

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 7 August 1985

The **SPEAKER (Hon. T.M. McRae)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

### PETITIONS: UNSWORN STATEMENT

Petitions signed by 84 residents of South Australia praying that the House support the abolition of the unsworn statement were presented by Messrs Blacker, Mathwin, and Meier. Petitions received.

### PETITION: ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

A petition signed by 349 residents of South Australia praying that the House support the objection to continual increases in electricity tariffs and call for an inquiry into the financial management of the Electricity Trust was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

### PETITION: PRESCHOOL EDUCATION

A petition signed by 124 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the State Government to request the Federal Government not to reduce expenditure on preschool education was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

### PETITION: TEACHER POLICY ON HOMOSEXUALITY

A petition signed by 30 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose the South Australian Institute of Teachers policy on homosexuality within State schools was presented by Mr Groom.

Petition received.

### PETITION: HOMOSEXUAL INFLUENCES AT SCHOOL

A petition signed by 15 residents of South Australia praying that the House amend the Equal Opportunity Act to protect children from homosexual influences at school was presented by Mr Groom.

Petition received.

### PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Consumer Affairs, Commissioner for—Report, 1983-84.

### QUESTION TIME

Dr G. DUNCAN

The **Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY**: Will the Premier overrule his Attorney-General and establish a Royal Commis-

sion into the Duncan case? If not, why not? In his response to the Opposition's call yesterday for a Royal Commission, the Attorney-General has said that the establishment of a Royal Commission may have two prejudicial effects. However, the Opposition has been informed that for all practical purposes the Attorney's concerns are irrelevant to the present circumstances in which a forum completely independent of the Government and the police may be the only way of obtaining information to clear the air once and for all about what are allegations of the gravest kind, especially those concerning political interference.

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: No; I think there is absolutely no case to overrule the Attorney-General, who is handling this matter quite properly and correctly. I have complete confidence in the way that he is pursuing the investigation. Let us get this in perspective.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: The member opposite who interjects was a member of the Cabinet which for three years had ample opportunity to release a report, and initiate investigations or have a Royal Commission. However, the former Government chose not to do so. Many allegations were made, and I can remember a particularly scurrilous motion, which was moved in this House and which matched a motion moved in another place in 1980, dealing in a tangential way with such events in which every opportunity could have been taken to do so. That opportunity was not taken, and it seems to me extraordinary that members of the present Opposition, who had all those opportunities while in Government in dealing with a case which took place at a time when not one of my members was in Cabinet (in fact very few were in the Parliament—those events having taken place in 1972), are now saying that there is some political problem in this matter. That is absolute nonsense.

From the very day the allegations were published in the *Advertiser* newspaper the Attorney-General acted to authorise the Crown Solicitor and the Police Commissioner to undertake an investigation into those allegations. At every stage he has said that the matter must be pursued. A special task force has been assembled to do just that. Proper protections and support will be provided for it. That investigation is going on. As my colleague the Attorney-General points out, at this stage it would be totally irresponsible to have a Royal Commission into a matter, the allegations of which have not even been tested properly in a preliminary way.

There has been a lot of public media controversy over it, statements and counter statements, but meanwhile the proper documented investigation is taking place as a matter of urgency, and based on the forthcoming findings the Government will then determine what it is appropriate to do. It would be my sincere wish (as I imagine it would be everyone's wish) that there is new evidence that can lead to successful prosecution against those who perpetrated the act in 1972. But whether that is so at this stage cannot be established.

The Attorney-General has also made clear that to precipitately jump off into a Royal Commission type of inquiry could in fact prevent the successful prosecution of those who perpetrated that act in 1972. Are honourable members opposite, or indeed is anyone in the community, going to put the law enforcers in a position that will inhibit such a prosecution? The Attorney-General has spelt that out quite clearly, within the terms of the Royal Commissions Act and the proceedings. It has been made quite clear why that would inhibit the matter.

Let me repeat: we hope that the investigations that are being conducted and the information coming forward (and I understand that we need a lot more hard information than

has been published to date in this matter) will lead to a successful prosecution of those who were involved. If in fact at the end of that investigation we are not able to be in that position, the Attorney-General will make his recommendations to the Government as to what further action is necessary—whether it be a Royal Commission or whatever. That can be determined only at the appropriate time.

I assure the House that this matter is being pursued with vigour. It is a matter in which none of the members of the present Government have been involved. The previous Government had a full three years to deal with the matter, had it so wished. Obviously Attorney-General Griffin at that time did read the report, because before the election he had announced his clear intention to reactivate the case and release that report. He did not do so, presumably for good reasons—good reasons based in law and fact. Nothing has changed so far except a series of allegations which are being tested. If those tests show that there is substance that has to be explored, it will be explored.

### HOUSING TRUST BUILDING PROGRAM

**Ms LENEHAN:** As there are a number of proposed Housing Trust developments planned within my electorate, including the Morphett Vale East development, can the Premier tell the House whether the Government's recent decision to freeze the Housing Trust rentals will in any way affect the trust's building program? Whilst I have been contacted by several constituents congratulating the Government on the action which it has taken in freezing Housing Trust rentals, those same constituents have expressed concern regarding the allegations which have recently been made by the member for Light that, in freezing the Trust's rental program and the rentals charged, this would result in a reduction in the Trust's building program. As this is causing confusion, I ask the Premier to clarify the situation.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The statement received considerable publicity, in fact the front page, in the morning press. The answer to that question is 'No.' I find it extraordinary that the Opposition, which spends half its time braying about taxes and charges rising in this State and the terrible imposts under which the people of South Australia are groaning, when confronted with a responsible decision of that sort, a decision made and fully explained by myself and my colleague the Minister of Housing as to the action we are taking, which is in the interests of Housing Trust tenants, complain about it and say, 'What a terrible thing: these rents should be jacked up and put up immediately.' I hope the member for Light is going to publicise that widely throughout the community. It is probably an indication as to how the Opposition would deal with these matters in the future. It would have embarrassed his colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, who has been trying to create completely the opposite impression.

I suppose the member for Light had an attack of what one might call Valderism, that is, a sudden urgent desire to speak the truth publicly about the plans of the Liberal Party. If that is so, I appreciate his honesty and I am happy that he put it on the record. We know what the Liberal Party policies were in Federal and State office, the so-called market related rents, the effect of which would be to jack up public housing rents by a very considerable number of dollars a week as they sought to reach a level in conjunction with the private housing sector market. In that situation one asks: why have a Housing Trust? I guess we again relate that to another policy of the Liberals, who would answer, 'Yes, you are right. Let us privatise it; we will raise the rents so high that there will be a good profit margin and then we will sell them off to the private sector.' If that is their long-

term plan, again let us hope that this spirit of Valderism continues to affect members opposite and that we hear the real truth about that matter.

It is a nice coming together of two of their policies, the first being to attempt to ensure that public sector services are not helping in the way that they should help people in need in our community, and the second is that one tries to put them in a position where they can be sold off in the sale of the century—the sale of South Australian assets—to ensure that there is a short fix to the budgetary dilemma in which the Liberal Government would find itself.

That course of action is not acceptable to my Government. We are very proud of our Housing Trust, which is the foremost Housing Trust in this country. It has an international reputation. We have a better financed and better developed public housing system than any other State in Australia and, under my colleague the Minister of Housing, far from there being an adverse effect on the Housing Trust construction program, we have had record levels of construction. A target of 9 000 homes within our period of Housing Trust construction and acquisition will be met, and there is no question about that. That has been accompanied by a major private sector revival in housing and, more importantly, the building program of the trust is the largest building program since approximately 1964, so let us not hear any members opposite attempting to criticise our record in relation to housing.

I would have thought that any pronouncement that my Government and my Minister make on that subject would be listened to with respect by the community and by the industry, because our record is there for all to see. When we make a decision that we can afford not to increase Housing Trust basic rents for the next period while we undertake an investigation, that should be listened to. The reasons were spelled out: it is not short-term expediency. It is based on an investigation of the difference between the market rent concept of the Liberals—their 'sell it off and jack it up' policy—and the cost rent policy under the new Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement.

What its precise implications are, what the appropriate levels of rent are, and how that fits in with our concession scheme that at the moment is benefiting something like 60 per cent of trust tenants are all questions that have to be answered before we make a further determination. As I say, while I admire the honesty of the member for Light in letting the real policy of the Liberals be known, he does no service at all to public housing or Housing Trust tenants in creating alarm of the sort that he did. The Housing Trust program will continue at its record level in the next year.

### Dr G. DUNCAN

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I ask a question supplementary to that asked by my colleague the Deputy Leader. Given the Premier's rejection of a Royal Commission option in the Duncan case, and given the statement that he made that the Government needs a lot more hard information as yet, will the Government immediately offer a substantial reward for information leading to the conviction of any person or persons responsible for the death of Dr Duncan, and will it offer immunity from prosecution to any person other than a principal offender?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Those matters were raised yesterday in the course of the ongoing debate in this case, and my colleague the Attorney-General is giving them full consideration. If it is desirable or necessary to take those actions, they will be taken. I correct the preliminary statement made by the honourable member that we have rejected a Royal Commission: we have not rejected nor has my

colleague rejected that as being a possibility if it proves necessary or desirable so to do. My colleague is simply making the point that at this stage there is no evidence that that would be the best course of action. On the contrary. I am appalled that the Opposition is playing around with this case in this way because, although some of its members were in Parliament, none of them was directly involved, either. It was some 13 years ago, and we would like to see the matter cleared up because it is a notorious case. It is surely in the interests of public debate that the proper investigation take place without prejudicing the possibility of prosecution.

My colleague has made clear that, if we launch into a Royal Commission at this stage, we prejudice the possibility of prosecution. So, let us have some responsibility from members opposite in their approach. They should stop trying to create sensationalism about something which we have as much interest as they do in clearing up.

### LIBERAL PARTY HOUSING POLICY

**Mr HAMILTON:** I ask the Minister of Housing and Construction a question supplementary to that asked by the member for Mawson. Can he say whether housing statements in a Liberal Party glossy campaign supplement have any credibility? The supplement was circulated a few weeks ago in the *Sunday Mail*. In its housing section it claimed that interest rates are higher than they have ever been. It also claimed that a Liberal Government would provide 'affordable houses'. I have been approached by many constituents who doubt the veracity of many of the statements in that pamphlet. Can the Minister lay to rest once and for all the questions raised in that document and respond to my constituents?

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I will be only too pleased to respond to the honourable member's question. The use of the phrase 'affordable housing' as a slogan by the Liberal Party can only be described as an obscenity. Affordable housing is the trademark of this Government. What is more, everybody out there in the community knows it. The Hawke and Bannon Governments will be remembered for our outstanding support for housing, both for home buyers and for those renting, either in the private or the public sectors.

The Liberal Party's glossy pamphlet is full of falsehoods. Interest rates are not higher than they have ever been, land is not scarce through being rationed by this Government and the Housing Trust is not being restricted in its program by high Government costs. In fact, interest rates for local building societies reached a peak of 14.25 per cent under the Tonkin Government.

As far as scarcity of land is concerned, allotments from the Government's Urban Land Trust are being exhausted and have made a significant contribution to meeting demand. It is simply not true that the Government is rationing land. In fact, the majority of vacant allotments are in the hands of private owners and private developers, and not the Government. They are being held and not being put up for sale because they are hopeful of making a killing at the expense of those people seeking to get into the home market. Neither is the trust program being restricted by Government costs—that is just laughable. This Government's expansion of public housing is so overwhelming that it is beyond dispute.

A record 9 000 additional low-rental homes will be provided in the first term of this Government's office, and 14 000 households in this State have been helped to buy homes under Labor Government policies. These families would still be renting if it were not for this Government's schemes. About 7 000 householders renting privately are receiving assistance with their rent payments, whilst about

600 are receiving help with mortgage repayments. About 65 per cent of trust tenants are paying reduced rents whilst this Government has launched the biggest per capita public housing programme in the history of Australia.

Private building, too, has been revitalised by this Government filling the contract books of private building companies and eliminating unemployment in the building industry. Home building has reached about 14 000 commencements a year under the Bannon Government, while the Tonkin Government allowed the industry to run down from this level under previous State Labor Governments to a measly 7 500 per year. That is why there was massive unemployment and a slump in the industry. The use by the Liberal Party of the term 'affordable homes' is an insult to all those South Australians who lost ground in their struggle for affordable shelter under the Tonkin Government. The Liberal Party's glossy pamphlet is an outrageous concoction of untruths and fantasies.

### ETSA

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Will the Premier confirm that the Government's decision to remit to the Electricity Trust some of the Government's turnover tax on the Trust has been made on a one-off basis only and, if this is the case, will he explain how the Trust will keep down electricity charges in future years? The announcement by the Premier on Monday of this week will save the average consumer on M tariff 2.6c a day—less than 20c a week. This will be achieved by remitting to the Trust \$11 million, or about 40 per cent of the Government's tax on ETSA introduced by the Dunstan Government. This \$11 million is \$2 million less than the extra interest the Trust now has to pay the State Government as a result of decisions of this Government in respect of interest rationalisation.

I also understand that the decision to remit part of the tax this year has been made on a one-off basis as evidenced by the Premier's statement on air. In asking the Premier to confirm this matter, I also ask him to explain what advice the trust has given him on how it will keep prices down in the future.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The material that the honourable member puts in in the explanation of his question is old stuff and has been repeated many times. In looking not only at the pending tariff increase but also at future ones, the Government has had in-depth discussions with the Electricity Trust of South Australia about its financing, future arrangements and possible deficit. We have taken all that into account in the decision we have made. The remission is for 1985-86 in order to secure a 2 per cent reduction in tariffs.

But, let me make clear that to that should be added the normal cost increase of CPI, which would have occurred—an average perhaps depending on what it is of around 7 per cent or so. We are getting in fact close to a 10 per cent reduction in real terms in electricity tariffs. As to the figures of so many cents a day that the honourable member puts in, I notice that when members opposite talked about electricity price increases they did not use cents a day; they used annual figures, if I remember rightly, which are some dollars.

All he is doing is highlighting that, in terms of electricity tariffs, one can put it in a cents a day way and in terms of the commodity that is delivered it is not too bad a price, in general terms. It is often compared with the price of other commodities we might buy daily—milk or whatever. It comes out quite well. It is very interesting that, when they want to minimise advantages or benefits it is cents per

day: when they want to cry 'shock, horror' over these things it suddenly becomes annual rates in dollars.

However, I will leave that because it is a peripheral argument. The fact is that it represents a very real substantial reduction in electricity tariffs. We have gone further: we have said that next year—and the trust understands this fully and has looked at the figuring of it—there will be an increase below the rate of CPI. So, we are ensuring that there are added real reductions in terms of electricity tariffs over that time. I would have thought that that was an extraordinary result.

In fact, there has never been a reduction in the history of the Electricity Trust as far as we can ascertain. It certainly is a stark contrast with the 60 per cent increase that was set in place under the Tonkin Government. That was the appalling increase laid on. If one talks about the levy, that has been in that base of charges of the Electricity Trust since 1971. The previous Government was in office for three years and at any time could have done something about remitting that levy, but it did not do so. It did not touch it. We are the first Government since that was imposed to have remitted anything from that levy, and we have done it this year.

*The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** On a temporary basis, the gas levy, but I am talking about electricity and that was the question. The restructuring of ETSA accounts and interest rates was a course of action that the previous Government had already said was appropriate, because it meant that there was across the board, in terms of public sector borrowing requirements, a uniform rate which took into account the overall needs of the public sector.

It made a lot of sense in terms of public finance and accountability. Again, there was a one off effect of that restructuring which now no longer has any effect because the rates are in conformity with the general level of rates. That is an old furphy for the honourable member to bring up. The basic point remains that the Opposition, having screamed about electricity tariffs and having inflicted the worst possible gas price agreement which helped to jack those tariffs up in the period of our Government and which we were helpless—

*The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I am amazed that the honourable member even has the gall to interject on that. At least he had the decency to let the question be asked by the member for Light.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Deputy Leader to come to order.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The extraordinary thing is, Mr Speaker, that having done all that—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Premier to resume his seat. I call the honourable Deputy Leader to order. I think that the honourable gentleman was absent from the House yesterday. I remind all honourable members of the point that I made yesterday that, in calling any member to order, I was giving notice to all members. If members continue, they will be on the receiving end of only one further warning. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** It has gone on for so long in this way and, when we take action and can do something as a result of the financial management that we have introduced and of our negotiations with the Electricity Trust, suddenly it has become a thing to be condemned. The honourable member who asked the question is the very one who attacks us over Housing Trust rents: he wants them increased! There is this real sour grapes attitude on the part of the Opposition. All these crocodile tears about taxes and charges have been exposed.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the member for Light.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** We see this total hypocrisy whenever action is taken: instead of support or welcome, it becomes a con, a gimmick, or something that is one off. In their reaction this week to the Government's tax package, Opposition members have exposed themselves for the shallow, cynical bunch that they are.

