although when this development was first submitted to Cabinet in May 1985 the cost had been only \$12 million. The select committee reported to the Legislative Council in mid April 1989 and noted that 'the final cost of the scrimber plant is now estimated to be \$34 million.'

Just 4½ months later at page 380 of the Auditor-General's Annual Report we read that the current estimate of the final project costs total \$44.2 million, which is a massive 30 per cent hike in just 4½ months—exactly double the estimate of two years ago and 3½ times the original cost when Cabinet first examined the project four years ago.

This extraordinary cost escalation makes a nonsense of the optimistic forecasts for early profits from this venture. In fact, timber industry experts confirm my views that a profit is not likely in the first decade of operation, if at all. Taxpayers could be forgiven for thinking that they have been scrimbered!

Not only has there been a massive cost blowout but also there have been serious delays in commissioning the scrimber plant—hardly surprising in view of the fact that the South Australian Government has committed taxpayers to a new and untried technology which, from all my inquiries, was rejected by potentially interested parties in the private sector.

At the time the select committee was set up in October 1987, the scrimber plant was expected to be operational in mid-1988, or certainly in the second half of 1988. In the first half of 1988 the select committee was told that the plant would be up and running before Christmas 1988. Before Christmas 1988 we were told it would be ready in the first quarter of 1989.

In the select committee report tabled in the Council on 13 April this year, on information received only days earlier, we were advised that 'commercial production of scrimber is now scheduled to commence in the third quarter of 1989'. In fact, we were told it would be July. The latest advice to hand is that the plant will be commissioned in November—presumably that is November 1989.

All the predictions about a cost blowout and likely delays made in September 1987 have in fact come to pass. My questions to the Minister are: first, will the Minister advise whether in fact \$44.2 million is the final cost of establishing the scrimber plant; secondly, how can the Government justify to taxpayers their investment of \$22 million by Satco (a statutory authority which, in each of its first 10 years of commercial operation from 1979 to 1988, never made a profit) in an untried technology rejected by the private sector and unlikely to be profitable for many years, if at all?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I am not able to provide information about figures relating to this company. This

question is not in the area of my responsibility, but I am happy to refer the honourable member's question to the Minister responsible and I will bring back a reply.

MARINELAND

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Yesterday, as a result of the Auditor-General's Report tabled on Tuesday, I raised with the Minister of Local Government questions about Marineland and the West Beach Trust. I now want to direct some questions to the Minister of Tourism. The Auditor-General's Report refers to a consultant's report obtained in August 1988 on the Marineland development. The Auditor-General states:

The August report, which addressed the viability of a reduced (\$7 million) project based on the same patronage figures as the original project, concluded that 'the project appears to be beyond acceptable commercial risk levels'. The report indicated that:

- (a) The appropriate patronage forecast level was more likely to be 150 000 to 200 000 visitors a year and that projected visitor spending levels were too high—which converted profit projections to losses.
- (b) A facility to attract 300 000 to 400 000 visitors a year probably requires an expenditure in the order of \$15 to \$20 million.
- (c) Seaworld, Surfers Paradise should be excluded from comparative patronage purposes, given its composition and large vacation market base.

These matters were referred by the Auditor-General to the Director of State Development and Technology, and the Acting Director responded as follows:

Regarding an independent assessment, the department sought expert formal advice from the Department of Tourism on patronage levels and expenditure and obtained supporting data from a similar park in Western Australia and from other local tourism facilities . . .

It is acknowledged that advice was obtained from the Department of Tourism. However, while that advice indicated that, for a high quality and well managed facility, patronage of around 250 000 could be considered achievable, attention was not drawn to this figure in the submission to the Industries Development Committee, even though it was below the break-even level of 292 000, nor did the submission indicate the effect of this lower figure on the financial viability of the project.

Even between the August 1988 consultant's report and advice from the Department of Tourism there is a significant difference as to expected patronage levels—150 000 to 200 000 on the one hand compared with 250 000 on the other. That can extend from a 25 per cent to a 66 per cent difference, depending on the figures used. Such a facility as a revamped Marineland could be expected to be a major tourism drawcard for South Australia and one would expect that in the development of the project there would have been extensive consultation with Tourism South Australia and its predecessor department. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Does the response from the Department of Tourism (now Tourism South Australia) on patronage figures indicate that that was the only involvement of the department in advising on the Marineland development since 1986?
2. If not, in what other respects was the Department of Tourism (or Tourism South Australia) involved and what was its advice on each occasion?
3. What was the basis for the department's reaching its conclusions referred to in the Auditor-General's Report with respect to patronage?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I do not have at my disposal all the information that the honourable member is

asking for but I will certainly seek a report on those aspects that I am not able to answer at the moment.

When the Tribond proposal first came to light and a proposition was put by the Tribond company for a guarantee from the Industries Development Committee, the Department of State Development, as it then was, sought information from the then Department of Tourism about such issues as the expected patronage for a redeveloped Marineland and that information was provided to the Department of State Development back in, I think, 1987.

The projected figures which were given by the then Department of Tourism were based upon the need for a high quality development which would be well managed and which had a good marketing scheme. It was felt that the patronage figures outlined in the Auditor-General's Report could be achieved if those other three pre-conditions were met. That information was provided to the Department of State Development and presumably was used in the preparation of their submission to the Industries Development Committee. I have not seen the submission to the Industries Development Committee so I cannot comment on how that information was used or in what way it was reported.

I am not able to indicate on how many occasions or on what subjects officers of Tourism South Australia have met with Tribond or subsequent companies that may have had some interest in the Marineland development. I will have to seek a report on those issues. Recently, the involvement of Tourism South Australia officers has not been extensive at all. In fact, Tourism South Australia officers have been invited to only one meeting, relating to this most recent development at West Beach. I will have to check that information to be absolutely sure that what I am reporting to the Council is accurate, and I will bring back a report on those matters as soon as I can.

SCHOOL CLOSURES

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 school closures.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: There is a great deal of uncertainty in various communities at present about what schools will be closed next year and in future years. One of the problems that occurs because of this uncertainty is that some parents decide to locate their children in schools other than those they would prefer because they fear that a school is to be closed. That causes dwindling numbers and in turn eventually causes closures. In recent days I have been contacted by staff of Kidman Park High School with a related problem. They do not know at this stage whether or not that school is to be closed next year and this uncertainty has ramifications for them. The first is that, if they do not know within a few days, they cannot get their name on the transfer list for next year, the staffing program will go on without them, and that will put them at the end of the queue, with severe disadvantages for them.