## LIBERAL PARTY POLICY

**Mr MAYES:** Can the Deputy Premier say whether the Government has prepared evaluations of the likely effects on the Government's social welfare program of the comments made by the Federal President of the Liberal Party? Under the heading 'Libs' Valder may be in strife again', a report in the *Advertiser* of 1 August states:

The Liberal Party's controversial new Federal President—

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, as I heard the question, it related to Federal matters which are not the responsibility of any Minister of this Government.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member for Unley to repeat the question.

**Mr MAYES:** Has the Government prepared evaluations of the likely effects on the Government's social welfare program of the comments made recently by the Federal President of the Liberal Party?

**The SPEAKER:** I rule that question in order.

**Mr MAYES:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I return to my quote.

**Mr GUNN:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The member for Light was warned for doing far less than members opposite are doing. Mr Speaker, where in the Standing Orders are Government members permitted continually to ask blatant Party political questions that have no relevance to the Ministers, as they are not responsible for the matters raised? This is a blatant attempt to embarrass the Opposition when the Government has nothing to provide for the House by way of constructive policy to help the people of this State. I therefore ask you, Mr Speaker, to rule such questions out of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order. The honourable member for Unley.

**Mr MAYES:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I refer to the article in the *Advertiser* of 1 August, headed 'Libs' Valder may be in strife again', which states:

The Liberal Party's controversial new Federal president, Mr John Valder, appears to have landed in hot water again. Mr Valder has predicted a Coalition Government would have to cut the social welfare budget . . . Mr Valder made the remarks on a videotape distributed by Westpac to 300 people, including politicians.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I am only too happy to attempt to reply to the question. Parenthetically, I refer the member for Coles to her Notice of Motion (Other Business) No. 3 on the Notice Paper and suggest that there might be some inconsistency in drawing your attention, Mr Speaker, to Standing Orders on this occasion. I am aware of the newspaper statement, and I imagine that members opposite are also aware of it. I am not altogether surprised that a question of this sort has been asked. It is a serious question indeed.

This Government has not yet had an opportunity to explore fully the implications of the covert policy now revealed by the Federal President of the Liberal Party, but we intend to do so and will work through the figures as

quickly as possible. I have that newspaper article in front of me. On the infamous video (infamous at least to members of the Liberal Party) this is what Mr Valder said:

If you are really going to make any big reductions on Government spending, I have got to say there is only one way it is going to be done—it would have to be done in—that's social welfare.

He went on to say:

I think our Party is very conscious of the need to do that. The introduction of the assets tests was a small step in that direction. There is nothing like a breath of honesty to clear the decks somewhat. For quite some time the Leader of the Opposition has been putting various spending proposals before Government, as the Opposition backbench is continually doing but, on the other hand, making lots of noises about taxes and reduction of Government revenue. People have been wondering how it is possible to achieve at the one time those contradictory objectives. Of course, it is not possible to do so, and now we have this breath of honesty from the President of the Federal Liberal Party, who is prepared to come out and admit what is the covert policy of his Party at the Federal level.

The working through of this proposal would be disastrous so far as the State's community welfare programs are concerned. What in fact is involved in the hidden agenda of the Federal Liberal Party? For example, are they going to abolish or cut back the sort of support which enables a concession scheme covering pensioners' electricity bills, which in this State is the most comprehensive of its kind in Australia? Are they going to cut back on the sort of assistance which enables the States to give concessions to pensioners on water rates? Will they cut back the sort of assistance which enables the States to provide public transport concessions for pensioners, emergency financial relief for those in need, or community grants programs in general? The truth is out, to the embarrassment of the Liberal Party throughout this country. Mr Valder has come clean. It is time that the Leader of the Opposition did so as well.

### TOXIC WASTE INCINERATOR

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Does the Minister of Water Resources concur with his Federal colleague the Minister for Home Affairs and Environment (Mr Cohen) in supporting the establishment of a toxic waste incinerator east of Broken Hill? If not, will he say what action the Government is taking to oppose the project? The proposed site is 22 kilometres from Broken Hill and is within the Murray/Darling Rivers catchment area. At present it is believed that about 10 000 tonnes of halogenated organic compounds are stored in Sydney alone. About 80 per cent of toxic chemical waste is generated in Sydney and Melbourne. It is proposed to transport this—mainly by rail—through the catchment area of the Murray/Darling river system. The substances, including dioxans, furans, polychlorinated biphenyls and many others, are believed to cause foetal abnormalities and cancer, even when present in a few parts per million of water or less.

A number of accidental spillages have occurred in Europe and the United States of America. The dangers of road and rail transport spillages and the possibility of incinerator malfunction could be catastrophic for South Australia, as the majority of our potable water is derived from the Murray River. The people of South Australia want to know what action the Government intends to take to safeguard their future.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I am quite sure that my colleague is well able to address the matters that relate to the Murray/Darling basin. However, since I have had direct discussions with the Commonwealth Minister for Environ-

ment and Planning, it may be more appropriate at this stage for me to attempt to enlighten the honourable member and his colleagues. There is a need for some form of high temperature destruction of waste in this country. Members would be aware that, from time to time, a ship known as the *Volcanus* has visited this country and our people have been involved in tests on high temperature incineration of highly toxic wastes at sea. It has been a fairly successful program. Nonetheless, the problem is that one cannot always predict exactly when the *Volcanus* will come to Australia and, in view of the build-up of certain high toxic material, particularly on the eastern seaboard of this continent, there is a feeling that there should be an incinerator. Although everyone supports that proposition in general, no-one wants it in their backyard and that is quite understandable.

So far as I am aware, four sites have been proposed. The first was at Botany but, again, so far as I am aware, that site is not being further actively pursued. Another site is somewhere in the Melbourne area, but I am not in a position at this stage to enlighten members any further in relation to that site, because I do not know much more about it than that. The third site involved the Broken Hill proposition, and the fourth concerned setting aside an area in Western Australia, around Kalgoorlie. This has been discussed at the Australian Environment Conference, and I have made it perfectly clear to Mr Barrie Cohen, on behalf of this Government, that we will not tolerate a system whereby any highly toxic wastes would be transported to a facility from across any part of the Murray/Darling Basin.

No proposition has been put forward to set up such a facility in South Australia, nor does it make any sense to do so, because the amount of noxious material that we have available for disposal is very small indeed when compared with that which exists on the eastern seaboard. Once the basic capital facility has been established, the costs really relate to transport rather than the ongoing operation of the plant.

There are successful plants around the world, and I visited one very recently in France, but there is no proposition, nor does it make economic sense, to set up such a facility in South Australia or Western Australia. We oppose, have opposed and continue to oppose any proposition which would involve the transport of any such material across any part of the Murray/Darling Basin.

### BRIGHTON ROADWORKS

**Mrs APPLEBY:** Can the Minister of Transport provide details of the work presently being undertaken by the Highways Department at the Flagstaff Road/South Road/Marion Road intersection? Can he further indicate what improvements will be undertaken at the South Road/Seacombe Road intersection by his department? A substantial number of constituents have expressed outrage concerning misleading and inadequate statements which have been made by the member for Davenport and his colleagues relating to these matters. I ask this question of the new Minister to assure my constituents that the work is proceeding as determined by the Government in its priority development of the southern area.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** That question seems to have generated some comment from the Opposition, and that is no wonder, because I have read some of the statements made by its spokesperson on transport for the southern region. It is quite clear that almost every element of the Opposition's so-called policy is a direct quote from the Report of the Southern Areas Transport Working Group which this Government accepted and is steadily implementing. Every substantial and practical suggestion in the

Opposition's policy has already been proposed by the Bannan Government. In most cases work is under way and in some cases the total project will be completed before the date of the next election.

The Opposition's policy could be summed up like this: the Government muffed it, the Opposition is committed to it; if the Government is planning it, the Opposition will investigate it. In a nutshell, that is what the opposition is saying because it is bankrupt of any original ideas for transport development in that part of South Australia.

Flagstaff Hill Road is a case in point. It is one of the roadworks promised within four months in the Liberal Party policy and is one of those projects which the Liberal Party is still talking about while the Government has started the necessary work. Currently, Flagstaff Hill Road and Marion Road have three lanes and two lanes respectively on their approach to the Flagstaff Hill Road/South Road/Marion Road intersection. Given the large volume of traffic using this intersection, motorists exiting from Flagstaff Road and Marion Road are experiencing delays in periods of peak traffic flow. To ameliorate these delays, the Highways Department has developed a proposal involving the upgrading of the intersection through the provision of additional lanes.

The Highways Department commenced work at the Flagstaff Road/South Road/Marion Road intersection two weeks ago, and honourable members opposite have referred to that. The work is estimated to cost \$400 000, and will take approximately four months to complete. It is not expected that Flagstaff Road will be wholly closed to traffic during the upgrading of the road approach to the intersection. However, the nature of the work involved is such that it will be carried out in stages and every endeavour will be made by the Highways Department to minimise disruption to the travelling public. Traffic will be able to use the road; however, some inconvenience and reduction in road width will be unavoidable at various stages.

With regard to the South Road/Seacombe Road intersection, I am pleased to advise the honourable member that the Highways Department has designed improvements to be undertaken at this location. The work involved at this intersection provides for an additional right turn lane from South Road into Seacombe Road and an additional right turn lane from Seacombe Road into South Road. These improvements are aimed at reducing the delays on Seacombe Road in the evening peak period, but will benefit traffic generally throughout the day. This work is estimated to cost less than \$100 000 and will be carried out as soon as possible after the improvements to South Road/Flagstaff Road/Marion Road intersection.

### GRAND PRIX PROGRAMS

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** Will the Premier take whatever action is necessary to have the tenders for the contract to print programs for the South Australian Mitsubishi South Australian Grand Prix recalled? It has been submitted to me that PBL Marketing had accepted a tender from Australian Consolidated Press (ACP) in New South Wales to print the program for the Mitsubishi South Australian Grand Prix and that PBL asked for quotes in South Australia from two printers who use sheet feed type printers, which is an expensive way of printing that type of product, and that therefore those prices are unrealistic.

Within the State we have one printer—Messenger Press—which has a Mitsubishi reel feed press, and I believe that Australian Consolidated Press has a reel feed press and will print the program by that method. The Messenger Press of South Australia—a South Australian company—was not

approached about giving a quote to produce the program for our Grand Prix. It has been submitted to me—I will not debate it—that, therefore, PBL has done the State a disservice and that the tenders should be recalled to give South Australian companies a proper opportunity to tender.

It has been submitted to me also that there is a comparison in the case of the ASER project with some kitchen equipment. A company that has operated in South Australia for 40 years, Noyes Bros, tendered and was high. Another South Australian company was given the opportunity to bring its price down to that of Noyes Bros so that it could win the contract on the basis that Noyes Bros, because its head office is in another State, would not be given the contract. I draw that comparison as a justification for the Premier to recall or ask PBL to recall tenders for the program for the Grand Prix as we have a Mitsubishi press here and it is a Mitsubishi Grand Prix.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The Grand Prix Board is operating under the general policy that, to the greatest extent possible, all work done in connection with the Grand Prix should be carried out by firms based in South Australia or with South Australian connections. I understand that that policy has been very rigorously enforced and the results have been very satisfactory for South Australian firms. For instance, in relation to the capital works program of something like 18 tenders that were let, 16 went to South Australian companies, one to a New South Wales company and the other to a Victorian company. It is obvious also in realistic terms that, without in some cases considerable cost penalties or risk to the product, that cannot be done.

That certainly would not be the case in printing as we have a whole range of printing operations in this State that are very successful. In the last two or three years the printing industry has been very prosperous. As I understand it, the same policy has been applied by the Board in relation to the letting of printing contracts. I am advised that of the order of four to one in favour of South Australian printing firms is the figure. It is large and small firms at Finsbury and Largs Bay that have done work for the Grand Prix and that will continue.

The particular contract that the honourable member mentioned was in the hands of PBL Marketing, which is part of the Associated Press conglomerate. I understand that they were able to get house prices and that any alternative quotes were some thousands of dollars above what could be done in that instance. I can only say to the honourable member that the board has taken very seriously its charter to ensure that maximum activity is generated in this State and that has been very successful—something like 250 full-time and 650 part-time jobs have already been generated. I appreciate the support that the honourable member gave the Grand Prix in his question and his recognition of its clear economic value.

In respect to this matter, to the best of my knowledge the Board in its marketing arrangements has tried to ensure that contracts are carried out in this State. It has not been possible on a 100 per cent basis. I guess from the outset that nobody contemplated that it would be. That is all the information that I can proffer to the honourable member at this stage. If he would like to discuss the matter further he should feel at liberty to take it up directly with the Grand Prix Board.

### HOUSING TRUST RENTALS

**Mr M.J. EVANS:** Will the Minister of Housing and Construction give this House an undertaking that there will be no catch-up of Housing Trust rents forgone during the present rent freeze at some future time when the review of

the rent fixing mechanism has been completed? I am sure that the recent announcement of a Housing Trust rent freeze will enjoy considerable support among those people in my electorate who live in trust accommodation. However, some tenants have expressed their concern to me that the rental increase forgone during the freeze may be recovered by the Government in a catch-up rent increase after the election. Accordingly, I seek an assurance from the Minister that the freeze is a genuine one and that tenants will not suffer a catch-up rise at some later date to recover the rental increase forgone during this current rent freeze period.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I am sure that no member opposite would suggest that that question was a Dorothy Dixier. Housing Trust rents have been an issue of some concern since we came to office. I remind the House that the Tonkin Liberal Government increased Housing Trust rents by a massive 56 per cent in its term of office and that is discounting the fact that it delayed its last increase until we would have had to put up the rent. This Government has been concerned to establish a proper formula for trust rent reviews and has spent much of the past two years working on it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I make one thing clear: freezing trust rents is not an election ploy. It is a natural next step in the Government's determination to see that Trust rent reviews are once and for all established on a fair and equitable basis. Just to remind those members opposite who are braying like mules, I refer them to the second reading speech I made on the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. Under 'Rents', I said:

Public housing rents will be based on the costs incurred in the provision of public housing. Cost rents will replace the current market rents policy, which has been shown to be inequitable and inefficient.

This is a very valuable change which will have a significant impact on Housing Trust rents, ensuring that they rise only to cover costs. No longer will the trust be required to relate their rents to those of private landlords.

That was a move that members opposite supported fully—a change that this Government has already made and implemented. I further said:

Costs are to include the recovery of all operating expenses directly related to the provision of the housing and various community facilities, the interest charges on borrowed funds and a provision for depreciation. Depreciation will be based on current market values and an effective dwelling life of 40-75 years. Although the cost rent formula will lead to lower rents, South Australia, on a matter of principle, has expressed some minor concern with this depreciation proposal. We suggest the principle is unfair if we expect public tenants to have their rents determined annually on the current market value of a dwelling, while the housing costs for home owners each year are based on the historical cost of the dwelling, from when it was purchased. We believe that rents ought to be set on an 'equity' formula, tied to the actual costs incurred, but modified to represent a comparative cost to those who buy. The new cost rent formula does represent a major gain for tenants, but I will continue to argue for a broader, more equitable formula, during the discussions on annual achievements.

This rent review is a part of that argument. Despite the statement made by my friend Terry Hehir of ABC radio on Monday morning that this rent freeze would mean a doubling of rent increases next year, I assure the honourable member that the next increase will be well within the CPI.

#### VEHICLE NUMBER PLATES

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** Following the disappointing announcement by the Minister of Transport last Sunday on historic number plates, will he now agree to see a deputation from the vintage car clubs and then to change the Government's policy on historic number plates? Last Sunday, after

three months of stonewalling, the Government finally backed down on the historic number plates issue.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** Half way—not even that far!

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I am coming to that. In the new policy adopted by the Government a very severe qualification is included—only vehicles registered since 1 March 1984 will now be allowed to be registered by the end of September of this year. Since the public meeting of over 200 car enthusiasts on 17 July at which I spoke and at which certain resolutions were passed, I was asked to arrange a deputation from that meeting to meet with the Minister of Transport so that those car enthusiasts could put their case to the Government.

Since 18 July, the day after, the Minister has constantly refused to see such a deputation, saying that we should wait until after his announcement. In the *Advertiser* last Monday (5 August) the spokesman now for the car enthusiasts, Mr Pearson, has described the new Government policy as being 'half cocked'. He goes on to say that the new policy would not meet the needs of many car enthusiasts. In that article he also criticises the Minister for not being willing to consult with the car enthusiasts before coming out with his new policy. I therefore ask whether the Minister will now see a deputation and, having seen it, back down even further on his policy so as to allow all people who are the last registered owners of historic numerical number plates to claim those plates and keep them, provided that they pay the Government a suitable fee.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** First, as to whether I am prepared to meet representatives of the car clubs, the answer is 'Yes'. Secondly, I would have thought that the honourable member would have done himself and the whole topic a service by informing the car clubs that I, as Minister, had indicated that I would see them, but that they should wait until I had seen the policy and made any amendments necessary. The honourable member, I fortuitously think, forgot to pass on that information, because we have been telling the car clubs that I would see them. However, they have said that they are surprised to hear that: this is the first that they knew about it. I said that they should check with Dean Brown's office because he had had that information previously.

The second thing is that the Opposition has called for the Government to review certain policy statements and, when they had been reviewed, to back down. Therefore, according to the Opposition's request, one cannot win: if one holds on, one is dictatorial and, if one compromises, one is backing down. All South Australians should understand that the number plates belong to the Government: they belong to the Crown. The honourable member understands that. When people do not register their vehicle with the number plate attached to it, that plate is normally the property of the Crown. That is still the situation.

The specific compromise that I have reached will benefit 8 800 South Australians who have access to numerical number plates. If the honourable member suggests that that is small fry indeed, I am surprised, because it provides for all the individual requests that have come to my office. I have also issued a press statement that, if Mr Pearson has people within his organisation (or, indeed, if the honourable gentleman has constituents) who feel that they are unduly prejudiced by that policy, I will consider cases. We are not selling any plates that have been registered within the past three years. We have given the opportunity to people who have registered their vehicles between March 1984 and September 1985. That period of 18 months is an interim period and the policy is retrospective to that extent. We have met the needs of most of the people who have contacted us, but I will examine individual cases. I should be surprised if that

information has not been conveyed to the organisations concerned.

#### Dr G. DUNCAN

**Mr TRAINER:** Will the Chief Secretary ask his colleague the Attorney-General whether either of the two members who held the position of Chief Secretary in the previous Liberal Government had access to the Scotland Yard report on the death of Dr Duncan? One of those Chief Secretaries was the present member for Victoria and the other the current Leader of the Opposition. The *Hansard* report of proceedings in the Legislative Council in October and November 1979, immediately after the election of the Tonkin Liberal Government, reveals the response by the then Liberal Attorney-General (Hon. K.T. Griffin) to the following question that was asked by the Hon. C.J. Sumner on 23 October 1979:

Will the Attorney-General say whether, before the recent State election, the Liberal Opposition spokesman called for the report from Scotland Yard detectives on the death of Dr Duncan some years ago?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I understand that it is not in order to refer to debates in another place.

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** As to the substance of the question, I will inquire to the extent that I can do so. In commenting on this matter, the Government has assumed all the way along that the only member of the previous Government who read that report, or indeed had access to it, was Mr Griffin, as Attorney-General. However, in the light of the information to which the honourable member has just referred and which is a contribution to the ongoing debate on this matter, I will, in the public interest, try to obtain the information for him to the extent that it is possible to obtain it.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: HOUSING TRUST RENTALS

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I seek leave to make this personal explanation because I claim to have been misrepresented by both the member for Mawson and by the Premier. At about 9.30 on Sunday evening, I was invited by the *Advertiser* to make observations on an announcement that had been made by the Premier earlier that day. Any reading of the legitimate observations that appeared in the article on the front page of the *Advertiser* would indicate clearly that there was no commitment, either by the Liberal Party, or by me as its spokesman in this area, to increase rentals: it was purely and simply to draw attention to the facts that I now restate.

The report of the Auditor-General for the year ended 30 June 1984 indicated that the South Australian Housing Trust had suffered a loss of \$10 million as opposed to making a profit of \$3.7 million during the previous 12 months. In explanation, it was indicated that the trust had been unable to recover certain of its costs associated with excess water. Indeed, it was stated that 63 per cent of the trust's tenants were paying a reduced rental, part of which concession, but not all, the trust could recover from the Government. Those facts are clear. If the Premier and the member for Mawson wish to draw a long bow—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I believe that that is comment on the part of the honourable member.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I must have hit the nail on the head.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I assure the Premier that neither he nor the member for Mawson hit the nail: they are simply seeking to misrepresent fact and I am putting that into correct perspective.

The matter of the announcement made to the public of South Australia that there would be no increase in rents due to a freeze has been taken up by the Minister of Housing and Construction this afternoon. I point out to the House that currently the rents of many Housing Trust tenants are being increased, and I am referring to the rents that they personally pay, even though there has been a freeze on the rental associated with the houses. Individuals are subject to an increase in the rental that they are being called upon to pay because of changed circumstances in relation to their income.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Ms Lenehan:** You don't understand the system.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I wonder now who has hit the nail on the head! The people have been misrepresented: I claim to have been misrepresented, and any reading of the statement made by me on behalf of the Opposition will clearly indicate that that is so.

---

**The SPEAKER:** Call on the business of the day.

#### STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier):** I move:

That Standing Orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable Government business on this day's Notice Paper to be considered as required and to have precedence over other business, except questions, before the Address in Reply is adopted.

Motion carried.

**Mr BAKER:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker; reference has been made to today's Notice Paper, although as yet we have not received it. If we are going to transact business in this House, I would appreciate it if we could have the Notice Paper on our desk. This is typical of the Government's performance.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Due to a breakdown in the printer's machine, there are not sufficient copies of the Notice Paper for distribution. However, honourable members may come to the table to consult the Notice Paper.

#### STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Stamp Duties Act, 1923. Read a first time.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

On coming to office at the end of 1982, the Government undertook a complete review of the State's finances and the budgetary position it had inherited. That review, which was conducted by the then Under Treasurer, Mr R.D. Barnes, showed that the financial position of the State was extremely grave. It stressed that action would have to be taken if the financial problems facing the State were to be contained.

While those problems were not of my Government's making we accepted the responsibility to take that action,



and in 1983 announced a number of revenue measures designed to correct the serious imbalance that had developed in the State's finances. At the time I introduced those measures, and on many occasions since, I have made it clear that once South Australia's economy improved and the State's financial situation was restored, the Government would act to reduce the burden on South Australian taxpayers. The economic recovery of the last two years, and in particular the strong growth in the housing sector which has been boosted by the economic policies of the Government, means that we are now able to provide relief.

This measure is one of four which I am introducing today to give effect to the tax cuts which I announced on 5 August. They comprise a package of measures which will give benefits to a large number of employers; the majority of people paying land tax; to persons buying property; to young job seekers; and to the wine industry. In addition, they will significantly advance the Government's policy of deregulation.

These measures have been combined with action taken in co-operation with the Electricity Trust of South Australia to reduce electricity tariffs from 1 November. The package of measures has been designed to ensure that South Australia's economic recovery is maintained, and that business and consumer confidence is boosted.

The Government believes that all South Australians should benefit from the economic recovery that has taken place, and consequently is introducing these measures now in advance of the Budget.

The Government believes that these measures are responsible. They will provide immediate relief while ensuring that the fundamental financial strength of the State is maintained and that the problems created by the former Government which led to the serious financial situation in 1982 are not repeated. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Remainder of Explanation

The Government proposes to make a number of changes to the Stamp Duties Act. These changes are aimed at providing revenue concessions, achieving desirable social objectives and assisting in the process of deregulating business activity. Stamp duty on the conveyance of property is one of the main sources of revenue for all State Governments. Even quite small adjustments to the rate of duty can have a significant impact on revenue collections. However, the Government considers that the impact of this duty must be reduced. Consequently, we have resolved to relax the conditions applying to the first home stamp duty concession and to make an adjustment to the tax scale which will result in a worthwhile reduction in duty for a great many other property transactions.

When the Government came to office it raised from \$30 000 to \$40 000 the value of a first home which was exempt from stamp duty. This figure has remained unchanged since 1 December 1982. It is proposed that the exemption now be lifted to \$50 000. Together with the proposed change to the tax scale, this is expected to benefit first home buyers by \$2 million. Buyers of first homes up to \$50 000 in value will pay no duty and those who buy more expensive homes will save an additional \$300 in duty. In addition to raising the value of a first home which attracts full exemption from stamp duty, the Government proposes to relax the conditions of eligibility. At present anyone who has held a relevant interest in land is ineligible for the concession. This provision has had the effect of denying the concession to a considerable number of people who qualify for the Commonwealth First Home Owners

Scheme. The Government's aim in amending the legislation in this respect is to bring about a situation in which anyone who has never been the owner-occupier of a dwelling, or who has been an owner-occupier only as a minor, is eligible for the concession. Moreover, it is proposed that applicants be given 12 months rather than three months to take up residence.

To qualify for the concession at present, a prospective home builder who buys a block of land must have already entered into a contract to build and must intend to occupy the dwelling within three months of the completion of construction. This is a rather restrictive requirement and it is now proposed to provide, in addition, for refunds of duty (whether or not there is a contract to build at the time of purchase of the land) as long as the purchaser is occupying the house as his principal place of residence within 12 months of the date of the conveyance. It is not possible to be accurate about the cost of this relaxation of the conditions of eligibility, but it may be of the order of \$0.5 million. The Government has decided to introduce changes to the tax scale for conveyance duty to modify the effects of the progressive rates on transactions in excess of \$20 000.

This change will produce a saving of up to \$100 in duty for transactions of between \$20 000 and \$30 000 in value and a saving of precisely \$100 for transactions of more than \$30 000 in value. The benefit to property buyers is expected to be about \$4 million. The new provisions will apply with respect to all documents presented for stamping on or after 5 August 1985.

Stamp duty on workers compensation premiums is presently levied at the rate of 8 per cent. There is, in addition, a levy of 1 per cent which is paid to the Statutory Reserve Fund to finance payments to employers whose insurance company defaults. In order to reward and encourage the employment of young workers, the Government proposes to abolish the requirement to pay stamp duty on premiums paid for the insurance of people under 25 years of age. This is expected to cost about \$3 million and will apply in respect of all premiums paid on or after 1 January 1985.

The 1 per cent levy will be retained for all employees. The Public Actuary has reported recently that contributions of this magnitude are still appropriate in order to meet demands on the Statutory Reserve Fund. Therefore, any reduction in contributions with respect to young workers would require an increase in contributions with respect to other workers. Given the purpose of the Fund, this would not seem to be a logical or desirable outcome.

When a residential tenancy agreement is first entered into it is subject to duty at the rate of 1 per cent of the average annual rent. This requirement poses no particular problem for individuals on average or higher incomes but is a burden for the low income families and welfare beneficiaries who tend to be greatly over-represented amongst renters.

The Government has announced its intention to increase the stamp duty concession for first home buyers. We believe it is appropriate at the same time to introduce a concession for those who cannot afford to buy a home. Accordingly, we propose to abolish stamp duty on residential tenancy agreements. While this will benefit some who can afford to pay, its main impact will be on low income earners and welfare beneficiaries who have received nothing from measures such as the first home stamp duty concession. The abolition will apply with respect to all leases or agreements for leases presented for stamping on or after 5 August 1985.

At present, duty at the rate of 1.8 per cent per annum is payable on the total amount received from rental business if that amount exceeds \$2 000 per annum. Costs incurred in servicing the goods are an allowable deduction. Because the threshold is so low the legislation requires many part-time and seasonal operators to register and pay duty. The

Government believes this serves no useful purpose and is an unnecessary administrative burden both for the operators and for the State Taxation Office. Therefore, it is proposed to raise the threshold to \$15 000 and to impose duty only on income in excess of that amount. The allowable deduction for costs will also be calculated by reference to the income received in excess of \$15 000.

It is estimated that the change will provide full exemption for about 200 small businesses, including a number operating on the fringe of the tourist industry. The proposed new arrangements will also be much more equitable between those just above and just below the threshold. The change will be retrospective to 1 July 1985.

It is common practice in the USA for financial institutions to raise funds for lending by issuing paper against the security of their mortgages over real property. A similar market is beginning to develop in Australia. In the interests of promoting this market and enabling South Australian borrowers and lenders to participate fully in its development, it is proposed to abolish stamp duty on the transfer of mortgage-backed securities.

In some of the eastern States duty has been abolished recently on the transfer of corporate debt securities, such as debentures. The rate of duty on transfers of fixed interest securities in this State was reduced to 10 cents per \$100 in 1980 but with no obvious effect on the level of activity. It is apparent that the existence of stamp duty has stifled the development of this market and the Government proposes now to remove it.

Both these measures are small but important contributions to the process of financial deregulation at present taking place in Australia. They will operate from 5 August 1985.

The Government has identified several provisions of the Stamp Duties Act which it would seem sensible to abolish. This is in keeping with our aim to do away with unnecessary regulation and to enable businesses to concentrate on the tasks of operating efficiently and identifying new opportunities for profits and for jobs.

The provisions which we propose to abolish come under three headings—

- bills of lading
- letters of allotment, scrip certificates and scrip
- affidavits and declarations.

From 5 August 1985, no duty will be payable on these documents.

Since the introduction of Medibank, private medical benefits funds have offered a product called 'health insurance' to the public. This could, in some circumstances, require medical benefits funds to register as insurers and pay duty on premiums received in respect of such business. It has not been the practice in the past to require these funds to pay duty and it is proposed to amend the Act to preserve this exemption.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. It is intended that the Act be deemed to have come into operation on 5 August 1985. Clause 3 strikes out a definition that will no longer be required on account of the amending legislation. Clause 4 empowers the Commissioner to refund any duty that is overpaid in consequence of the amendments effected by this Bill. Clause 5 provides for the repeal of section 28 with the effect that duty will no longer be payable on an affidavit or declaration.

Clause 6 amends the section imposing duty on rental business receipts. The amendments provide for a threshold of \$1 250 per month under which duty will not be payable. Furthermore, a registered person who does not receive more than \$20 000 per year may apply to lodge returns annually instead of monthly (presently only those who receive less than \$2 000 per annum may make such an application. Clause 7 alters the procedure for allowing service costs to

be deducted from receipts. Under the present provisions a registered person may deduct 40 per cent of receipts for goods in relation to which a service agreement exists. It is intended to alter the scheme so that a deduction may only be made once the registered person has receipts in excess of the \$1 250 per month threshold with the deduction being made against the excess.

Clause 8 provides for the repeal of section 53 with the effect that duty will no longer be payable on a bill of lading. Clause 9 amends section 71c of the principal Act in several respects (the 'First home-buyers' section). One significant amendment will allow people who have owned real estate but never occupied land as an 'owner/occupier' to apply for the concessional rate of duty. Another amendment raises the complete exemption to \$50 000. The amendments are expressed to operate in relation to every conveyance presented for stamping on or after 5 August 1985.

Clause 10 provides for the repeal of section 75 with the effect that duty will no longer be payable on a letter of allotment, scrip certificate or scrip. Clause 11 effects several amendments to the second schedule. The general scales for conveyances or transfers are to be altered. Premiums paid in respect of workers compensation insurance for workers under the age of 25 years will be exempt from duty for an annual licence, as will premiums paid for medical, dental or hospital insurance. Other exemptions from duty are to be provided for the conveyance or transfer of a mortgage or an interest in a mortgage on a conveyance or sale, for the conveyance or transfer of a mortgage by a voluntary disposition *inter vivos*, for the conveyance or transfer of debentures and similar interests on sale and for leases for residential premises. Various consequential amendments are also to be made.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### LIQUOR LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Liquor Licensing Act, 1985. Read a first time.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

As an incentive to the wine and tourist industries in this State, the Government has decided to abolish the liquor licensing fee with respect to cellar door sales of wine. This will be achieved by removing the requirement in the Act for holders of a producers licence to pay a licence fee in respect of sales of their own product. The holders of a producers licence will still be required to pay the minimum licence fee, as are all other licence holders.

The wine industry is of particular importance to South Australia and one of the main attractions for tourists to this State is the opportunity to buy wine at the cellar door. By removing the licence fee in respect of such transactions, the Government is opening the way for a reduction in prices. This should have a significant impact on tourist numbers and on local industry and commerce in the wine regions. The direct benefit to the industry and to consumers will be about \$1.5 million.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the measure to come into operation on 1 January 1986. Clause 3 amends

section 87 of the principal Act. The amendment provides that a fee based on a percentage of turnover will no longer apply to a producers licence. A producer will in future pay the fee fixed as the minimum licence fee for the purposes of section 87 (9). Clause 4 makes a consequential amendment to section 93 of the principal Act.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Land Tax Act, 1936, Read a first time.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

The schedule which is the basis for levying land tax was last modified in 1977/78. It has 18 narrow steps with progressively increasing marginal rates. A schedule such as this inevitably produces rapid increases in liability for tax as land values rise. The recovery in South Australia's economy has led to increases in land values and has benefited land owners by increasing the value of their properties.

The Government is convinced that land tax should be levied on a progressive basis. Therefore, it follows that taxpayers from time to time will move from one tax bracket to a higher tax bracket and incur a more than proportionate increase in tax. However, we believe it is possible to simplify the basis for levying tax and so reduce the 'bracket creep' which is endemic to the present arrangements.

Accordingly, we propose a schedule with a general exemption of \$40 000 and only five other steps. Not only will the proposed new schedule dramatically reduce the frequency with which landowners move into a higher tax bracket but it will also result in actual tax reductions for about 90 per cent of taxpayers.

It is estimated that 76 000 of the 100 000 taxpayers otherwise liable will be entirely exempted from tax. These will be owners with land (other than the principal place of residence or land used for primary production) valued at less than \$40 000. A further 14 000 taxpayers are expected to pay less tax in 1985-86 than in 1984-85. These will predominantly be owners with land valued at between \$40 000 and \$80 000.