They have also expressed the view that curriculum development work should start now. Do they start developing curricula for next year and thinking about what subjects to offer, only to find that they cannot offer them? Likewise, should some schools close and others must accept extra students, the subject curricula need to be worked on now. Will the Minister make a clear and immediate statement on what schools will be closed in 1990, so that problems of this sort can be avoided?

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

SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN SCHOOLS

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Education, a question concerning sexual harassment in South Australian schools.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES: I understand that Ms Carrie Herbert, the Adelaide author of a book launched yesterday entitled *Talking of Silence: the Sexual Harassment of Schoolgirls*, has claimed that sexual harassment of schoolgirls is a widespread phenomenon. I understand that Ms Herbert's book is based on nine months' research at a London comprehensive school. According to Ms Herbert, more girls are experiencing sexual harassment in schools and in classrooms than is realised, but many people hide behind this behaviour, calling it normal, flattering or just a case of 'boys being boys'. Further, she said that schoolgirls were reluctant to talk about sexual harassment experiences either because they were not believed by adults or the behaviour was accepted by adults as normal. What procedures are taken within the Education Department to deal with sexual harassment in schools?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I will certainly refer that question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply. I know that problems of sexual harassment in South Australian schools is of great concern to the Minister and to the department and that a comprehensive policy for combating it has been developed. I am sure that the Minister can and will provide details on the specific question asked by the honourable member.

HOSPITAL WAITING LISTS

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Health a question about waiting lists.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I understand that, in reply to a question in another place, the Minister of Health said that the majority of people who seek elective surgery have to wait only three to four weeks. I assume that in his reply the Minister gave the official figures for July in respect of waiting lists and waiting times but, just in case he did not, I received a copy from a source within the Health Commission.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: If we had freedom of information legislation, I would not have to do it this way. However, until we have that legislation we must rely on sources within the Health Commission. I have had the figures for a few days. The Minister did not have them when I received them. The July figures are: the Royal Adelaide Hospital, 2 373; the Flinders Medical Centre, 1 547; (and I ask honourable members to remember that figure); the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, 1 712; Modbury, 739; and the Lyell McEwin Health Service, 539. That makes a total of 6 910, which is a drop from the June figure of 7 406.

One could presume that everything in the world is rosy. However, I happen to have an information bulletin (which I will table in a moment) from the Flinders Medical Centre. It was very kindly forwarded to me by someone at the

centre. It is a very detailed document which contains everything on which one requires knowledge, including general surgery subtotals. The maximum waiting time for general surgery is 1 836 days. Haemorrhoids are not that comfortable—the waiting time for surgery is ‘only’ 1 836 days (or six years); and the waiting time for varicose veins is the same. If you require a tonsillectomy and you are over the age of 15 years, you must wait 1 498 days; but, if you are a child, it is not too bad—the waiting time is only 357 days.

According to official records at the Flinders Medical Centre, the total figure at the end of July in respect of waiting lists was 1 672. However, the Health Commission figure that was handed to the media is 1 547. It just so happens the difference between the two figures is exactly the same as the purported drop in the number on the waiting lists at the end of last month. It seems that in the previous month the difference between the figures was only 30. It seems the closer we get to the election the more intense the cooking of the books by someone in the Health Commission.

Will the Minister attempt to explain the difference between the official waiting list figures from the hospital for the end of July and the official figures from the Health Commission, as I understand that in another place the Minister claimed that he receives the waiting list figures direct from the hospital? If that is the case, I am very surprised at the difference of 125 between the two figures.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will refer the question to my colleague in another place and bring down a reply.

AUSTRALIAN ECONOMY

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the acting Leader of the Government in this place a series of questions about our economic well-being.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: Recently I read a biography of Ben Chifley, written by L. F. Crisp. I was absolutely amazed as I read chapter 13, which commences at page 183. For the information of members, the chapter is headed ‘Minister for post-war reconstruction 1942-45.’ As early as June 1940 the Federal conference of the Australian Labor Party called for ‘an early outline of general principles of post-war reconstruction’. Indeed, in November 1942 the Federal conference of the Australian Labor Party urged that post-war reconstruction must be regarded not as a diversion from the war effort but as part of it.

I believe, as all members must surely agree, given the sorts of pressures that Australia was under at that time, that this action has to be considered a truly remarkable exercise of foresight. It would be appropriate to remind all members that on 3 September 1939 Australia entered the Second World War on the side of the Allies and that it is almost 50 years to the day of that very saddening event.

The stark parallels between the era of Curtin and Chifley, and the present era of Hawke and Keating, are very real indeed; for example, on both occasions it was the Australian Labor Party which was entrusted by the electorate with the task of guarding the nation’s destinies at times of gravest crisis. The political conservatives appeared on both occasions to be bereft of any beneficial creativity and also to be bitterly divided amongst themselves. Indeed, it is worth noting that the last budget surplus prior to the Keating surpluses was achieved in 1952 largely, one suspects, due to the economic prudence of the Chifley Labor Government. I also note the similarity in unemployment decline

during the Curtin-Chifley Governments, and I find that the same thing is true in respect of unemployment levels during the present incumbency of Hawke and Keating.

I now mention the light on the hill, referred to by the much loved and revered Ben Chifley, whom, by the way, history records as John Curtin’s first Minister of Post-War Reconstruction. Incidentally, for the information of members, he was appointed Minister on 22 September 1942. Indeed, Chifley’s first action was to appoint Nugget Coombes as the first Permanent Head of his newly created ministry. Again, history records that it was the activities and dedication of these two men over the next four years which bequeathed to Australia the long, almost uninterrupted, years of extreme prosperity which this nation enjoyed from 1945 through to the early 1970s.

It fair breaks my heart, given that Chifley was defeated by Menzies in the 1949 election, to see how all the good economic work carried out by our war-time Government was squandered and dissipated by an apparent lack of ongoing planning by successive national Liberal Governments. For that reason, up until six years ago this nation had to pay a very high price. Some examples of what this lack of planning between 1949 and 1972 led to were record levels of unemployment, a lack of manufacturing investment in South Australia, high tariff barriers resulting in Australians having to pay more for imported goods and services; and last, but no means least, the worsening of Australia’s trading position. That is precisely the same position inherited by John Curtin when he came to power. The parallels between the situation existing when Curtin and Hawke respectively were elected to the position of Prime Minister of Australia must be striking to all members. The benefits which we, as a nation, have had and derived from the economic planning of these two Australian Prime Ministers are only now being realised by the nation’s inhabitants.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: On a point of order, I ask you, Mr President, to rule that this is turning into a dissertation of personal opinion and an abuse of leave to make a so-called explanation.