The remaining 10 000 taxpayers are expected to pay more tax in 1985-86 than in 1984-85. However, the extent of the increase in many cases will be very much less than would have been the case under the existing schedule. The owners affected will be predominantly those with land valued at in excess of \$80 000. The new schedule will take effect from 1 July 1985. It is expected to save landowners about \$8 million in tax in 1985-86.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. It is intended that the Act be deemed to have come into operation at midnight on 30 June 1985. This time of operation is determined by a provision of the principal Act which provides that taxes imposed for a particular financial year shall be calculated as at midnight on the 30th day of June immediately preceding that financial year.

Clause 3 proposes a new scale of land tax. Six new rates are to replace 18 that currently apply. Land with a taxable

value not exceeding \$40 000 will be exempt. Clause 4 proposes a new scale of land tax for partially exempt land. Land with a taxable value not exceeding \$40 000 will be exempt. Other partially exempt land will be taxed at the rate of 2c for each \$10 by which the taxable value of the land exceeds \$40 000. Clause 5 increases the minimum amount of land tax payable from \$2.50 to \$5.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Payroll Tax Act, 1971. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

On 1 July 1985 the general exemption from payroll tax rose from \$200 000 to \$250 000. The benefit to employers of this increase is approximately \$5 million. Under the present provisions of the Act, this concession is reduced by \$2 for every \$3 by which payrolls exceed \$250 000, so that for firms with an annual liability for wages and salaries in excess of \$625 000 no exemption is available.

The Government considers that the rate at which the exemption reduces is too rapid and has the effect of applying tax too severely on small firms with payrolls in excess of \$250 000. Accordingly, we have introduced this Bill to reduce the rate at which the exemption is phased out from \$2 for every \$3 by which payrolls exceed \$250 000 to \$1 for every \$4. This will have the effect of extending the 'taper zone' to \$1 250 000.

All firms with payrolls in the range \$250 000 to \$1 250 000 will benefit. Some examples of the impact of the change on these firms are given in the following table:

TABLE I

Payroll \$	Present Tax \$	Proposed Tax \$	Reduction \$
400 000	12 500	9 375	3 125
650 000	32 500	25 000	7 500
1 000 000	50 000	46 875	3 125

The effect of this measure will be to give South Australia the lowest payroll tax of any State for firms with payrolls between \$300 000 and \$1 million. Almost 25 per cent of registered employers fall into this category. For ease of compliance it is proposed to make the change retrospective to 1 July 1985. This will greatly simplify the calculation which takes place after the end of each financial year to adjust the 12 monthly instalments made during the year by a firm with the final determination of its liability. The two are invariably different because the monthly instalments must be made before the amount of the annual wage and salary bill is known. This adjustment will also pick up any over-payment made in the first month or two of the financial year when tax was being collected on the basis of the old taper zone.

A change is proposed also in the method of applying payroll tax to travelling allowances. At present all amounts paid to employees on a per kilometre basis for the use of their private vehicles for business purposes must be included

by employers in payroll tax returns. It is proposed that employers be required to pay tax only on the excess above a prescribed amount per kilometre, the prescribed amount representing an approximation of the reasonable cost of travel. A similar change is proposed in the method of applying payroll tax to accommodation allowances. The benefit to employers of these measures is expected to be about \$5 million. Coupled with the increase in the general exemption level, the total benefit will be approximately \$10 million.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 6 August. Page 48.)

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** Quite obviously the Opposition supports—

**The SPEAKER:** Is the honourable member the lead speaker for the Opposition in relation to this matter?

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** In respect of this matter I am, Sir, but not on the grievances which will follow. The Opposition supports this Bill. The introduction of this Bill is a regular feature of the parliamentary session, and from time to time it has been responsible for generating considerable debate while, on other occasions, very little debate. The Opposition understands the reason for this measure: it fits in with the program involving consideration of the major Appropriation Bill and is expected by the Treasurer to provide sufficient money for the Public Service to operate until early November this year, when it is expected that the debate on the Appropriation Bill will have been concluded in both places.

I note the increase from \$390 million provided last year to \$485 million this year. The Premier draws attention to the fact that that figure of \$485 million can be discounted by approximately \$65 million because of the changed financial circumstances which have been instituted since 1 July 1985. We have no difficulty in accepting that proposition. In the Bill which came before the House in February this year the Premier indicated that this provision would be effective as from 1 July 1985.

If we take the proposed balance of \$420 million, we see that, extended on an equal basis, the total amount would be \$2 640 million for a full year of expenditure. That, of course, will not be the final figure, because we recognise that, for the year up to 30 June 1985, it was anticipated that it was going to be \$2 623 840 000, being the total for 1984-85; and, within the constraints which are imposed by this form of supply, where the Government may only move within the programs which have already been outlined, one-sixth of that total is very close to the \$420 million which is being requested.

We find that that figure of \$420 million this year compared to \$390 million last year is an increase of approximately 7.69 per cent, and that is built into the requirements for the period up until November. One would then have to ask whether all economic considerations of the State will be organised around that increase of 7.69 per cent, or in round terms 7.7 per cent, for the year 1985-86. We will have to wait until the handing down of the Budget to determine that matter, but there has been a relativity between the amount requested and the eventual percentage increase which is anticipated during a financial year.

I would like to draw attention to the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition last March, when the Supply Bill (No. 1) 1985 was being debated. The Leader on that

occasion sought to present the scenario as he saw it and as researched by his staff. During that debate, at page 3198 of *Hansard* of 13 March 1985, he said:

The timing of this debate is yet another indication that this Government has run out of ideas and initiative. It is a tired, divided Government, grasping at every possible opportunity to avoid its responsibilities to this Parliament and the people. This legislation is to grant supply for the early months of next year. Why, therefore, is it necessary to have this debate now?

He drew attention to the fact that, although one would normally expect the debate to have taken place in May or June 1985, it transpired in March. A number of the observations made by the Leader of the Opposition during that period have been shown to be factual. For example, he made the point that this Government would have earned \$50 million more than it budgeted for in stamp duties. That was the inference that could be drawn from the information available at the time.

We are not in a position at the stage of debating this issue to know whether that prediction was absolutely correct or partially correct, because, even though the request has been made to the Treasurer's own department for the release of the relevant documents, the Opposition and the public at large have been denied access to the figures for the year ended 30 June 1985. For the information of the House, it is normal practice for an end of month balance to be distributed. The period needed to get that end of month balance distributed has been blowing out to the point where, for example, members received information in July involving figures for the end of April and May. To this date, 7 August 1985, we are still without the figures to 30 June 1985.

One of the reasons given for the document in question not being available was that we have to wait until the accounts are audited; that is, it is not possible to make use of the document until it is in an audited form. I draw attention to the fact that the Premier and other Government members have seen fit to adopt the bottom line, that is, the balance figure to 30 June, as a legitimate figure in a number of their public pronouncements. If the figures utilised to determine that bottom line are not audited, one might ask how the figure, which the Premier has been trotting out to the public and which is not substantiated by any documentary evidence publicly available, is an audited figure.

We believe it is a farce that the Parliament should be expected to consider a matter as important as this involving the appropriation of funds for the conduct of the business of the State without the basic information being available to its members. I give an undertaking to the public in general and to members on both sides of the House that the Olsen Government will make available the documents relative to balances within two weeks of receipt, not hide them, seek to capitalise on the information they may contain—possibly embarrassing information which is contained within them—or seek to have the Parliament, with virtually both hands tied behind its back, debate such a critical issue.

In a previous Government regime of the same political persuasion as that which is now in place in South Australia, members were not able to have access to the Auditor-General's Report because of the major deficiencies which it exhibited and which would have been an embarrassment in a major financial debate. That is not good enough and it is not a course of action that the Olsen Liberal Government will undertake under any circumstance. We talk of open government and of being frank and free with information to which people ought to have access: the Liberal Government, under John Olsen, will put that into effect and not hide documents away in the cupboard as the present Government is doing.

My colleague the Leader, on the occasion to which I have just referred (page 3 200 of the House of Assembly debate on 13 March 1985), sought leave to introduce figures relative to movements in selected State and local government charges and in the all groups index, excluding selected State and local government charges for the period 1980-81, relative to Adelaide and nationally. We have since had a chance to upgrade those figures, and I seek leave to have them inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

MOVEMENTS IN SELECTED STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT CHARGES AND IN THE ALL GROUPS INDEX EXCLUDING STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT CHARGES (1980-81 = 100)

ADELAIDE

	All groups excluding State and local government charges		Selected State and local government charges	
	Quarters	Annual average	Quarters	Annual average
1983-84				
September	128.2		162.0	
December	130.5		171.4	
March	130.6		168.9	
June	130.9	130.1	166.0	167.1
1984-85				
September	132.7		166.2	
December	134.8		179.7	
March	136.6		184.0	
June	140.2	136.1	185.4	178.8
Percentage change 1983-84 to 1984-85	+4.6 per cent		+7.0 per cent	

NATIONALLY  
(Weighted average of capital cities)

	All groups excluding State and local government charges		Selected State and local government charges	
	Quarters	Annual average	Quarters	Annual average
1983-84				
September	127.3		159.9	
December	130.1		167.5	
March	129.9		161.2	
June	130.4	129.4	159.0	161.9
1984-85				
September	132.1		162.6	
December	133.7		167.4	
March	135.6		169.2	
June	139.0	135.1	171.2	167.6
Percentage change 1983-84 to 1984-85	+4.4 per cent		+3.5 per cent	

Source: ABS Cat. 6401.0 Consumer Price Index.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I assure the House that those tables are purely statistical and are an upgrade of the position that applied in March of this year. They relate to the ABS figures supplied to 30 June 1985. It is interesting, but unfortunate, to see that the South Australian position has been worse than any other State. Members of the Opposition do not gloat over the misfortunes of their State but are genuinely perturbed that this State under the present management should find itself in such an awkward and unfavourable position. Far be it from preaching doom and gloom, which charge members of the Government would seek to level against us: we deal in fact, as I was able to exhibit a short time ago to you, Madam Acting Speaker, and also to the Premier.

Legitimate comments and requests are not doom and gloom. It is a matter of putting the record straight so that a position may not be misrepresented and so that members

of the public can progress their argument and understanding of an issue from that point. What do we find? For example, as between 1983 and 1984 the annual average in South Australia has deteriorated from 161.9 to 167.6. We find that the average percentage change from 1983-84 to 1984-85 on those selected State and local government charges in South Australia is plus 7 per cent against a national figure of 4.6 per cent. Because these figures have been a very major part in the CPI figures, they are now impacting on industry, in fact, on Government charges and operations, in the same way that they do in every State, but in South Australia with greater impact. That has certainly been noted in the CPI figures to 30 June 1985, which were recently made available.

The Leader very clearly indicated as early as 13 March 1985 that there was already an element of built-in additional cost that would affect the CPI in Australia and, indeed, in South Australia at 30 June 1985. That has come to pass, notwithstanding that when it did the Federal Government and this State Government sought to click their tongues and say, 'We did not expect that to happen until into the next quarter', which gives a fairly clear indication that their management and understanding of the economy and very involvement in economic analysis are in error and are not sensitively enough attuned to benefit management in South Australia overall.

The Leader also said that honesty and credibility are what count. He went on to say that they are not given to a person but are earned by one's one's track record. He said:

However, this Premier and this Government by their actions have none. Because of the effectiveness of the Opposition's campaign against rising taxes and charges, the Premier is now dangling out the tax relief carrot.

That statement was not made last week but on 13 March 1985 by the Leader of the Opposition as a result of his analysis of what was taking place in this State and the noises that have already been made by members of this Government as to how they would seek to recover their political position in the fabric of South Australian society. The very fact that it has not happened and they now have had to come forward with some fairly massive handouts under the guise that they are a natural occurrence with no relationship whatsoever to an election has been shown for what it is—a complete hoax on the people of South Australia. It is, as members moving around their electorates find very clearly, well understood by the public at large. It was encapsulated in a very practical way by Atchison in yesterday's *Advertiser* where he (as did the editorial writer in the *Advertiser*, the editorial writer in the *Australian*, and to a lesser degree the editorial writer in the *News*) indicated that the attempted spoof by the Premier of the people of South Australia had not been effective.

Certain members were very touchy in Question Time this afternoon, seeking to diffuse a number of aspects relative to these supposed benefits to the people of South Australia. I was very pleased to see the member for Elizabeth ask the question, and the Minister very quickly told us that it was not a Dorothy Dixier. It was rather interesting, though, that he had all the appropriate papers set out on the table in front of him and that he read the answer.

**The Hon. Michael Wilson:** Several pages.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Several pages of it. He read the answer.

**Mr Klunder:** Good preparation!

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** If the member for Newland believes that it was just good preparation, he is as uninformed as he is relative to his own opportunities in the seat of Todd at the next election. The position is not as clear cut as the Government would have us believe. In relation to Housing Trust rents, for 65 per cent of the tenants those rents are likely to increase, quite apart from this supposed

total freeze behind which the Government has been seeking to hide. People across the State of South Australia have been advised by the Housing Trust that the review in train could affect them. No alternative instruction exists but for that review to impact upon their position. Therefore, where is the freeze in the eyes of that 65 per cent of the Housing Trust population?

We have the position in relation to Housing Trust rental homes where, because local government charges have increased across the board and are met by the Housing Trust—not by the people who live in the houses directly but by the Housing Trust; because of the fact that water and sewer costs where people are renting the houses are met by the Housing Trust and not by the people who live in the houses; and because the Housing Trust has consistently written off most of the excess water rates applying to Housing Trust properties, and it will continue to do so, the trust is being placed in the position of having to pick up compulsorily additional costs without being able to recover those costs.

I do not (and I stress this clearly) suggest that those costs should be recovered against the people of South Australia by way of rental increase in the manner that has been misrepresented by the member for Mawson and the Premier, but they will be recovered only by being able to inject into the housing projects a lesser sum of money or else the Housing Trust will go off the board backwards, as would any other department or private organisation that was spending beyond its means.

So paranoid are the Premier and the member for Mawson on this issue that, whether by design between the two of them or because the Premier got the bit between his teeth and did not know when to stop, he sought to tie the Liberal Opposition into a position of selling off the Housing Trust. Where has that ever been stated? Where has that ever been stated?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Where has that ever been stated? Where has that ever been stated? I have repeated that question four times because there has been no answer from members opposite. It has not been stated.

**Mr TRAINER:** On a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker, insofar as interjections are normally out of order, what is the point of making interjections?

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson):** I cannot accept that as a point of order.

**Mr KLUNDER:** On a point of order, does a four times repetition by the member for Light constitute undue repetition under Standing Orders?

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** There is no point of order and I ask the honourable member for Light to continue.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I thank you for your protection, Mr Acting Speaker. There has been no such statement, but if we look at the situation in Great Britain where, in a privatisation program, housing has been included, we find that the Labor Party of that country is demanding of the Government that it give away the houses rather than privatise them in the sense of selling them. The Labor Party is presently out on the hustings saying to the Thatcher Government, 'We believe now in so many aspects of privatisation—give away the houses.' Some 760 000 to 800 000 houses have been sold. The Labor Party is now saying that the houses should be given away.

The Premier in his bland statement today sought to tie the Liberal Party into a position which it has never stated publicly and which is not part of any policy that has been enunciated. I want to go on quickly to pick up one or two aspects of the Premier's remarks by way of introducing this measure in the House yesterday. He did indicate—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I am happy to allow other members to make a contribution out of place and out of character, but I do not think that it does a great deal for the debate.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** The point is taken. I ask honourable members not to interject out of their seats.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I also wish to pinpoint a statement made by the Leader of the Opposition in addressing this matter in March when he said that the Government (referring to the present Government) has been making a habit recently of copying Opposition initiatives such as our firm commitment to tax relief and our deregulation policy. He then proceeded in respect to the deregulation policy to outline the manner in which the former Ombudsman, Mr Bakewell, found himself as Chairman of the group looking at deregulation. He could certainly expand at this moment, and the opportunity will be there tomorrow when we debate a package of four Bills introduced this afternoon to pinpoint how the lead given by the Opposition over recent months as a direct result of its carefully and adequately monitoring the views of the people of this State is to be applied in relation to stamp duty for first houses, payroll tax and the importance it will have in relation to employment and licensing where the people of South Australia are being ripped off now because of the exorbitant State charges and increases on beer and other beverages. They had plenty of opportunity as a result of advice given to them before this House rose in May earlier this year to overcome many of those difficulties before now.

The document before us gives an opportunity for a wide ranging debate if that were believed necessary by the Opposition. The Opposition is appreciative that the self same opportunity will obtain when we look at the major Appropriation Bill and therefore the contributions to the primary debate will be deferred until that time. I am certain that, in the course of action that follows the passage of the second reading of this Bill, that is, the opportunity to grieve, the House will be in full knowledge of the very serious Government failings that are causing problems for the people of South Australia. It will be interesting to see whether members of the Government are going to make use of that 10 minute grievance time to bring to the notice of their own front bench the difficulties that their electors are experiencing. Government members will be very silent on this occasion, not wanting to stir the possum or do anything at all to identify to the public of South Australia the misgivings and deficiencies in the operation of their own Government.

**Mr Baker:** It's amazing!

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** We might be surprised. We might find that they get up and tell us that the Government we bear in this State at present is lilywhite, doing everything it should be doing and that it should be returned at the election which is inevitable.

**Mr Mayes:** It is inevitable: we will be returned, I agree.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** It is the election which is inevitable: it is not the re-election of the Government which is inevitable. That will not occur. The honourable member would know full well that that is the case, otherwise we would not have the panic which is apparent on a daily basis from members of his own Government.

**Mr Trainer:** The Opposition has lost the wind out of their sails.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Not at all.

**Mr Trainer:** The cartoonist in last night's *News* certainly thought so.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** It is amazing how some people try to defend their position by joining in and trying to drown out somebody else who is telling the truth. The position is one of considerable interest to the public of South Australia—that is the election of an Olsen Govern-

ment. It is one which we look forward to coming on at the earliest possible moment so that the misery of the present member for Newland, who will not be the member for Todd—

**Mr Klunder:** That's not what you said a moment ago.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** My word, it is, if you sit and analyse the situation.

**Mr Klunder:** A Freudian slip!

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** No Freudian slip, none whatsoever. I commend to members of the Government the figures which have been introduced by way of leave and which show the true position of South Australia and the effect that the extravagance of this Government has had on our position in Australian society. Certainly there is nothing in the document we have had thus far, and we will look upon it and accept it in its true spirit of a preliminary document, which would suggest that the Government has learnt the folly of its previous ways and is intent on reducing its spending so as to give genuine relief to its population.

This Government is adopting a position identical to that of its colleagues in Canberra. It has been so frequently highlighted since the tax summit by people of all political persuasions, by journalists over a very wide range of journal cum newspaper cum television cum radio interests, that nowhere during the course of that discussion did the Government recognise and accept that the progress which is necessary for Australia and in South Australia as a result of this State Government's activities is one which trims its sails—that is it cuts its programs according to what the market will bear.

I recently visited the United States and Canada where, quite apart from the interest I showed in general State, local government and Federal Government funding, I found both Americans and Canadians recognising that they had to recast their thinking—there no longer was a money tree at the end of the garden and that there was a need to live within their means. As one American very aptly put it, 'Sir, we do not have any growing pains but what we are suffering is pains of contraction.' I believe that this is—

**Mr Klunder:** A Labor pregnancy!

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** We have been suffering pains of contraction and 'labor' pains for the past three years, but I was not seeking to reduce the debate to that level. I want to point out and believe it to be factually correct that what Australia and the States will have to do is to learn to live within their means, which will be a contraction of their spending, and that the pains we will have in the future and those which the Liberal Party is prepared to offer to the people of South Australia (and has said so consistently) is that there will be less intrusion into the hip pocket of South Australians and a far more balanced and reasoned approach to management than the *laissez faire* attitude which has been so much a part of this Government's activities ever since it was elected. One has only to look—

**Mr Trainer:** We have been called lots of things, but never a *laissez faire* Party.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I would be happy to demonstrate to the member for Ascot Park, if he needs the demonstration any further, that he has only to look at the debacle out on the North Parklands called the Aquatic Centre. He has only to look at the remand centre, the burgeoning prices of land and in so many other areas to recognise the lack of constraint which has been placed upon the people by this Government. I indicate again that the Opposition supports this motion, but we will take full opportunity of the benefits of the grievance debate that will follow. The Leader of the Opposition will be the lead speaker in that debate, but will not commence it.

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I want to take one or two brief minutes at the second reading stage of the Supply Bill to appropriate \$485 million. I do so for a number of reasons which not only affect the people of this State but, in particular, those affecting my electorate. The expenditure of this money, unfortunately, will not go as far as any of us would desire.

Therefore, it is a matter of getting the Government's priorities in order. Those priorities can be assisted by a vigorous program of deregulation, privatisation and getting rid of red tape, together with unnecessary control and licence. I will only take a few minutes, because I do not believe in unnecessarily delaying the House, but I have one or two things I want to say. We backbenchers do not get many opportunities to speak, but I wish to speak about my electorate, in which I am interested.

In the *News* of 30 May I read a headline 'Bannon pulls off \$46 million funds coup'. I was pleased to read that because I thought that the Premier had much more money than he anticipated and it would be good for South Australia to undertake some of those projects that I regard as top priority and which may come to fruition. Also, I have been concerned because it appears that the Premier has a complete misunderstanding of the Opposition's policy in relation to deregulation and privatisation.

I sincerely hope that as this debate goes on there will be a better understanding of this policy, because it is unfortunate when debate in these areas degenerates into misrepresentation based on incorrect information. When the Premier and Government Departments are appropriating that \$485 million I sincerely hope they give very close attention to some of the problems currently facing local government. Recently, on the last day of the new Minister of Lands' term as Minister of Transport, I took a deputation along to see officers of the Highways Department. The submission from the Mount Remarkable District Council states:

The council has endeavoured to ascertain from the Highways Department an indication of possible funding on either:

- (1) Booleroo Centre to Jamestown Road.
  - (2) Reconstruction of Main North Road; but without success!
- As can be clearly seen from the schedule of grants received, there has been inadequate consistency in grants for rural arterial road construction over the past five years. The council therefore looks to the Highways Department and the Minister of Transport to ensure that funds are provided in 1985-86 financial year, and beyond, to enable the council to continue its construction program. . . . If substantial grant funds of \$150 000 or greater are not able to be provided, and the council must obviously continue with its retrenchment options, then a significant burden is placed upon the community in providing alternative employment, or supporting those persons retrenched through social welfare benefits. As you could appreciate, such action is not well received in small rural communities, resulting in impaired relationships between the council and the community. The district council therefore appeals to the Highways Department and Minister of Transport to provide adequate financial support to ensure the retention of its existing personnel, and to provide for a continual upgrading of the State's road network.

I can understand the situation of that council and other councils that may be deprived of adequate funds to continue their construction programs. I refer specifically to the need for funds to be spent on the road between Orroroo and Hawker. If these funds are not provided, the Mount Remarkable council must make further retrenchments with little or no likelihood of the persons retrenched being re-employed in their local community. Such an unfortunate occurrence would not improve the prospects of the Government in that area.

I wish to raise one or two other matters with which I hope the Government will deal. The member for Light referred to the deplorable program with which both the Minister of Water Resources and the Minister of Housing and Construction have been involved and which concerns that white elephant, the North Adelaide aquatic centre. I

tell my constituents that the Government cannot provide a water supply for them, yet they see at first hand where as much as \$8 million has been spent on this project while it says that it has not even \$500 000 to spend on a water supply west of Ceduna or to replace the water supply for Smoky Bay. It is an absolute disgrace that this Parliament in 1985 will allow Ministers to waste taxpayers' money in such a blatant way as it is being spent on this fool of an aquatic centre, which is not even on Government land and is completely out of control.

If a senior executive in private enterprise were to commit his company to such expenditure and to display such incompetence, he would be dismissed on the spot, and that should have happened to both Ministers. Unfortunately, however, they are allowed to bungle on as if nothing were wrong and to tell people such as my suffering constituents at Penong that they cannot have the water supply extended. Further, the Minister of Marine has reneged on a promise to upgrade the port facilities at Thevenard, where we have the richest gypsum deposits in the world. A shipping company has built a boat to operate in this area, but that vessel cannot be completely filled.

**The Hon. R.K. Abbott:** That work has only been deferred temporarily.

**Mr GUNN:** That is excellent news. I am pleased to hear it, because my constituents will be pleased. I should appreciate the Minister's making a public statement within the next day or two to clarify the situation. I will talk to him privately about this matter. I am pleased to get his assurance, because that proves the value of members taking part in such a debate as this when they get that sort of information from the Minister.

In my district, community school libraries are urgently needed in certain places. At Leigh Creek the school is bursting at the seams. Various preschool centres in the district need to be expanded, yet nothing is done, although Ministers such as the Minister of Water Resources and his colleague the Minister of Housing and Construction can bungle on, spending money on harebrained schemes such as the aquatic centre, as well as \$700 000 to shift the tennis courts at Port Augusta in the district that happens, coincidentally, to be represented by the previous Minister of Tourism. The Public Buildings Department is allowed to engage in irresponsible acts such as shifting those tennis courts from behind the TAFE building to another site. I thought that the people in Hawker were telling me a funny story about this matter, and it is significant that my question on notice concerning it has not been answered yet.

The Government should investigate such matters as I have raised. It should look at the situation where the recently appointed Minister of Transport and the vocal lady from Mawson and their tourist committee went to Wilpena and promised the people there an electricity supply within 12 months, yet nothing has happened. Why is it that my question on notice remains unanswered? Is it because the Government is so embarrassed that the Minister spoke out of turn? What are the facts? This debate gives me a chance to raise such matters as these. We are talking about the expenditure of \$480 million, and I remind members that Ministers have wasted not hundreds or thousands of dollars, but millions of dollars, while people in isolated communities have suffered for too long. Every time I get a chance in this House I will highlight such matters as these.

Fortunately, the member for Newland and the member for Unley, who asks his Dorothy Dix questions, will not be here to take part in debates after the next election. That reminds me that this Bill is only a temporary measure and that, for at least six months of the period that is covered by this Bill, a Liberal Treasurer will be administering these funds. I hope that, when the Treasurer replies in this debate,

he will explain why the Ministers to whom I have referred, having displayed such incompetence and misspent so much taxpayers' money when there are so many urgent priorities in this State especially in my district, have been retained. Why should my constituents have been allowed to suffer for so long because of inadequate expenditure on public facilities in their areas?

The Government can spend money at Port Augusta, but not a thought has been given to those people in extremely isolated communities who are doing everything possible to raise funds so that their children can have a reasonable education. There is no thought of matching the Queensland provision for isolated communities of up to about \$1 400 for the first year. Yet we can waste money on harebrained schemes. I could go on and on.

I conclude by saying that I hope that the Premier will bring the matters that I have raised to the attention of his Ministers and that we will see some action. In Denial Bay, a few kilometres from Ceduna, one of the fastest growing towns in this State, where, if you build a house, the law says that you must have a septic tank, there is no water, yet the Minister who has spent an extra \$3 million has told the Murat Bay District Council that there will be no social or economic improvement if the pipeline is put out there.

We realise that the Minister of Water Resources is not too bright. The Deputy Premier talks about yesterday's men but, if we needed a list of yesterday's men, look at most of the gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches. The Minister of Water Resources and the Minister of Housing and Construction would both qualify as yesterday's men. I have referred to the sort of nonsense that we get from them and the way in which they waste taxpayers' money, such as on the white elephant at North Adelaide, which I am told will not hold water and in respect of which, I understand, there is trouble with the roof. I have said enough to show my complete annoyance at how unfairly many of my constituents have been treated by this Government in recent times. I support the Bill.

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Fisher):** I wish to raise a couple of points in relation to this Bill. I find it disappointing that, while we are allocating more money to pay for the Public Service (and I realise that public servants must be paid), the Treasurer has not said how many public servants have retired during the period for which this Supply is required, and whether they have retired because of age, disability, stress, or whatever.

It is important for young people about to undertake their final matriculation exams, for example, and those in other fields who are perhaps looking for a job in the Public Service to have some indication from the Government at this time (and if not in this Bill it could be done at Budget time) about future prospects. It would give some indication to young people of whether there will be job opportunities available in the Public Service or semi-government bodies in South Australia.

Many people are employed in the Government field, and replacements will be required. The philosophy that I support is that we do not want to see Government departments grow. I am not advocating that that should occur, and, further, I believe that in some areas there may be more people than are required. I am not suggesting that anyone should be removed, but I think the Parliament should be informed on how many people in the current financial year, for instance, have left the Public Service and for what reasons, and how many of those people have been replaced.

We should be given some estimation of how many jobs there will be for young people, and perhaps an indication of the areas in which they are likely to be, especially now at a time when we are running into an election campaign.



This would be a great opportunity for the Government to promote at least some enthusiasm amongst the younger people in the community (in this year of youth) that there will be some opportunities for them. I am sure that that will be the case.

I am not blaming the Government for not having done this up to now, as no Government in the past has done it. However, the community needs that sort of information. I hope that, if we cannot obtain it at this time, such information will be forthcoming in the Budget debate at which time the Premier in introducing the Budget could give a clear indication on this matter.

In regard to money provided for the Engineering and Water Supply Department, I refer particularly to the provision of sewerage facilities. In the District Council of Stirling area there was a big spiel a few years ago about how the area would be sewered and that the program would be undertaken rapidly because the reservoirs were being polluted with the seepage of waste from the septic tanks of many thousands of homes in the water catchment area, many of which are in the District Council of Stirling area and the defined townships of that area.

Recently, departmental officers—who will be paid out of this \$485 million—attended a meeting of local government representatives in the Hills. At that meeting they clearly showed, by the use of maps, the concern that the department has in relation to the pollution of the reservoirs. What has happened about speeding up, or even keeping up, the program of sewerage in the Stirling District Council area? Nothing has happened. Nearly all departmental employees and their equipment have been pulled out and taken to other projects, and the program has virtually ground to a halt. It cannot proceed to any degree unless the officers of the department in conjunction with the Stirling District Council decide to submit to the Public Works Standing Committee a plan for the next section.

I am simply asking the Minister to get mobile and to get a proposal before the Public Works Standing Committee to enable the approval of the next section or whole completion of the Stirling sewerage program, and for the Government to then get on with it. Equipment is standing idle in the department's yard at Dry Creek or wherever it is. There is enough equipment available to build many sewer drains. That equipment is worth millions of dollars. All the Government needs to do is to get into action which would thus resolve the pollution problem in the area by enabling homes that want to be connected to the sewer system to do so.

That is all I want to say at this stage. I know that money must be allocated to pay the wages of the people involved, the vast majority of whom are very dedicated public servants working for Government and semi-government instrumentalities. If there is some red tape, hang ups and wasted resources, it is because the Parliament or the Government has not allocated resources to make proper use of the man and woman power that is available. I ask the Government to take up the two challenges that I have put to the Parliament today, because I believe that they are very important: one involves the younger age group in the community, and the other involves a community that has been accused of polluting the reservoirs, although that community can do nothing about that because the Government will not act.

**Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth):** I support the Bill, but in so doing I bring to the attention of members of the House and the Government several matters which are of concern to me at the moment. The first matter, and one which I consider to be the most important for South Australia as a whole, relates to the question of bushfire protection. As honourable members would be aware, over the past 12 months the State Government has taken a number of

important initiatives in relation to bushfire protection and has taken a number of steps to ensure that South Australia has a more effective country fire fighting service able to respond to bushfire emergencies. The Government has also taken some steps to ensure better co-ordination between the MFS and the Police Force in these matters.

However, one aspect of this matter remains to be addressed. This has already been foreshadowed by the Government but it has not been acted upon. This aspect of the problem is causing me some concern. On 16 October last year the then Minister of Emergency Services (the member for Adelaide) tabled in this House a very important statement on the reorganisation of the CFS and on the Government's general strategy for bushfire protection in the future. A critical part of that ministerial statement made in October 1984 was the foreshadowed establishment of a bushfire protection authority. This was to be a permanent authority, statutorily based, which would have very important functions in terms of co-ordinating the response to the bushfire threat in this State.

At that time the Minister indicated that the relevant legislation would be brought before the House in early 1985. To date we have not seen that legislation. It is this aspect of the problem that I feel needs to be reviewed quickly, because the bushfire danger season for this year is very rapidly approaching and little time remains in which to take the necessary action to ensure that the foreshadowed legislation is brought into effect.

The bushfire protection authority is to be part of an ongoing review of this area. I believe that, although the Government has taken a number of important initiatives, this remaining initiative is perhaps the most critical. The funds which I am sure the Supply Bill allocates to the CFS, the MFS and the police in their respective bushfire capacities should also be allocated in part to the establishment of the bushfire protection authority. That would bring together many of the public and private authorities of the State that have a hand in fighting bushfires. We all know of the very great danger that bushfires pose in this State. In recent times, we have been fortunate, but one cannot tell when the next significant bushfire danger season will see the outbreak of more serious fires which will bring even greater destruction to the Adelaide Hills area and to life and property in those areas.

The bushfire protection authority, foreshadowed by then Minister of Emergency Services last year, will bring together the authorities like the National Parks and Wildlife Service, the Woods and Forest Department, the insurance industry, the Department of Lands, local government, the police, the MFS, the CFS, and so on, as well as private individuals who are concerned about bushfire protection. These various authorities need to come together in a single co-ordinated attack on what remains the single greatest threat to the viability of this State's agricultural industry and of course to those who live in bushfire prone areas.

I commend the Government's proposal that was foreshadowed last year for the establishment of the bushfire protection authority, because a number of issues remain to be addressed. Of course, in that context I remind the House of the question of the undergrounding of the ETSA power distribution network. That is a very difficult question and one to which a number of pros and cons apply and it is necessary for a single agency to sort it out.

Whether it is going to attack that problem or whether it will be addressed by the Government directly I do not know, but either way a decision has to be made at the earliest possible opportunity if we are not to go into another bushfire season with inadequate protection.

As the last Ash Wednesday fires demonstrated, it is critical to ensure that not only is the CFS fully prepared (and

I am sure under its new Director and its most effective new board and Chairman, in whom I have every confidence, it is addressing the problems from the point of view of the (CFS), but also serious consideration must be given to the responses by the MFS and the Police Force of this State. Those three agencies together play a pivotal role in addressing the bushfire menace. It is essential that they work together as a coordinated team.