The PRESIDENT: I am not prepared to do that. Traditionally, the answers and the questions have been able to be conducted in members’ own time. It is the right of any member, if he objects to what is happening, to call ‘question’ on any member. I know you are loath to do it, but that is your solution. I am not taking it as a point of order.

The Hon. T. CROTHERS: I am sure everyone will agree that if Australia is doing well then South Australia is also doing well. The questions, therefore, that I wish to direct to the Acting Leader of the Bannon Government in this place are as follows: first, does the Acting Leader believe that the duumvirates of Curtin and Chifley and Hawke and Keating have been so successful because they have had an overall economic game plan as compared to their political opponents who appear to have had none?

Secondly, does the Acting Leader believe that the good economic health of the State of South Australia is in part related to sound economic planning by national Governments?

Finally, does the Acting Leader believe that the reconstituted practices of procuring the bulk of our defence requirements from Australian industrial resources as opposed to previous conservative Government policies of buying from overseas is beneficial for employment, generating new skills and ensuring that Australia has its own defence manufacturing capacities and is also beneficial to the national economy in general terms and, more specifically, to the South Australian economy?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I do not think there is any doubt at all that the plan that both the Hawke Government and the Bannon Government have put in place in terms of managing the economy within Australia has played a significant part in the recovery of our economy during the latter part of this decade. The comparisons that the honourable member has drawn between the work of the Chifley Government and that of the Hawke Government is probably very apt, because it seems to me it is no coincidence that the people of Australia have chosen Labor Governments to see them through times of crisis because they know that Labor Governments will be more sympathetic and will respond more appropriately to the needs of ordinary people.

It is appropriate that the honourable member should draw the comparison between the war reconstruction years and the work that was done by Labor Governments at that time and the work that has been done by the Hawke Government in bringing us out of the economic doldrums of the early part of this decade. During the time that the Hawke Government has been in power there has been an increase of 1.5 million jobs in Australia and an increase in total employment of close to 25 per cent. There has been a real per capita disposable income increase of 7.7 per cent. This is the first Government in 35 years, for which comparable figures have been kept, that has been able to repay both external and domestic debt. That is a direct result of the wage restraint brought about by the accord, which was an agreement that no other Government had been able to achieve in Australia.

The Hawke Government has addressed many of the hard decisions within Australia. It has dealt with tax reform, financial deregulation and restructuring the labor market. During that time we have seen a restoration of business profits back to the levels of 15 years ago. We have also seen a better targeting of welfare resources so that we are now able to see pensioners receiving 25 per cent of average weekly earnings. Many other things have been achieved under this Federal Government without having to raise the general level of taxation. That has stayed the same as it was in 1982.

Within South Australia, of course, the same sort of things have occurred. Our economy has grown by 30 per cent since the Bannon Government came to power. Our participation rates in employment are also up. There has been an increase of 110 000 new jobs within South Australia. There has been an increase in investment in various areas of the economy. Last year we saw an employment growth in manufacturing which was three times higher than the national average. Much of the investment which has come into South Australia, which totals \$7.6 billion since 1982, has brought with it the creation of 13 000 new jobs. There has also been an increase in tourism investment within South Australia during the last couple of years, and in the last 12 months in particular. South Australia continues to have the lowest level of industrial disputation of any mainland State in Australia. The records of Labor Governments at both Federal and State level have been excellent.

Just to finish off, it seems to me that the most recent successes of the Federal Government and of the State Government in bringing some of these defence contracts back on shore, and particularly into South Australia, will be one of the decisions for which the Bannon Labor Government will long be remembered. Not only have we won the \$4 billion submarine contract, but recently we won about 16 per cent of the Anzac frigate contract. Along with that will come many jobs into the South Australian community over a period of many years. In fact, a whole new area of

industrial development and activity is being generated around those contracts. Some 27 new companies, which are related to the defence and aerospace industries, have set up in South Australia as a result of those contracts coming here and as a result of the work that has been done by Labor Governments, both State and Federal, in improving the quality of life of people in this country.

NARACOORTE CORPORATION

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: Has the Minister of Local Government an answer to the question that I asked on 17 August regarding a possible conflict of interest within Naracoorte corporation? I am happy that it should be inserted in *Hansard* without being read.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I certainly have this response. I should have thought that the honourable member would be interested in hearing the response, but, in view of the request, I seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The investigation into an alleged breach of the conflict of interest provisions of the Local Government Act by a former councillor of the Naracoorte Corporation is complete.

Allegations that the conflict of interest provisions have been breached are taken very seriously. The offence carries a maximum penalty of \$10 000 or imprisonment for one year and conviction may result in disqualification for election to council for seven years. Investigations into such allegations are thorough and take some time and can be delayed through the unavailability of witnesses. In this case, documentation which may have simplified the inquiry was inconclusive and statements were required from a number of persons.

Having considered the Crown Solicitor's advice, I have decided that proceedings will not be instituted by my Department in this case. I have advised the person who made the initial inquiry and will write to the other parties involved to advise them of the decision. The council, and the former councillor involved, will be reminded in strong terms of the need for council members to ensure not only that they give impartial consideration to matters before council, but that they are seen to do so.

HOMESTART SCHEME

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs, a question about the HomeStart scheme.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Members will be aware of the HomeStart leaflets which have been provided to members and to consumers in South Australia headed, 'How to Reach the Light at the End of the Tunnel.' Some cynics have suggested that the light at the end of the tunnel might be the headlights of an oncoming train. Under the heading, 'What happens to my loan balance?', the following appears:

Remember, HomeStart loans should enable you to avoid paying rent and to own a home without paying any more in real terms over the life of the loan than you would with a conventional loan. Today's *Advertiser* and *News* have given the lie to that. I wish to quote quickly from an article by an independent financial journalist, Grant Rowlands, in the *News*. He quotes that section, and says:

This is not so. Under HomeStart the total amount paid on the \$61 600 loan is \$443 154 compared with \$216 384 under a 15 per cent bank loan and \$243 386 under a 17 per cent building society loan.

That is a claim made not by the Liberal Party but by an independent financial journalist in the afternoon newspaper. The Fair Trading Act—an Act which binds the Crown—in section 56 (1), under 'Division II—Trade Practices', provides:

A person shall not, in trade or commerce, engage in conduct that is misleading or deceptive or is likely to mislead or deceive.

That would be applicable. One could also argue under section 58, which provides:

A person shall not, in trade or commerce, in connection with the supply or possible supply of goods or services or in connection with the promotion by any means of the supply or use of goods or services—

(a) falsely represent that goods are of a particular standard, quality, grade . . .

Also, section 64 is possibly relevant:

A person shall not, in trade or commerce, engage in conduct that is liable to mislead the public as to the nature, the characteristics, the suitability for their purpose or the quantity of any services.

This Fair Trading Act is meant to protect consumers of goods and services within South Australia against misleading advertising, and the Act quite clearly binds the Crown. This Government's advertising of the HomeStart Scheme contravenes section 56 of the Fair Trading Act and ought to be investigated.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Isn't that an opinion?

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: After Mr Crothers' question, anything is possible. My questions to the Minister are: first, will the Minister refer this leaflet and advertising to the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs for an urgent investigation as to whether or not the advertising contravenes the provisions of the Fair Trading Act? Secondly, will the Government withdraw this advertising until such time as that review by the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs has been finalised?

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: I am sure that the action the honourable member is calling for will not be necessary and I think that the sort of criticisms that he is making here have already been made by his Leader.

I understand that the Minister of Housing has already issued a statement to address the issues raised by members of the Liberal Party about these issues, so I would be very surprised if he would consider it necessary for a review by the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs of this pamphlet. However, I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague who no doubt will respond as quickly as he is able to.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: BLACK RIBBON DAY

The Hon. M.S. Feleppa: I seek the indulgence of the Council to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.S. Feleppa: Mr President, during yesterday's debate on Black Ribbon Day, marking 50 years of the infamous Hitler-Stalin pact, the Hon. Mr Stefani chose to misrepresent my actions in adjourning the debate on 23 August. I will quote Mr Stefani's contribution from *Hansard* yesterday when he said:

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.

Mr President, I clearly indicated in my speech yesterday that I was unable to make my contribution on 23 August because of the way Parliamentary business proceeded. I therefore ask that the record be set straight in relation to the inference made in Mr Stefani's comments yesterday.

I was not instructed to adjourn the debate on 23 August as was suggested by the Hon. Mr Stefani, nor did I adjourn the debate because I did not understand the significance that date for people from Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. I would have thought that my contribution yesterday and my contribution to that protest rally held by the Baltic people's organisation in South Australia, which was held on Saturday 26 August, would have indicated my deep and sincere understanding of the suffering of the people from Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.

I chose not to interject yesterday specifically when the Hon. Mr Stefani made his remark so that the dignity of the debate on such an important motion would not be disturbed. However, I feel that I should make this personal explanation today to set the record straight. I also now must take this opportunity to ask that the Hon. Mr Stefani acquaint himself with the proper procedures of the Westminster parliamentary system before he makes assertions similar to those he made yesterday.

SEMITRAILER SPEED LIMITS

The Hon. I. Gilfillan: I am advised that the Minister of Local Government has an answer to my question about speed limits of semitrailers. I am happy for that to be incorporated into *Hansard*.

The Hon. Anne Levy: I seek leave to have this answer recorded in *Hansard* without my reading it. It is a lengthy reply.

Leave granted.

My colleague, the Minister of Transport, has advised me that the national decision to increase the open road heavy vehicle speed limit from 80 to 100 km/h was made on two grounds: economic and road safety. The economic grounds are fairly obvious: that the transfer of freight could be done legally in a shorter time. These economic grounds still pertain, and provide a justification for the increase in the speed limit.

The road safety grounds are more complex. A major point argued in favour of increasing the speed limit for heavy vehicles was that it would result in fewer cars overtaking semi-trailers and therefore in fewer overtaking crashes. It was recognised that the effects of the speed limit increases on semi-trailer speeds and crashes would have to be carefully monitored to detect any possible unforeseen consequences. For that reason, the speed limit increases were introduced in two stages.

Interpretation of the South Australian data on speed shows that there has probably been slight increases of 1 or 2 km in the mean speeds of both cars and semi-trailers over the last 3 years. The fact that this increase applies equally to cars and semi-trailers indicates that it was not caused by the increase in the open road heavy vehicle speed limit, which, of course, did not apply to cars. The most likely explanation is that gradual improvements in vehicle engineering and road standards have resulted in all types of vehicles travelling slightly faster on the open road.

Given that the increase in the speed limit had no effect on the mean speed of travel of semi-trailers, it follows that it could not have had a measurable effect on the frequency of semi-trailer crashes.

In summary, the evidence to date indicates that the increases in the heavy vehicle open road speed limit has had no effect on road safety in the State. It is a nationally agreed standard with economic benefits and South Australia will not move to return to the 80 km/h limit.

That is not to say that the Government is not concerned about the safety record of heavy goods vehicles and especially of semi-trailers. This is one type of vehicle where the remarkable safety improvements of the last 4 years have not been achieved. The Government is well aware that a relatively small number of owners and drivers are irresponsible both in the speeds at which they drive and in their standard of maintenance.

The Government is very active in this area and has already announced that later this year inspectors of the Road Safety Division of the Transport Department will start a program of random stopping and inspection of heavy vehicles. Also, all State and Federal Transport Ministers have been approached with a suggestion that all new heavy goods vehicles be required to be fitted with electro-mechanical devices which will limit their speed capability.

The Police Department is investigating the possible use of equipment which will automatically photograph speeding vehicles. Also, researchers in the Road Safety Division are, with the co-operation of the Coroner, studying all files on fatal road accidents to determine those in which semi-trailers are involved. It is hoped that this work will throw some light on the causes of these accidents so that other countermeasures can be developed.

ROAD FUNDING

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government a question on road funding.

Leave granted.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: Owing to the wet season following the drought a lot of damage has been done to roads in all parts of this State, but I refer particularly to one on Eyre Peninsula. An article in yesterday's *Port Lincoln Times*, headed 'Lock Road a death trap', states in part:

The Elliston to Lock road is a death trap, open or closed, according to Elliston doctor Clive Auricht. Dr Auricht said the road's condition was so shocking it threatened lives if driven on, but when closed meant a detour of up to 122 km to reach patients.