I am aware that the MFS, CFS and police over the last 12 months have had discussions in an effort to bring their policies closer together and also to ensure that there is no conflict between them in the event of an emergency, but I also believe that a statutory authority, such as the Bushfire Protection Authority, would greatly assist in developing co-ordinated management plans and coordinated communication facilities in order to ensure that those three agencies are effective in dealing with this threat.

Something which was a surprise and of concern to me was that the necessary legislation was not foreshadowed in the Governor's speech. I hope that that does not mean that the Government has overlooked it. I am sure that an issue as critical as this must be under active review and I hope that the Government will come forward very shortly to announce its plans in this area. It is essential that, if that legislation is to be enacted, we have it on the Statute Book as early as possible so that the authority has the opportunity to spend some considerable time in consultation and planning in order to ensure that the State has a properly coordinated bushfire protection plan and that the relevant authorities are brought into a concerted group ready, willing and able to meet that threat whenever it arises.

Although at the moment we are experiencing significant rains and the threat is virtually zero, we all know how few weeks are required to change a zero threat into a very significant threat, so I hope that the Government will give consideration to that in determining how it allocates its funds from the Supply Bill and that the House will be informed of policy measures in that area at the earliest possible opportunity.

I now refer to another matter, perhaps of more local and parochial concern, but nevertheless it is important to me and to my electorate. I refer to the car parking arrangements at the Elizabeth railway station. The relevant authorities in this matter are the State Transport Authority and the Housing Trust, whose salaries are met by this Bill at least in part. It is time that those two authorities organised themselves a little better and got together in a coordinated and effective way to do something about a problem which is of major concern to those who use public transport in the Elizabeth area.

Although the electorate of Salisbury is now enjoying the benefits of a very substantial and, one might say, almost magnificent structure in the form of the Salisbury bus rail interchange, and although most of the other car parks at railway stations on the northern line are fully surfaced and more than appropriate for public use, the Elizabeth railway station, which is the regional centre for the Northern Plains area, remains unsealed.

I suggest that, in this day and age, it is a disgrace that a major regional centre should have an unsealed railway car park in the metropolitan area. People must walk through a quagmire of mud and slush in order to get to and from their cars in winter. Of course, in summer the dust is quite unbelievable. The problem has arisen because the two Government agencies involved (that is, the State Transport Authority and the Housing Trust) have been unable to agree on a formula by which the STA can take control of the car park and spend the necessary funds to have it properly sealed and developed as the people of the area would require, and as I am sure the Government would wish.

Unfortunately, the Housing Trust considers this land to be a commercial property. It is located right in the heart of the Elizabeth commercial centre. The trust wishes to sell it to the STA for what amounts to a commercial rate, which would entail a very significant and handy profit to the Housing Trust and which I am sure the trust would put to good use in its building program, but one which the STA is quite unable to meet, because it would also be required to fund the necessary redevelopment and sealing work.

Consequently, the stalemate continues. The car park can never be developed for commercial purposes, because obviously a substantial car park is required for a major regional station. No further action takes place. Year after year the people who use that car park are required to wear their Wellingtons and sometimes get out a small boat in order to reach their cars. That situation is quite unsatisfactory and I hope that the two Ministers concerned (that is, the Minister of Housing and Construction and the Minister of Transport) can request their respective departments to come to an equitable and reasonable agreement as soon as possible so that before the next winter season we will see some action. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Lands):** I move:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for consideration of the Bill.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I am not the lead speaker; the lead speaker will be later this evening. I want to mention statements made in the propaganda released by the Premier in relation to the tax cuts. I rate a mention under the ETSA announcement, and that pleases me. As Billy Hughes said, any publicity is good publicity. The only problem is that the statement is not only misleading, but it is downright untrue. My legal friends might even advise me that it is defamatory, but I do rate a mention. The Premier, in his handout, said, 'Bannon tax cut package'. Then ETSA is mentioned. A run-down of ETSA tariffs which have applied since 1971 is then listed. The Premier said:

On 1 December 1982 there was a 12 per cent increase approved by the Liberals and totally due to the Goldsworthy gas price agreement.

If it were not for the Goldsworthy agreement, and if it was left to the Labor Party contracts which were in force, it would have been 19 per cent. That is what the Labor Party inflicted on the State. An 80 per cent increase was granted by the arbitrator, a procedure which was set up by the Labor Party, those business geniuses who were in charge of the affairs of the State when that contract was written. They were legally granted an 80 per cent increase in gas tariffs. ETSA then came to me and said that that would require an immediate increase in tariffs of no less than 19 per cent. I said, 'That is not on.' After a great deal of negotiation, when we did not have a legal feather to fly with because of these appalling gas contracts, we removed the gas exploration levy the Labor Party had instituted and renegotiated that 80 per cent increase, reducing it to half for most of 1982. We got the producers to agree to no further increases in 1983.

As a result of that Goldsworthy agreement we were able to mitigate the effects of the Labor Party contracts which required a 19 per cent increase, no less, as a result of the unfolding of those arbitration procedures set up under the Labor Party's appalling contracts. So much for the statement churned out by the Premier giving me a mention, but it is a completely false and I believe probably defamatory mention.

**An honourable member:** Not very bright!

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Being a damn sight brighter than the member opposite and being a damn sight

more experienced in these matters, I simply point out the complete falsity and complete absence of any vestige of truth in the accompanying statement in relation to the increase which applied in 1982. Of course, Labor was in Government at that stage and it has had all this time to do something about it. I understand that the Premier and his Government are currently seeking to negotiate a 10 year price contract for gas in South Australia. Good luck to them!

**Mr Baker:** I bet he doesn't do it before the election.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** They are trying hard to, but it will be an appalling blunder if the Government ignores the Sydney contracts. I read in a speech by the Manager of the Gas Company that the range of prices that they are looking at is \$1.50 per gigajoule, which is a reduction from the \$1.62 which runs out in December, to \$2.50 in 1985 prices, but it will be an appalling blunder to agree—if they can get the producers to agree to that—without rationalising the Sydney contracts. I hope that the Premier hears this, because it will be an absolute blunder that will perpetuate the inequality that exists between those Sydney contracts and the South Australian contracts.

In other words, AGL will come trundling along every three years with an arbitration and we will have this continuing problem of these unsatisfactory contracts by which Sydney will buy our gas considerably more cheaply than we do. If the Government is writing the contracts and can reach agreement on a sensible range of prices, good luck to it! But, if it ignores the Sydney contracts with AGL and does not include them in any rationalisation of those arrangements in terms not only of the supply of gas—which is still doubtful because an independent assessment of the reserves is not available—and ignores the pricing arrangements for Sydney gas, that will be as big a blunder as the Labor Party made when it wrote those original contracts.

I am well aware that these negotiations have been going on. I am well aware that they stalled under Minister Payne, who did nothing from the end of last year in relation to it. I understand that they have been revived and that all sorts of tactics may be applied, but if the Government neglects, as I say, to rationalise those Sydney contracts it will be an all time blunder in relation to equality in gas supplies for South Australia.

The arrangements with ETSA are all very hazy. We are told that the Government is to remit \$11 million of the levy—the Labor Party tax, that is, which was imposed in those pace-setting 1970s when the tall poppies were to be taxed and, indeed, everyone in the State was taxed; the householder really copped it. The Government will remit part of that 5 per cent levy that the Labor Party had imposed on the taxpayers. That does not even approach the extra tax that the Labor Party applied this year by fiddling with the interest arrangements. There was no reason to fiddle with them at all. It was not costing the Government a cent more in interest repayments. They were loans that had been negotiated for a long time. It was just some bright idea that some genius dreamed up to increase the tax on ETSA. So the Government lifted an extra \$14 million this year from ETSA by way of those changed arrangements.

It also charged ETSA a fee in excess of \$3 million to guarantee the loans. It does not need to guarantee the loans; another complete fiddle to get at ETSA! As I say, all these arrangements for this 2 per cent cut are very hazy indeed because the largest component in terms of the increases that we face in Government were in terms of labour costs. The Labor Party gave ETSA the 38 hour week without even a word. The then Minister said, 'Right, you can have your 38 hour week.' ETSA is not under ministerial control, but it was told to do that by the Labor Party Minister.

The Labor Party invariably has supported any increases in pay rises, and they were really out of control during those years in which it was in Government. There was a wages

explosion: one claim for \$22 a week was granted, I recall. Inflation was running at about 12 per cent or 13 per cent. We had these gas contracts to deal with and here we have this announcement of a 2 per cent cut, but precious little detail as to how the Government intends to overcome this problem in the future.

So, the Government will give temporary relief of \$11 million for their tax for one year, but it does not mention that last year it pushed ETSA into a \$5 million deficit. What deficit will ETSA incur this year? To what will it push that deficit? If it has not made satisfactory arrangements in relation to the price of fuel, labour increases, increases in costs and the like, how on earth will it promise no rises in excess of the CPI if it is pushing ETSA, as I believe it is, into an increased deficit? There is always a day of reckoning.

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

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I am pleased to take part in this grievance debate. I want to say to the member for Elizabeth that, if he is concerned about the effectiveness of the Country Fire Services, at the appropriate time he should lend his support to a Bill which I will bring into the House in the near future to alleviate a number of problems, particularly in relation to the operational control of fires by placing complete authority to determine the most appropriate course of action anywhere in South Australia clearly in the hands of the Country Fire Services.

The second matter that I raise relates to an article that appeared in last week's *Sunday Mail* dealing with firearms. The Deputy Registrar of Firearms, Chief Superintendent Bill Tate, said:

... the increased rifle and shotgun registrations could lead to owners being asked to justify use and possession of all types of firearms. The restrictions would be similar for those in force for hand guns. Anyone seeking to own a hand gun—pistol or revolver—must obtain from police a special authority to purchase.

He also said that gun club membership means safety. He was indicating, as I understand it, that people may be required to belong to an appropriate club or organisation before being permitted to acquire further firearms or maintain ownership of existing firearms.

I say from the outset that I am very surprised at those comments. As one who has been involved for a long time in this debate, I believe that law abiding citizens are not only entitled but have a right, as long as they are responsible, to own firearms. I am not talking about hand guns and concealed weapons. I am surprised at the Superintendent's comments and I intend at the earliest convenience to have some discussions with him. I make very clear in relation to that article that it has caused a great deal of concern amongst law abiding firearms owners and amongst gun clubs. I point out to the Superintendent that he and those of like mind are in for a fight if they think they will bring about the sort of proposals that he suggested. If honourable members want to see a campaign where thousands of letters hit the Police Department and the Government, and if they want to see people really get organised, I suggest that they attempt to bring in this proposal. I give good warning that I will do everything in the Parliament to prevent it.

Not only is it unnecessary, but it is also unwise and I do not believe that this course of action is properly thought through, and I can give reasons for that. It will only control law abiding citizens and will not prevent criminals from having firearms. If anyone wants to obtain a handgun he can get it. If a law of this nature is brought into effect it would simply prevent law abiding citizens going about their sporting activities. People who use firearms in the course

of their work, such as farmers and graziers and those people who like to own one to do private shooting, will have their life made unbearable. It is not necessary, nor would it have an effect on preventing criminals owning firearms. If we want to prevent the illegal use of firearms we should amend the law to bring about mandatory gaol sentences for people who use firearms in the commissioning of an offence.

I have been involved in discussions and debates since this legislation first came into effect and it is unfortunate that this article will cause grave concern to those responsible bodies who represent the shooting fraternity in this State, of which there are many tens of thousands. Many would never have committed an offence in their lifetime, but they are unfortunately having their credibility called into question because of the actions of a very small minority who may have transgressed. These people would have transgressed whether or not there was licensing, registration or any other controls we could have.

I also point out that I do not oppose reasonable licensing. Registration is not all it is cracked up to be. No control exists in Queensland. I understand that in New Zealand they are taking action to get rid of some of these controls and this sort of suggestion, which puts fear into the minds of responsible firearm owners, makes it difficult to have responsible laws because the arguments against controls become emotive and emotional. People are fearful that no matter what responsible line they will take they will be overridden.

I look forward to having discussions with the inspector about this matter as this article has done little to help control illegal use of firearms. I was most surprised as I thought that a comment of that nature would have been properly made by the Minister as it is the Legislature and Executive that makes the laws. If the regulations are to be changed they will have to be brought before the Subordinate Legislation Committee. I give fair warning that there will be a line-up of people to give evidence to that committee and those people who have to administer it will be put through their paces at great length.

To put it mildly, I am not at all impressed with what has taken place. I have studied fairly closely the administration of the existing Act and regulations. It is one area that leaves something to be desired. I own a firearm myself, and I take strong exception to being told that people in my position and others have to go through an unnecessary examination or other restriction just to own a firearm.

The other matter to which I wish to refer is the very serious situation currently existing in South Australia and, in particular, rural South Australia caused by the high cost of fuel. The fuel parity pricing program is completely out of control. It is absolutely ridiculous that people should be inflicted with such unreasonable charges just to fill up their fuel tank and carry on their business. We had the classic statement by Mr Keating that the previous Government was using the petrol pump as a tax collecting agent. They have carried on that tradition with a great deal of zeal and I give him credit for being able to rip off even more money from the unsuspecting motorist and people using fuel. The rate of tax now applying is deplorable and is having a serious effect on the community.

People in isolated areas have to use motor cars to take their children to school, to go about their normal business, attend sporting functions and so on. They are being sluggish. It can no longer be justified. That policy should be repealed and there should be a considerable reduction in the cost of fuel. We will see political agitation in rural areas as we have never seen before if the high cost of fuel continues and if the Commonwealth Government attempts to introduce death duties. With the statements that have been made, make no

mistake that disruption amongst the rural community will be on a scale never seen before in this country.

We have been through all this nonsense and argument where Governments have tried to plunder the hard-gained assets of people in primary industry. They are not prepared to sit back any longer and tolerate the suggestion that this so-called enlightened Government in Canberra wants to inflict upon them. I assure members that not only country people but all thinking people would agree that this level of taxation is too high. The Government has to get its house in order, sort out its priorities and reduce the tax burden whilst becoming more efficient and businesslike. When money is tight it must cut spending to their income rather than wind up the tax mechanism and screw a bit more out of people. If it thinks it is going to get away with this attempt to seize the rural assets of this country through a capital gains backdoor method of death duties, it has another think coming. The rural industry is organised and has a very effective spokesman in Mr McLachlan. I have every confidence that it will take the appropriate action to defeat that legislation. I hope that every Senator in South Australia will use his vote to defeat any capital gains taxation.

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** I wish to refer to a matter that I have been pursuing for some years, namely, public transport within my electorate. Some years ago I raised the question of the development of Delfin Island. Contrary to the opinion of some members, it is not an area endowed with people who are necessarily in the high income bracket. Many people there are battlers or retired people looking for a good public transport system. I am aware of high demands upon the State Transport Authority in terms of the needs for additional services in this State. I believe the previous Minister did his best to address the problem.

In the Delfin Island area around Corcoran Drive, particularly in the Woodbridge part of Delfin Island, three large estates exist in which retired people reside. Many of them have some difficulty walking to the local shopping centre in Bartley Terrace on West Lakes Shore. For able and agile people in the community it is only a five or 10 minute walk across the bridge over the waterway into Bartley Terrace, into the shopping centre and back. However, many of these people have arthritic problems and other disabilities.

Some do not have cars, so they cannot travel to that shopping centre. If they do, they have a great deal of difficulty in getting there. Again, I appeal to the Government to give favourable consideration to the introduction of a State Transport Authority service into this area of Delfin Island, where there are more than 700 homes, at a conservative estimate. I suggest if we took into account retired people and young families we would be looking at a population somewhere around 1 200 or 1 300 people. It is a closely knit and closely developed community, as development there is almost completed and, by the end of next year, I believe it will be fully built upon.

It is important, given the nature of the electorate in terms of young people, married couples and the aged, that this bus service be introduced. People could then journey to West Lakes Mall where they could attend Lifestyle and restaurants in the vicinity. It would also provide access to Football Park, thereby reducing the number of cars needing to be parked in that area. I earnestly request that strong and favourable consideration be given to the introduction of such a service, hopefully if not in this year early in the new year. It would be a nice Christmas or new year present for those people. Delfin Island is a very important area, and one that should be catered for.

Members on both sides of the House would be concerned about certain recent events in my electorate. Within almost as many weeks we have had three or four robberies there.

The first was on Trimmer Parade, Seaton, where I understand that the staff of a supermarket were counting out money when robbers broke in through the back door and a considerable sum was stolen. The second incident concerned a delicatessen owner whose shop is not far from where I live. I understand that the small businessman was counting up his day's takings when people came into his shop and before he knew what was happening he was belted across the head. Marks indicated that he was assaulted.

The third incident involved a pharmacist who was robbed for the second time in three or four years. I am informed that drugs were stolen. All of those people told me that they have nothing but praise for the Police Force and the job they have done in trying to assist them in those unfortunate situations. I was also concerned to learn of a shopkeeper whom I will not name, but I am prepared to pass on the relevant information to the Chief Secretary. She rang my office on 5 August to say that her shop was broken into approximately three weeks ago and that a float of some \$150 was stolen.