He said this medical delay could also endanger life. Just one month ago, before the road was closed, a car carrying a family of three rolled off the road. One of the family was seriously hurt and suffered severe blood loss. Four hours passed before another motorist passed and they were brought to hospital.

But this is the irony. The article continues:

The road was closed two weeks later after the head supervisor of the Lock Highways Department branch crashed his car on it.

That gives some idea of what the road is like. That road is still closed. It is the main thoroughfare and it is funded by the Highways Department as an arterial road. Cleve District Council has applied for \$582 000. In early May, the council made formal application to the State Disaster Committee for assistance towards the \$582 000 of damage then existing. Subsequently, on 6 May, a second deluge fell, creating a further \$678 750 damage. The council stated that these floods are the worst within living memory of local inhabitants. I can see the Minister indicating that the Premier has made an announcement about this, and I will read that out in a moment.

On 6 April, Mr Francis of the District Council of Cleve applied to the State Disaster Fund, and the following reply was received from Mr Fairhead:

The assistance offered previously to other councils in similar circumstances has been in the form of concessional loans, that is, with the Government subsidising interest rates. These loans were based on the cost of repairs to essential roads, with repair costs assessed by the Highways Department, and evidence that these costs were beyond council's ability to fund, that is, as a proportion of rate revenue.

Subsequently, the Premier wrote to the council on 1 September 1987, as follows:

I am pleased to inform you that the Government has approved a contribution totalling \$0.5 million toward meeting the costs of restoring essential roads. This grant will be distributed amongst all the councils involved on the recommendation of the Local Roads Advisory Committee which has been asked to treat the matter with some urgency.

And this is the relevant part—

I emphasise that this assistance does not set a precedent for the future and it is important that your council considers how it plans and provides for such situations in the future.

My questions to the Minister are: first, will the councils referred to be eligible for concessional loans, as Mr Fairhead suggested, with Government subsidised interest? The present grant will meet only one-quarter of the extra funding required to restore those roads to a condition suitable for traffic. One must bear in mind that these roads must be repaired soon, because they are drying out and some of them are subject to drift. Some roads are required for use by school buses or to transport grain to silos. Secondly, in the light of the Premier's response, is there likely to be any financial assistance to any councils should a natural disaster strike in the future?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I believe that these questions should be directed to the Minister of Transport. As I understand it, road funding for councils comes through the Minister of Transport. There is involvement through the Department of Local Government, but allocations for highways are made by the Minister of Transport and not through my good offices. As I understand it, the Premier's announcement regarding a one-off sum to help with the roads has been appreciated by the councils concerned. I hope that they appreciate also the effort made by the Government in providing this sum to attempt to solve what are undoubtedly very difficult problems. I will ascertain the Road Grants Committees' attitude towards the effect that this one-off grant will have on any future grants made through the normal road grant program. I will bring back a reply as soon as possible.

ELDERLY PEDESTRIANS

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister for the Aged, a question about traffic lights and the aged.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: The issue of declining mobility is increasingly seen as a major factor which impacts on the status of older people. The Western Australian Government has taken an interest in this matter and mobility trials, which identified that many aged people walk so slowly that they are at risk each time they use traffic lights to cross a road, have been undertaken. The trial demonstrated that an average 65-year-old person would walk at an average speed of one metre per second. The traffic lights allowed enough time for a pedestrian to cross a road at a speed of not less than 1.2 metres a second.

Following these trials, recommendations have been made to the Western Australian Minister of Transport and the Minister for the Aged that the time allowed by traffic lights should be extended and that more concrete islands and

median strips should be provided. It is interesting to note that last year in South Australia people aged 60 years and over accounted for 11 of the 43 pedestrian fatalities representing a quarter of the pedestrian fatalities in this State. That percentage is well above the proportion of older people in our population.

Will the Minister determine whether trials have been undertaken in South Australia to investigate and identify physical factors such as the timing of traffic lights that place the aged (who have decreasing mobility) at risk. Has consideration been given to the provision of concrete islands and median strips on major roads and/or extending the time between the change of lights as a means of addressing this concern for an increasing proportion of our population?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to have the following replies to questions inserted in *Hansard*.
Leave granted.

STIRLING COUNCIL

In reply to the **Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN** (23 August).

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: In relation to the honourable member's questions 1 and 2 I seek leave to table copies of letters, dated 7 June 1989, 29 June 1989, 18 July 1989 and 20 July 1989, from the Crown Solicitor to Mr E.P. Mullighan QC. These letters comprise the Government instructions to Mr Mullighan QC as varied from time to time.

It should be noted that the procedures referred to by the honourable member as the 'fast track' procedures in no way interfere with the court processes that were in hand; nor do they in any way limit the legal rights of the defendant or the claimants.

As the letter of 7 June 1989 makes abundantly clear, Mr Mullighan QC was initially asked to provide advice to the Government on the nature and extent of the evidence available to the plaintiffs represented by Andersons and to the defendant. He was also asked to advise on what, in his opinion, would be an appropriate settlement figure for each of those claims.

Subsequently, on 29 June 1989 and as a direct result of the commendable progress already made by Mr Mullighan QC, he was asked to provide advice on the minimum amount that, in his opinion, the Andersons plaintiff's claims could be settled for. Importantly, Mr Mullighan QC was also asked to advise whether, in his opinion, a settlement at that amount would be reasonable in the light of all relevant factors.

It is now a matter of public record that the efforts of Mr Mullighan QC—for which all concerned owe a sincere vote of thanks—have provided the catalyst that was so badly needed to bring the parties to the point where a reasonable settlement of the Anderson claims could be made.

As the final letter that I have tabled indicates, Mr Mullighan's brief has been extended to include those other bushfire claims that are still outstanding against Stirling council. I expect these to be finalised in the very near future.

In relation to fees and costs, as the letter of 7 June 1989 indicates, Mr Mullighan QC is entitled to fees of \$2 000 per day. These fees are being met from the budget of the Attorney-General's Department and totalled \$67 000 for his considerable efforts in resolving the Anderson group of claims.

In reply to the **Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN** (24 August).

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: In response to the honourable member's questions 1 and 3, neither the Crown Solicitor nor other Government officers—nor indeed Ministers—made a detailed evaluation or assessment of the evidence available to the defendant or to the plaintiff in the 1980 Ash Wednesday bushfire cases. This was neither the purpose nor the intention in setting up the Mullighan process.

Letters from the Crown Solicitor to Mr Mullighan QC that I have already tabled clearly set out the purpose of his task. In essence, this was for Mr Mullighan—as a highly respected and experienced Queen's Counsel—to form a view on what level of settlement for damages claims against Stirling council would be reasonable in all the circumstances. This was not for the primary purpose of informing the Government on these matters, but to provide independent advice available to the different parties to enhance the possibility of an early settlement of the damages claims against the council.

With regard to question 2, the letters to which I have already referred set out in some detail the requirements of Mr Mullighan's brief. In addition, the comments made by the honourable member in his lead-up to these questions on 24 August 1989 raised some important points to which I am reluctant to respond at this time. It is expected that Mr Mullighan QC will complete his tasks by 8 September 1989 and I hope that by that date damages will have been agreed between the parties on all 1980 bushfire claims against Stirling council.

I intend at that time to make a detailed statement on the Stirling issues, including those concerns raised by the honourable member. Suffice to say at this stage that legal costs on the bushfire claims to date are over \$6 million and it has been reasonably estimated that the Mullighan process set up by the Government has avoided, as a result of the out-of-court settlements that have been agreed, a further \$5 million legal costs.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 5 September. Page 666.)

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I support the second reading of this Bill, and I commend the Hon. Trevor Griffin for his detailed analysis of its provisions. He indicated that the Liberal Party supports in principle the extension of the Equal Opportunity Act to include the ground of age. Our concerns about a number of aspects of this Bill, particularly those relating to implementation, will be raised during the Committee stage.

When I spoke to a similar Bill in April this year, I noted that I had some concern about the fact that the Government has not considered the ramifications of this legislation in the light of its intention to introduce a Bill relating to age discrimination. I very much regret that since April we have not seen the Government's age discrimination legislation. We have not been able to compare the impact of the implementation of the intellectual impairment provision in both Bills. In that regard, I am most concerned, because medical opinion would differ as to whether such diseases and illnesses as Alzheimer's disease and dementia are intellectual impairments or mental illnesses.

We are looking at these matters at the same time as we are addressing age discrimination and I think it would have been a courtesy to members in this place if they had been

given those Bills. The Government should have provided the opportunity for wider community comment on the association of those matters. As we all know, we have an increasing proportion of older people in this community. We have associated with that a high and growing incidence of dementia, and I think we should be looking at the two measures together and not in isolation, as the Government intends.

I also note that the Government has made one significant amendment to the Bill last introduced in April. This Bill refers to 'unpaid workers' and the earlier Bill referred to 'volunteers'. That change was sought during the recess by the Volunteer Centre of South Australia which was not initially contacted in relation to this Bill. When they had time to consider it, they recommended such a change, and I note that the Government has accepted that change. However, in my own discussions with the centre and with a number of other representative organisations in the non-government welfare sector, I learnt that the Office for the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity had had no cases of discrimination reported to it from the voluntary workers section.

However, it was concerned about the area of work experience. If that is the nature of the Commissioner's specific concern, I believe that we should in this legislation be addressing this matter rather than broadening the ambit to encompass all unpaid workers. This notion, which will be the subject of a Liberal Party amendment, certainly has the support of SACOSS and, I believe, of the Volunteer Centre of South Australia if pressed on the point. I have not undertaken that at this stage, but certainly that was the basis of earlier advice to me after they had spoken with the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity. I wish to read a letter sent by SACOSS on 6 September to the Attorney-General in relation to this Bill. It is as follows:

The South Australian Council of Social Services sees the amendments to the Equal Opportunity Act as well intentioned. However, we have some concerns at a pragmatic level with the Act and with the process of consultation surrounding the Act.

Firstly, we believe there was quite good consultation around changes in the Act in relation to intellectual impairment, and we applaud the changes within the Act to this effect. However, there was virtually no consultation about other amendments to the Act that have equally far reaching implications—most notably the expanded definition of the word 'employer' and 'employee' to include coverage of unpaid workers and people in the voluntary sector. Whilst we agree with the motion of extending coverage of the Act to unemployed people to give better protection as they seek voluntary work as a way back into the work force, we do feel some negative implications for the non-government sector may have been overlooked.

At a time when there is increasing emphasis for the need of volunteers, it is unfortunate that it will be more difficult to recruit and maintain volunteers as a result of this Act.

I would like to re-emphasise that point:

At a time when there is increasing emphasis for the need of volunteers, it is unfortunate that it will be more difficult to recruit and maintain volunteers as a result of this Act.

I repeated that sentence because it seems so contrary to the professed intentions of the Government that it should be more difficult for the non-government sector to recruit and maintain volunteers. I suggest 'professed intentions' because there seems to be controversy in Government ranks in relation to the status of volunteers, whether it be in the St John service or elsewhere. If we are to believe the rhetoric of the Government, it is keen that the non-government sector recruit volunteers, but it is Sacoss's view that this Bill would have a negative impact on that goal in the future. The letter from the Executive Director continues:

We would be interested to know what extra support will be given towards the non-government sector in the early stages of the proclamation of this Act. There is also concern about the welfare arm of various church groups. These groups are heavily reliant upon volunteer staff, and volunteers are generally drawn

from within the ranks of the church. However, now it appears the organisations' rights to choose volunteers will now be limited. For example, a number of church welfare groups would have difficulty with not being able to choose on the grounds of sexuality. Clearly, for some religious groups, homosexuality and transexuality fall outside the basic tenets of that denomination.

Further to that, there is some concern about group homes, child care centres, etc. no longer having the right to discriminate on the grounds of sexuality. There would be some debate as to the appropriateness of a transexual working in a refuge situation. Indeed, there is also concern that womens shelters may be subject to some harassment from male volunteers.

Further, the use of volunteer workers, though an essential part of many welfare activities, is also extremely time consuming. The lack of resources within the welfare sector does sometimes mean that groups are less willing to take on volunteers who may be perceived as being difficult to adequately support, for example, volunteers from another race who are having difficulty mastering the English language and/or difficulties with adaptation of culture. It is hoped that welfare groups will be given extra resources to enable them to take on such volunteer staff. It is often the desire of the sector to take on this staff, though it is not practical given the limited resources within the sector.