This woman, who is well known to me, said that she believed that a couple of lads had cased the shop a few days before the event. She told me that she had reported the incident to the police and had given them the registration number of the vehicle involved. She also told me that she is annoyed and also frightened. She will not open her shop on Thursday nights any more, and as a result she loses between \$700 and \$800. She said that she cannot and will not open the shop at nights and also that she is fearful during the daytime. I do not reflect upon the police in any way: they do a tremendous job. I asked for some advice from the Chief Secretary so that I could pass it on to these small businessmen. Possibly there is some action that they can take to try to cut down on these types of robberies.

These issues have to be addressed. Successive Governments have, to the best of their ability, endeavoured to reduce the incidence of crime in the community. Possibly these people can put some of their money into the bank early in the day and leave notices on the shop window that very little money is stored there. I raise this matter because it is urgent. I emphasise that I do not reflect on the police in CI division. From past experience, I know that they do a terrific job. However, I should bring the matter before Parliament as it concerns all my constituents. I hope that there is some advice for those people and that the matter is not kicked around in the election lead-up.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra):** I support the Bill which seeks, out of Consolidated Account, \$485 million and, as has been traditional in this place, during the passage of such a Bill members on both sides have the opportunity to raise issues of significance to the State generally or in relation to their own areas in particular.

As the Address in Reply debate is continuing over the next few days I propose to reserve those matters of State significance until then. However, I place on record several concerns about matters relating to my own district of Alexandra. Dating back to the time that Hugh Hudson was Minister of Education, progressing then to the Hon. Don Hopgood, and during the period that we were in Government the Hon. Harold Allison was Minister, I must say in fairness that, for the first few months Minister Lynn Arnold has been in office, our district has been served reasonably well from the kindergarten level through to area and high school standards.

School buildings, both new and staged development, and other items of maintenance have been attended to reasonably fairly, but for one or two exceptions. However, in the past 12 months or so it seems to us at that district level that the Hon. Lynn Arnold, the present Minister of Edu-

cation, has directed his attention to other areas of Government or, maybe in the parochial sense, to his own district.

Certainly, in our area education requirements have been almost totally ignored by the Minister. I cite the Victor Harbor High School where stage development has enjoyed a high priority listing for several years, but where in recent times it has dropped down to the point where the school council, the community, the staff and the students consider the matter critical. Indeed, we recently sought the opportunity for a deputation to discuss these concerns with the Minister.

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** You didn't get to see him?

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** I have never had a rejection of a deputation by a Minister of the Crown, either Liberal or Labor in this State, until recently, and I have now had two: one from the Minister of Water Resources and, more recently and more especially in this instance, one from the Minister of Education. I rang his office and offered him the choice of meeting a deputation from the Victor Harbor High School Council either in his office or at Parliament House, at his convenience, that week, next week, or in any subsequent week. However, the response that I received after a staff member had consulted with the Minister was that he had been briefed on the matter by his officers and that he did not desire to meet the people from Victor Harbor on it.

I take exception to that. Ordinarily I would not raise such a matter in this place, but to me that is an abdication of the Minister's role and responsibilities. He has locked himself away from, and therefore denied access to, the people of this State, specifically people from my district where this matter is one of real concern.

Over the years I have not run to Ministers with deputations on petty issues but, regarding the lack of overall development of that school's replacement and urgent maintenance works, I believe, with these people, that it was fair in this instance to ask for an opportunity to discuss the matter with him. We have been denied that opportunity. Facilities required for a teacher at Yankalilla Area School do not seem to be receiving the time and effort required of the officers concerned. If they are receiving such attention, the recommendations that have flowed through the system have, up to the present, been unattended.

Regarding facilities at the Penneshaw Rural School on Kangaroo Island, over a period the Minister has undertaken to ensure that the preschoolers (that is, the kindergarten children enjoying access to a room in the special rural school) will be accommodated and that a facility will be built for them. However, we are now near the end of the school year and within weeks those kindy children are to vacate the school premises because such premises are required by students from year 1 to year 7. Again, this demonstrates a matter that seems to have taken second place, if not last place, in the system.

I raise these issues concerning the Minister of Education, albeit in his absence from the Chamber today. He will know what I am talking about and he is conscious of the problems. I ask the Premier to ensure that the Minister be given sufficient support and assistance in his portfolio to enable proper attention to be paid to problems such as these.

Another issue that has arisen in recent weeks is of real concern to the Mount Compass and Goolwa regions. The school bus services in those two areas have proved inadequate. An incredible saga, if not an outrageous situation, arose earlier this calendar year when the Minister prevented, by order of his office, some children of families that had attended Mount Compass from riding on the bus from the Goolwa region to that school. We have heard enough about that subject, I would have thought, but more recently the matter has arisen again. There is real growth in both the districts to which I have referred, and the school bus serv-

ices there need to be reviewed urgently. Indeed, submission on submission has been made to the Minister in this regard but, up to the present, we have seen no real sign of attention being paid to this matter.

I am aware of the need (indeed, I have been in attendance with departmental officers who I am sure acknowledge this need) for attention to be given to the southern region, especially along the South Coast of Fleurieu Peninsula. This has one of the highest growth rates in the State, as evidenced by the most recent electoral redistribution, which showed clearly that the growth factor in the Alexandra District was such that the area of the district had to be reduced significantly in order to comply with the Electoral Act. That demonstrates the sort of growth that is being experienced in the region. Although that aspect refers to electoral growth in particular, it accordingly also applies to the growth in the preschool and student population in the area. In other districts that have experienced great growth, such as Tea Tree Gully and Morphett Vale, the governments of the day have provided facilities. Throughout Fleurieu Peninsula there is a real need for appropriate (not outlandish, outrageous or unreasonable) facilities for the children of that region. We seek fair attention in the near future.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** Almost 12 months ago, during the Budget Estimates Committees, I put it to the Minister of Lands that an artificial shortage of land had been created in South Australian country towns by the Government. In 50 towns the Government is the subdivider and provides land for housing, commercial and industrial purposes. At that time, I asked the Minister for a schedule of towns where the Lands Department was responsible, as the subdivider, so that I could see where no land was available for housing, industrial or commercial use.

The Minister provided me with a schedule which clearly indicated that in 40 South Australian towns, in respect of which the Lands Department is responsible as subdivider, no land was available for purchase by home builders or persons seeking land for industrial or commercial use. It is disgraceful that, in a country the size of Australia, with a population of fewer than 16 million, land is not readily available, especially for home builders.

Following the Ministers providing me with that schedule, I raised the matter in the House during Question Time, pointing out that the Minister was virtually saying that the Lands Department was not carrying out its duty as required as the subdivider of last resort. In reply to my question the Minister said:

Traditionally, of course, the Department of Lands has been a very important supplier of developed land in country towns where this proposition for various reasons is unattractive to private enterprise. Therefore, it is important that this function continue, and it will continue. Of course, I do not know that the list that I sent to the honourable member in fact addresses the important question of demand and the extent to which there is significant demand in some of those country areas. I will obtain further information from my department on that matter and provide it to the House.

That was almost 12 months ago, but since then we have received no further information. I have checked this matter with Riverland councils and it would seem that the situation has worsened since then. I am pleased that the new Minister of Lands is in the House this afternoon, because this is a serious issue of which I hope he will take account today. I seek from him the opportunity to put before the Director-General of Lands some information that I have in relation to the very real issues that confront many people throughout South Australian country areas.

Some months ago I introduced a deputation to the then Deputy Premier. I believed that he was the most logical person to go to, because I always found that he was a person I could count on to do something that he said he would do.

It is unfortunate that through ill health he was unable to continue with the work that he undertook to do. On that occasion the Renmark council indicated to the Deputy Premier that prime land was available in Renmark, being land currently held by Australian National. Originally this land was handed over to the South Australian Government for railway purposes and then at the time of the selling out of the State country railways to the Federal Government the land was transferred to Australian National.

However, during the past three years the railway line from Paringa to Barmera has been closed. That land has been lying idle for those years, and during that time both the Renmark and Barmera councils have tried to obtain access to it. It is extremely valuable to Renmark and Barmera, right in the centre of the existing town of Renmark, and would provide valuable land for the development in that area; the same situation pertains in Barmera. The land has been lying idle for virtually three years, and it appears that, no matter what efforts the Renmark and Barmera councils have made, there has been no progress in trying to make land available for use.

I refer to a letter dated 12 July this year from the District Council of Barmera to the then Minister of Lands (Hon. D.J. Hopgood) in relation to surplus land in the township of Barmera. It identifies what I am talking about, as follows:

Council wishes to draw your attention to the situation which has been of concern to members for some years now and as yet remains unresolved. I am referring to land at section 431, being the old Barmera railway yards which have been idle since the closure of the Paringa-Barmera railway some three years ago. Since the closure of that line, this council, together with regional officers of your department, had planned to use the land, once released, in town extensions. In 1982 with the preparation of the council's draft supplementary development plan the land was zoned in two portions—one industrial and the other residential. With the continued promise of impending release of the land by the State Transport Authority and Australian National, neither of which seems to be in any hurry to release the land, the problem just continues.

There are young people in some 40 towns in South Australia wanting to build a home but they cannot purchase a block of land. As I have said, that is an absolutely absurd situation. If the Government is serious about decentralisation, how on earth does it reconcile its position in relation to providing housing land with the situation that exists? I have only to refer to a letter which I received from a constituent living in the Waikerie area. He states:

I write to you hoping that you may be able to help my wife and I with a problem we are presently experiencing with the Department of Lands. We have been unsuccessfully trying to obtain land within the township of Waikerie since late last year, so as to build a family home. Last year I contacted the Department of Lands and was informed of the impending development of Heinemann Estate in Waikerie by the Department of Lands.

I was informed by the Department of Lands that the blocks would be released early in 1985 and this date was changed several times and I finally was assured that the said blocks would be released in June 1985. As it is now July 1985, the blocks have not been released and there is no indication that any announcement will be made in the future.

To the best of my knowledge it appears that the Department of Lands has dropped the idea of subdividing that land. So, just where do these people go? How do country people obtain a housing block, and how do we expand industry and commerce if there is no land available? These country towns are surrounded by countless millions of hectares of open space land, and no matter what sort of money one has one cannot buy a block in some 40 of the 50 towns for which the Department of Lands is responsible as the subdivider.

**Mr PETERSON (Semaphore):** In the few minutes that I have available to me in this debate I shall raise a matter of great concern to me, and I am sure to many South Australians

and, I hope, to every member of this House, namely the terrible situation in which many patients in nursing homes now find themselves. An article in the *News* of 19 June 1985 was the first inkling of the situation which was to develop. The article, headed 'Nursing home freeze "hits pensioners"' stated:

Hundreds of South Australian pensioners might be forced into bankruptcy or on to the streets by a Federal freeze on nursing home bed subsidies.

That is what is likely to happen. In the *Advertiser* of 25 July 1985, comments made by the Commissioner for the Ageing were reported. The appointment of a Commissioner for the Ageing was a magnificent appointment; we certainly need someone in such a position. The case that I shall put forward now will highlight the needs of the aged in our community. The article in the *Advertiser* entitled 'South Australia's pensioners hit by freeze on bed subsidies' stated:

South Australia was on the verge of a social-welfare crisis with most beds in nursing homes expected to be financially out of reach of pensioners before November, the South Australian Commissioner for the Ageing, Dr Adam Graycar, said yesterday. Fewer than 850 beds out of a total of 3 500 would then be available to pensioner patients and none by early 1986, he said.

In a mini Budget of May this year the Federal Government indicated that it will not increase the bed subsidy for South Australian nursing home patients in private care. That has brought about a situation where right now there are people in nursing homes who cannot pay the bill that is given to them every month. The situation has arisen because of forces beyond the control of the people conducting nursing homes. The bed fee that they are able to charge is assessed by the Commonwealth Government department responsible for community services.

Each home is assessed separately. They have to submit their figures; they are assessed and then given a set rate per day which they can charge on the beds in that hospital. They are therefore charging exactly what the Commonwealth Government says they can charge. Before people can be admitted to one of these nursing homes, they have to be assessed by the Commonwealth as being in need of nursing home care.

**Mr Baker:** Totally infirm.

**Mr PETERSON:** Yes, totally infirm. Therefore, there are two factors: the amount that can be charged per home and the need for that care. When people are admitted to a home, they are entitled to the nursing home allowance from the Government. They pay their pension and receive a bed subsidy based on a weekly or daily rate. This amount is now not meeting the cost of the beds. Many people now in nursing homes are unable to grasp the situation they are facing. They have difficulty understanding the bill which they receive every month or which somebody is paying for them. They also do not understand that there is a difference between the bill and the amount they receive each week, and they have no idea how it is going to be paid.

If they have a few assets upon which they may receive some return and which may cover the difference, they are not able to make those decisions because, in order for them to have been accepted in the nursing home, they must have been assessed as being in need of this infirm care, and therefore many of them are unable to make any judgments relating to the need for adjustments in their finances. In other cases those patients who can and are able to make those decisions may not have anybody to perform such tasks for them. Many of these patients are being subsidised by their families but, as with a case brought to my attention, because of the age of these people in many cases their children are also on age pensions and living in subsidised housing.

*Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:*

**Mr PETERSON:** We all have them. Although some of these plush suburbs do not have them, I have four private homes in my electorate.

**Mr Baker:** I have 12 in my electorate.

**Mr PETERSON:** You must also have the problem. These people are being treated disgracefully. The bed charges that are applied are assessed on the rates of pay which are payable to the staff. I have no quarrel with that. It is assessed on the hours of work performed, and this has been decided through the arbitration system, but it adds to the cost of the home. The homes are told what they can charge and, when they charge that rate, the people in the homes cannot meet it. Mr Graycar says that, by 2001, the Australian population will rise by 31 per cent, but the numbers over 65 by 64 per cent, and those over 75 by 113 per cent, so it is a problem which not only affects us now, but it will also affect patients in these homes and their families in the future.

There is no way that the people concerned can overcome the problem. If people have assets, they might be able to rearrange them, but if they receive a larger return on those assets their pension is then reduced accordingly. They then revert to the situation where they cannot find the difference. There are people who can adjust their assets and there are also patients in the homes who are being cared for and the bills being paid by the family, or out of an estate, but many have no family to turn to and no private resources.

In an article dated 19 June the Minister said that South Australia challenges the plan to cut it back, but that does not pay the bills. What is going to happen to these people if they cannot pay the bill? There has been no public response as to what is going to happen to them. Are they going to be provided with beds in the Julia Farr Centre or some other place? The situation worsens week by week.

In November this year there will be another adjustment to the Commonwealth bed subsidy in most States bar South Australia and I think the Northern Territory or Tasmania, so the rate will be increased because of the cost of living increases in nursing homes, but patients will be placed in a worse situation of having a larger deficit when comparing their resources and the bill. I did a quick survey of the four private homes in my district and there are definitely people in those homes who need assistance or some alternative form of care, or some mechanism by which they can pay the bill, but it is not forthcoming. Some people do have assets and I think everybody would agree that it really is not the Government's place to foot the bill for those people who have the resources to pay their account. We are not in the business of subsidising inheritances, but we are here to see that people are cared for properly, and that is not happening.

We have three forms of care for these people. We have private homes, which under this system are now feeling the pinch. That does not happen in the case of Government institutions, because the bill is paid anyway. We also have deficit funded establishments where really it does not matter what it costs, because the difference is funded by the Federal Government. I think strong action must be taken by the State Government to protect the South Australians who are neglected by this system. Different levels of staffing are required in each State, and this has caused a difference in the bed rate per State. That is laid out clearly in the circular from the Commonwealth Department of Health where it is stated that the cost per day in each State is different, and that is so because the care provided is different. The only way to decrease the rate in this State is to lessen the care. If anybody in this House wishes that to happen, let them stand up and say so. If not, let us support these elderly people who deserve our protection and who must be looked after. If there is no answer to this nursing home problem,

let us find an alternative answer that may look after the people concerned for the rest of their lives.

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

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I wish to take this opportunity to complain about what I think is discriminatory action taken by the Minister of Recreation and Sport. For some time his department has been fiddling around with the various sporting organisations and clubs. No doubt the department has adopted a very high-handed and dictatorial attitude towards the allocation of sports grants.

In the *Guardian Messenger* of 17 July 1985, under 'Sport' there is a headline '\$1.5m grant for local sport groups'. That headline is misleading, because that \$1.5m is spread over four financial years. The article goes on to state:

Government salary subsidies to recreation, sport and fitness groups will total \$475 020 in 1985-86, \$430 000 in 1986-87, \$355 547 in 1987-88 and \$226 933 in 1988-89.

I claim that is misleading, because an election is due within the next few months, and there could well be a change in Government. No matter what happens there will be a change in administration and who is to say that future Governments will spend this amount of money? Indeed, I hope it will be much more. These organisations deserve more funds.