To that point I would add that I am well aware of the desire of many non-government agencies in our community to recognise the multicultural nature and cultural diversity of our society. They believe in providing these services to our community and ensuring they reach the widest number of people. It is desirable that they recruit paid and volunteer staff from a variety of cultural and linguistic backgrounds. The letter continues:

Finally, the sector is concerned that there has been virtually no consultation on these implications with community groups. As a result of this, there is much anxiety within the sector about the full implications of the legislation. There is a general agreement that the intention of the Act is sound. However, there is genuine concern at the practical outcomes of such legislation. There is concern that the disadvantages may well outweigh the advantages. We would urge any action in relation to amending section 5 of the Act be delayed until a fuller consultation has occurred. In terms of the desire of the Act to assist people into employment, a possible compromise could be to expand the definition of 'employee' to include 'work experience/student placement' rather than the blanket 'unpaid worker'.

The letter is signed by Gerard Menses, Executive Director, SACOSS. Copies were sent to Trevor Griffin, Ian Gilfillan, and me. The letter supports a Liberal Party amendment in relation to confining the definition of unpaid worker to a person on work experience. This letter and further conversations that I have had with a number of groups, including groups that work with the intellectually impaired and the psychiatrically disabled, confirm a significant worry that they will be less able than they have been in the past to recruit volunteers who would be appropriate to work with such people. It is very important that people working with people with intellectual disabilities or mental illness be very sensitive to their needs and be particularly well vetted, whether they be volunteer or paid staff. I am acutely aware that these organisations which have been dependent on providing services are most concerned that, with the definition in the present Act, they could not provide the service they wish to provide to the persons concerned, nor to their care givers if, without a great degree of thoroughness, they cannot assess applications from volunteers to undertake such sensitive work.

I have indicated that I believe that this Bill is one for discussion, question and answer in committee, so I will leave my second reading contribution at this point and pursue some of those other matters during consideration of this Bill in Committee.

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

MARALINGA TJARUTJA LAND RIGHTS ACT

Consideration of the House of Assembly's resolution:

That, pursuant to section 43 (12) of the Maralinga Tjarutja Land Rights Act 1968, this House resolves that section 43 of the Act shall continue in operation for a further five years.

(Continued from 5 September. Page 666.)

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: On behalf of the Liberal Opposition I indicate that we support this resolution from the House of Assembly. I note that the message itself concerns the extension of the Parliamentary Committee arrangements for a further five years. I was one who was most sceptical about the merits of the parliamentary committee in relation to the Maralinga Tjarutja Land Rights Act. Looking back at the record of the debates at the time, I am interested to note my loud comments about how patronising such a committee was. I am pleased to say, five years later, that that has not been the experience of those who have served on the committee or of the Aborigines involved. They support the committee and the extension of the committee and have welcomed its visits over the past five years.

Members should note that the parliamentary committee was proposed by the member for Eyre in another place, during the time when the Legislation was before a select committee. The five year sunset clause was subsequently proposed by the Hon. Mr Lucas in this place who, like me, was rather sceptical about the establishment of this parliamentary committee and was keen that it should not just continue to exist for all time but that the matter be returned to this Parliament for consideration after a short time.

The timetable for that consideration was five years, and we will reach that point in about six months. I have witnessed the conduct of this committee for about 4½ years and I am very pleased to say on behalf of the Liberal Party that we agree to the motion so that the committee can continue its valuable work.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: The Australian Democrats also support the motion. However, in so doing the Democrats note developments in the Maralinga lands which will need the very urgent attention of the committee. A little under five years ago the Maralinga Tjarutja Land Rights Act was passed by this Parliament and it was highly significant for the Aboriginal people of this area. In recent years I visited Yalata, a settlement to the south of the lands, which is probably one of the most depressed of the Aboriginal communities in South Australia. Its people were uprooted from their traditional lands to the north—the Pitjantjatjara lands—and, as a result, their tribal ways were very much disrupted and the community has not functioned nearly as well as was hoped.

In recent years many of the people at Yalata have moved back into the heart of the Maralinga lands to a place near Lake Dey Dey, where they follow a traditional lifestyle. From all accounts, while these people still have certain needs, the good that has resulted from this move has been quite profound. However, there has been a recent development which threatens to undermine so much of what has been achieved in the past five years. I draw to the attention of members an article in the *Bulletin* of 25 July. The article, at page 35, is entitled 'Maralinga tribal lands for war games park', and it states:

The Aborigines are the same people driven off the very same land to make way for the British nuclear tests more than 30 years ago. Having just managed to get their land back, the government is saying it must become part of the new international range. Earlier letters had pointed out that the Commonwealth could over-rule any refusal on their part . . . Premier John Bannon says

that the WIR is 'clearly unique' for its size alone—130 000 square kilometres, roughly the area of England, which will allow weapons testing on a scale unimaginable in the northern hemisphere. The sales hype says Australia will be 'the envy of the world's air forces'.

Missing from the promotional material, however, is that the western sector of the mega-range belongs to a group of Maralinga people. Their land is to be at the hot end of things—a cruel irony for the families who have just started to move back to their lands and have yet to be told the full extent of British nuclear contamination.

The Aborigines have just been given some form of sovereignty over their lands, but we now find that that sovereignty is being undermined in the first instance by the Department of Defence—not primarily for defence purposes but for industrial purposes. This mega-range is to be put out to tender. The department is virtually saying, 'Anyone who has a bright idea in respect of what to do up there, let us know and we will consider it.'

The weapons producers of the world wish to use a large part of South Australia, including the Maralinga lands. There has not been adequate consultation with the Maralinga Tjarutja people in respect of this. Unfortunately, this is another example where the Department of State Development and Technology and probably the Premier's Department—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I point out to the honourable member that his remarks are fairly wide ranging, and he is getting away from the motion. The honourable member is debating other issues.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: No, Mr President, I am describing the sorts of things that the committee should address, and why I consider that they are so important. As I said, there appears to have been a gross level of political interference of which the people on the lands were not aware. Government departments have made plans as to what should happen on these lands without consulting the traditional owners. It is clear that the committee should urgently address this matter before a great deal of the good work of the past five years is undermined. Much goodwill has been built up with the Aboriginal people and they were becoming a lot more confident as they took control of their destiny, but suddenly—yet again—it is being wrenched away from them. I hope that the committee looks at this matter urgently.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE (Minister of Tourism): I thank members for their contribution to this debate and also for their support of the motion to enable the committee to continue its work. I am sure that with the support of all three political Parties in this place the committee will continue to successfully deal with matters of importance to these people and will continue to fulfil their wishes as they relate to their life on these lands. Once again, I thank members for participating in this debate and supporting the motion.

Resolution agreed to.

BUDGET PAPERS

The Hon. Barbara Wiese, for the Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I move:

That the Council take note of the papers relating to the Estimates of Payments and Receipts 1989-90.

I indicate that this motion has been put each year in the Council for some years to enable members to debate the budget papers before they are introduced into this place and to ensure that when they do arrive they enjoy a hasty passage.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I support the motion. I refer to the capital works program for 1989-90 and note that no expenditure of any kind is proposed for the electorate of Newland where I live. The electorate has been completely overlooked in this regard. The loud and clear message of the capital works program is 'Nothing for Newland'. It is true that some fairly small amounts, relatively, are to be spent in the neighbouring electorate of Florey which give some benefit to electors of Newland—but there is nothing for Newland.

The Golden Grove shared secondary facility expenditure in 1989-90 will be to the tune of \$1 093 000; the Golden Grove secondary school stage 1 \$1 558 000; the Tea Tree Gully TAFE college stage 1 \$5 312 000; and the final stages of the O-Bahn \$750 000. These, particularly the last two, will have significant catchment areas in Newland. However, the expenditure in 1989-90 is miserable. The TAFE college will not be operative at all in the current financial year. The expenditure on the TAFE college represents fees and some earthworks.

On 17 September at 10 a.m. an extraordinary ceremony to mark the commencement of the work on the college will be held, although the work will not actually commence for many months. Astonishingly enough, this ceremony will be held on the O-Bahn platform (which has already been officially opened by the Premier) and not on the site of the proposed TAFE college; I find that extraordinary. I might add that the officers of the Department of TAFE find it equally extraordinary, and they have told me so. The ceremony was arranged not by the department but by the board of the college—the Chairman of which is the member for Newland. I should have thought that, if a ceremony was to take place to mark the commencement of work, it would take place closer to the event. A marquee should have been erected on the site and the ceremony should have been in the form of turning the first sod.

The ceremony is to be performed by the Premier and by the Commonwealth Minister of Employment and Education Services, the Hon. Peter Duncan. The TAFE college will be hardly out of the ground by the end of this financial year. The college itself, of course, is a good and obviously necessary initiative, but it is a cynical exercise to try to grab pre-election publicity through this premature and inappropriate ceremony. It is amazing, in recent times, how many facilities have been opened long after they have been in operation or the start of which has been celebrated long before it happened. An example of opening a facility long after it was operational is the Hallett Cove R-10 school, which will be opened this month by the Premier. The school has been in use for 2½ years. Members will note, of course, that both Newland and Bright are marginal seats.

These are the actions of a tired government trying to get itself a few credits just before an election by holding a farcical series of opening and commencement ceremonies which have little relationship to the time of the event celebrated. No doubt the ceremony to mark the commencement of work on the Tea Tree Gully TAFE is being held on the O-Bahn platform to try to squeeze a bit more kudos out of the O-Bahn. The completion of the O-Bahn represents the final stage of a magnificent Liberal initiative, originally bitterly opposed by the present Premier and the Labor Party.

Works which have been pressed for by the local council in or for the benefit of Newland are not in the program. One is the takeover by the Government of the common effluent drainage schemes operated by the council. This was promised by a previous Minister but rejected by the present Minister. I have given details of this previously. Another is

adequate car parking at the O-Bahn terminal. As I have previously set out, this is considered by the council, apparently on good grounds, to be inadequate. Another is the upgrading of the Reid's Road ford to enable all-weather access from the Newland area through to Gorge Road in Todd. I have raised this recently: when the River Torrens is flowing strongly, the ford is impassable, and anyone seeking to travel from one area to the other has to go a long way round. In the past dozens of cars have had to be pulled out of the river and some have been swept away. An alternative to upgrading the ford would be to extend Hancock Road through to Gorge Road with an adequate crossing of the Torrens. I noted recently a sign at the entry to Reids Road saying that the ford is closed. This is not provided in the program. The program does not include any capital works in the Modbury Hospital.

The capital works program containing nothing for Newland has solved for me an enigma which has puzzled me for some time. I have noted that the car driven by the member for Newland has messages painted elaborately all over it. That on the rear reads 'Di Gayler MP Tea Tree Gully'—not 'Newland', mark you, but 'Tea Tree Gully'. On the side is written 'Di Gayler MP working for Tea Tree Gully'—not 'Newland' but 'Tea Tree Gully'. I cannot recall ever having seen signs on a member's or candidate's car which do not anywhere refer to the electorate and these on this car do not refer anywhere to the electorate of Newland.

Also I have noted that the member's newsletter is entitled *The Tea Tree Gully Report*. The Liberal candidate's newsletter on the other hand is appropriately entitled *The Newland News*. The whole emphasis appears to be on Tea Tree Gully, not on the electorate of Newland as such. Does the member not know what her electorate is? How extraordinary! No wonder the Labor Party does not want an electoral redistribution. It does not even know the names of the present electorate. After perusing the capital works program I think I see the reason.

There are considerable capital works in the neighbouring electorate of Florey, much of which is included in the City of Tea Tree Gully. Much of this expenditure is associated with the Golden Grove development. The Labor Government has done little or nothing for Newland and it would appear that the member is trying to attract for herself the credit for what the Government is doing in the Golden Grove area. It is also notable that neither the member for Newland nor a number of other ALP members and candidates have mentioned the ALP in their advertisements.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Would you if you were an ALP member?

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: Of course I would not. There is no mention of the ALP on the member for Newland's car. Every Liberal member or candidate whom I have observed has not only the name of the electorate (which the member for Newland has not) but also the Party for which they stand.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Isn't that the honest way?

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: Of course it is. One should nominate one's Party and electorate when one is either a member or a candidate seeking election. That is what the member for Newland has not done. She has not done that but the candidate for Newland has. I am informed that, when the advertisements were first on the car, ALP was mentioned. However, I cannot be certain about this. Apparently, she is not Labor and not Newland, so I really do not know—

The Hon. R.R. Roberts: She's a winner.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: She is not. She is apparently not Labor and not Newland, so I really do not know whom

she does represent. It is understandable that the member for Newland does not want to be associated with the Australian Labor Party and its pea and thimble trick in this budget. There was nothing for Newland or for South Australia in the budget. I support the motion to note the papers.

The Hon. R.R. ROBERTS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.54 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 26 September at 2.15 p.m.