It is a pity that the Minister is not here, because all he is allocating this financial year is \$475 020 and we have not even seen the budget, so here is a pre-budget announcement. I refer in particular to the discriminatory nature of these grants. The grants are given to various organisations for positions, including general managers, coaching directors and administrative, development and executive officers. The Minister is quoted as saying:

For many years, South Australian groups were forced to compromise on their ideals and make the best of their limited opportunities and personnel.

After all, he has been Minister for nearly three years, and surely he has done something to improve their lot. The article goes on:

Individually, sport will get \$1 126 490, recreation \$258 800, and fitness and healthy lifestyle \$136 500 over the four years.

I would like an explanation from the Minister and/or his officers as to how the South Australian Genealogy and Heraldry Society fits into any one those three categories. I do not believe that it does. Let us look at the organisations that will receive some financial assistance, and good luck to them! I just wish that there was more money. The organisations to benefit under the State Government programme—and the Minister has not said what amounts of money they will receive—are: the Scout Association of Australia (SA Branch), the Girls Guides Association SA Inc., and Australian Recreational Marching.

I remember on many occasions approaching previous Ministers and the department for assistance to marching girls in this State and I could not get a penny to help one of the most successful marching teams at the Western Youth Centre.

**Mr Mathwin:** The West Points.

**Mr BECKER:** The West Points, quite right. The girls have won the Interdominion titles on many occasions, the Australian titles and the State titles, and could not get a penny. They were promised money about four years ago when Tom Casey was the Minister. Since then, the department—I blame the department because it would not allow successive Ministers to make a grant to these girls or to the Marching Girls Association—

*Mr Mathwin interjecting:*

**Mr BECKER:** Yes, and a successful marching team that was, too; so the marching girls have not got anything except that we now find that at least one group is being recognised

under these grants—the Australian Recreational Marching. The list goes on:

YMCA, Camping Association of S.A., the Bush and Mountain Walking Leadership Training Board, Canoeing Association of S.A. Inc., Playgrounds Association of S.A. Inc., Pony Club Association of S.A., Girls Brigade, S.A. Genealogy and Heraldry Society Inc., Calisthenics Association of S.A. Inc., S.A. Hang Gliding Association, S.A. Tennis Association, S.A. Paraplegic and Quadriplegic Sports, S.A. Table Tennis Association, Basketball Association of S.A., S.A. Boxing Association, S.A. Softball Association, S.A. Soccer Federation, S.A. Amateur Swimming Association, S.A. Little Athletics Association, Equestrian Federation of S.A., S.A. Gymnastics Association, S.A. Amateur Water Polo Association, S.A. Baseball League, S.A. Small Bore Rifle Association, Auto Cycle Union of S.A., S.A. Korfball Association, S.A. Ice Hockey Association, S.A. Rifle Association, S.A. Cricket Association, S.A. Revolver and Pistol Association, S.A. Volleyball Association, S.A. Golf Association, S.A. Ladies Golf, S.A. Badminton Association, S.A. Lacrosse Association, S.A. Squash Rackets, S.A. Hockey Joint Council, S.A. Rhythmic Sportive Gymnastics, S.A. Ten Pin Bowling Association, S.A. Rugby Union, S.A. Rugby League, S.A. Chapter of Roller Skating, S.A. Touch Association, Royal S.A. Bowling Association, S.A. Women's Bowling Association, Athletic Association of S.A., S.A. Rowing Association, Confederation of Australian Sport, S.A. Yacht Racing Association, S.A. Clay Target Association, S.A. Water Ski Association, S.A. Fencing Association, S.A. Weightlifting Association, S.A. Road Runners Club, S.A. Keep Fit Association and Australian Council for Health, Physical Education and Recreation.

The reason why I read that out is that I want it recorded to prove the discrimination that has been suffered by the South Australian Netball Association, which has not been recognised and which is being discriminated against by the Minister and his department. Yet, this organisation is recognised by and affiliated with the Australian Netball Association. The South Australian women are the Australian champions and have been for many years. The Australian team is the world champion. Yet, the South Australian Netball Association does not get a penny or rate a mention at all. The parents of those who are involved in netball—and there are some 45 000 registered players of netball in South Australia—have not been given any money under this grant.

**Mr Mathwin:** No encouragement by the Government.

**Mr BECKER:** None at all. They feel that they have been discriminated against, and so do I. Of course, there are problems: there is a Southern United Netball Association—and the Deputy Premier has an involvement in that organisation—representing some 2 000 registered players, and the United Church Association, with some 7 000 players. The department is dictating to the South Australian Netball Association that until it can merge the three groups it will not get any money at all. We have heard this talk before by the current Minister, who was somehow able to survive the recent shake-up of the current Government. The Minister at the bench is the only one who I can in all honesty say has done the right thing by me and deserves credit for what he did while he had transport portfolio: I have nothing but the highest respect for the Minister of Lands.

But I have no respect for the Minister of Recreation of Sport and some of the officers in his department, because I believe that this is blatant discrimination. I have also found out that several applications have been made to the Commonwealth Government for funding for sport and recreation facilities at West Beach. When these matters were drawn to the attention of the local paper they were squashed by an officer of the Minister's department who said that West Beach was just a name so that they could put the figures up to the Commonwealth Government for financing in the next five years. That is the type of credibility that we have with the administration of this department. It is not good enough. On behalf of the South Australian Netball Association—the women and the girls who participate throughout this State: the 45 000 of them, their parents and those who support them—I challenge the Minister to rectify



the situation as soon as possible, in other words, forthwith, and to make the grant available to this organisation so that it can carry out and develop its programs and encourage and provide facilities for these people.

*Mr Groom interjecting:*

**Mr BECKER:** The member for Hartley mentions the Heini Becker Motor Sport Park: that is the subject of another speech.

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

**Mr BAKER (Mitcham):** It is a great pity that we have an Independent member for Semaphore here, because he tackled the same subject that I was going to tackle: the aged care situation. I was pleased to be one of a number of politicians who were present at the Fullarton Park Community Centre when the arts and crafts of nursing home residents were on display. At that time, the Commissioner for the Ageing presented to the people present an exposé on the situation facing nursing homes in South Australia. I am delighted that the member for Semaphore has taken up the subject. I do not think that I can add much to comments he has made on this subject because they are very accurate. The Commonwealth is shedding many responsibilities not only in this area but in a range of other areas.

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

**Mr BAKER:** As my colleague the member for Mount Gambier says, South Australia is being penalised for the good quality care that it has. There are a few anomalies within the system, some of which have been generated by the Minister of Health and the standards that he has applied. I will not take issue with the member for Semaphore on the standard of care and the requirements for staffing.

I bring to the attention of the member for Semaphore the fact that anomalies exist and that the constraints placed by the Minister of Health have added to some of the problems being faced. However, they are minor when compared with the general principle that many old people require constant care. We do not wish to be in that situation, but most of us probably will be. We would like to think that we are going to get true and just treatment, and certainly as South Australians we should be standing up to the Commonwealth on this matter. Certainly the State does not have the resources to provide the additional funds required to keep some of these nursing homes going.

I can say to the member for Semaphore that I have probably the largest concentration of nursing homes in my electorate of any member. I have the largest nursing home in Australia in the form of Julia Farr, which is a Government instrumentality, as the member for Semaphore has said. I also have a large number of smaller nursing homes, all of which are run very efficiently and provide a marvellous support system for the people there. They are clean and good quality care nursing homes. I have visited all in the last three months and some real problems are arising in those areas.

One home was recently purchased with a large capital outlay and has no option but to charge a fee higher than the pension. The owners said that they cannot carry the excess costs and that the people who cannot afford to pay the price will have their bags at the door. There is nowhere else for those people to go. Some of the older establishments that were bought many years ago do not have the same commitments as far as mortgages are concerned. Therefore, their pay-out figure each week is far less. They have made other arrangements and some of them will be able to manage, but the quality of care will decline in the process. A whole range of new arrangements must be made and the major losers will be the elderly people in this State.

Having congratulated the member for Semaphore, I will briefly mention a remark made by the Premier yesterday in addressing the motion of no confidence in the Government. The Premier said that we should have been listening to the positive response he received over the radio yesterday. I know that if any members of the Australian Labor Party had been listening to the radio at that time they would have found on the three stations involved that there was not one positive comment. If that is what the Premier thinks is positive I cannot imagine what he would regard as negative comment about the tax or election strategy or whatever he likes to call it. It was proof to me that people are tired of Governments that continue to tax for the basic need to build monuments to themselves. I believe that that is a reaction against the manoeuvrings of the Hawke Government in the Federal Parliament.

I also believe that if the Hawke Government had said that it intended to decrease the taxation burden on the people of Australia the whole tax package would have received a far better response than it did. Inherent in the taxation policies of the ALP is an increased take from the community of Australia and the same applies in South Australia. People have rejected the policies of both Governments. They will have the opportunity to express that rejection in the polls in South Australia. I believe in that regard that the people of South Australia will show the lead to the rest of Australia. They will show the people of Australia that Labor Governments are no longer the Governments that Australians require, need or even desire.

They will show that the policies of the Hawke Government are to be soundly rejected. The mentality of the Australian Labor Party towards the people of Australia is, 'We will tax you for your own benefit.' This philosophy has reared its ugly head probably with increased momentum during the 1970s, and in the 1980s it needs a drastic rethink.

I would like to feel that governments of both persuasions can set directions that will benefit the community at large. There is no doubt in anyone's mind that taxation costs jobs. That was one of the first things I mentioned when I entered this Parliament in December 1982. I have continued to reiterate that in a number of debates in which I have participated during my time in this House.

Unless governments can be seen to provide value for money, that is, to create more wealth than they take away by taxation, they will be rejected. It has taken a long time for the people of Australia to understand that simple principle, but here in South Australia, in Australia and in the Western world, and people understand that one does not create wealth, better standards of living, by taxing the populace in the way that has happened over the past few years.

It may well be that the Premier will gnash his teeth and wail to the wall and say that he is being unfairly treated, but he has increased the taxation burden on South Australians by between 40 and 50 per cent. It is simply not good enough that the standards and quality of service have not increased by that amount. It is simply not good enough that the people of South Australia have had to give an increasing proportion of their pay packet to financing the largesse of a Government that believes it can use other people's money in the way it thinks fit without regard to the needs of those people.

I would like to think that my electorate of Mitcham has very few problems. However, I mention the growing traffic congestion because of the lack of a north-south corridor and the increasing incursion of people from the south through Unley Road and Goodwood Road, which mainly service my area. The people in the inner suburbs will ask for a north-south corridor and will express this opinion very strongly at the next election. Far too much traffic is generated on those roads. It takes longer now to commute. It

is time that we showed a little vision, as my colleague the member for Davenport is showing with his strong lead in this regard.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Davenport.

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport):** I wish to raise a matter that concerns many people in the Adelaide Hills—the problem of the European wasp. This is a matter of urgency, because the next six months is the Government's last chance to eradicate the European wasp from that area. Every available resource should be used to eradicate that wasp while its numbers are still small enough to do so. If it is not done, the wasp will be permanently established and will spread, of course, throughout the Adelaide Hills and the metropolitan area.

Its history is this: about three or four months ago after the Opposition and, in particular, after the shadow Minister of Agriculture had called upon the Government, along with various academics and scientists from the University of Adelaide, to take some action, the Minister said it was no more than a public nuisance and that nothing should be done. We know the ensuing public debate and the back-down that occurred some two or three months later.

After that backdown, the Minister of Agriculture promised to spend \$30 000 over the next three years. However, that expenditure is ill considered, as it automatically assumes that the wasp is now permanently established in the Adelaide Hills. That money, if not more, should be spent immediately. The Department of Agriculture, in consultation with the staff at the University of Adelaide and local councils, should prepare an action plan which would involve finding wasp nests and destroying them on a systematic basis. A pamphlet would need to be delivered to each household in the Stirling area so that local residents are enlisted in the eradication program.

Two or three professionals should also be employed for the next six months to carry out the extermination of the wasps and the destruction of the nests. The campaign would need to be ready to operate by the beginning of October; so, time is critical. I want to stress the point again: it is this year or never. The number of wasps is so small at present that it is still feasible in scientific terms to eradicate them; but unless every effort is put into doing that in the next six months, starting from about 1 October when the weather will start to warm up and the wasps will start to come out of their nests and fly around again and multiply, this chance will be lost, and it will then almost be an exercise in futility in simply trying to keep down the numbers of wasps rather than trying to eradicate them. Therefore, I stress to the Minister that this campaign must be worked out, in place and ready to operate by about the beginning of October. Time is critical.

By spending perhaps between \$50 000 and \$100 000 (it may not cost that much) the Government may eradicate a pest which otherwise could cost millions of dollars just to control in future. Although there is no guarantee that eradication can be achieved, even if a program is undertaken now, it is certainly worth trying. The results of an eradication program would be enormous as compared to the alternative of letting the opportunity slide by and trying simply to control the wasps in the future.

I am disappointed that the Minister of Agriculture has not taken advice from the staff of the Zoology Department at the University of Adelaide before deciding what action the Government should take. At the same time as undertaking this program, the State Government should ask the Federal Government to fund and support a research program to find a biological control measure so that the wasps

can be eradicated from the Eastern States, where they are now well established.

I highlight the difference between the situation in South Australia, where the wasps are not well established at present, where they are in very small numbers and where they could be eradicated, compared to the situation in New South Wales and Victoria, where they are well established and where only an effective biological control program could overcome them. Such a biological control program would take a number of years to complete—I guess it would take at least 10 years to work out a suitable control measure, if it is possible, and to implement it and to eradicate the wasps.

So, it is important that the State Government take action now and that the Federal Government be asked to also undertake a longer term program on developing biological control measures. We all know how long it has taken Governments to develop biological control measures for the millipede; we know the extent to which the millipedes are spreading at an alarming rate throughout the metropolitan area, that infestation also having started in the Adelaide Hills.

The Department of Agriculture needs to improve its surveillance procedures so that new pests, such as the European wasp, are detected as soon as possible. It is probable that the European wasp was well established in the Stirling area for well over a year before it was detected. New pests like the wasps are always bound to be introduced into the State or into Australia from overseas, and so we need to ensure that, through the Department of Agriculture the community is well informed and that officers are available to carry out on a regular basis the necessary surveillance to detect such pests. The important thing here is that early detection will allow for eradication to take place. If, however, as has occurred with the European wasp, it is allowed to establish for a year, eradication will be so much harder, even though at this stage, according to scientists from the Adelaide University, it is still a feasible alternative.

I wrote to the Minister of Agriculture today asking for a complete revision of the Government strategy relating to the control of the European wasp and to ensure that that eradication program is implemented by early October and that every single effort available will be made to ensure that we eradicate the wasps in the next six months. I believe that the whole community, and especially our Government, will look back with disappointment if the opportunity is lost simply because the minimal resources were not available at the time to undertake that eradication program.

The second matter I wish to raise is the announcement today by the new Minister of Transport that the Government is doing so-called marvellous work in the southern metropolitan area in overcoming traffic difficulties. It is a new Minister trying far too late to say that we are doing enough when in fact it is not enough and it is already too late. I will cite some of the matters which the Minister listed as being works that have been undertaken. The first is Reservoir Drive, where the work is already six months behind the appropriate schedule laid down by the then Minister of Transport last year. In the first 12 months of its operation it is already six months behind schedule. I stress that that is only one of the programs that has been deferred by this Government.

The second one raised by the Minister in this article in today's news media, and which he raised in Parliament during Question Time today, was the upgrading of Flagstaff Hill Road, and in particular the widening of the bridge at the bottom of that road where Flagstaff Hill Road intersects with South Road. When the member of Spence was Minister of Transport he promised that work would start on that project in February of this year. I am sure that the previous

Minister of Transport will acknowledge that that was the case, and he also said that it would take three to four months to complete. Even if it had started in February of this year, it still would have meant that I had been calling for this work to be commenced for approximately two years, so it would have been two years late, but I was prepared to praise the Minister for getting the project under way on that date, but it did not start. I asked the Minister why the delay had occurred and when work would start. The then Minister of Transport said that the work would start in May this year. May, June and July came and went and there was still no work.

Finally, and very belatedly, 2½ years after the work was due to have commenced, we find that the Government is undertaking what is really a minor traffic effort that will have significant short-term benefits for the people who live at Flagstaff Hill.

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

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Fisher):** I want to take up the point relating to the European wasp. I support what my colleague has said about trying to eradicate them, but even though I have read the advice from the experts who have studied the problem (and I have great respect for their advice), I believe that this is the last chance we have to eradicate them, but they have gone too far.

I have European wasps on my property this year and I am some distance from where they were first located at Stirling. The Sturt Gorge, from Coromandel Valley to Upper Sturt, has not been burnt out since 1934. There were blackberries, noxious weeds and other native bush growing up to 30 feet high. Some people have advised me that they have seen the European wasp in that area. The Belair Recreation Park has an area between 1 500 to 1 700 hectares, much of it native bush, and the task of carrying out a surveillance of that area and finding the blighters and their hives is mammoth.

**The SPEAKER:** I do not know that the word 'blighter' is parliamentary.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** If you have the things and they are going to sting you and perhaps cause death, they are a blight on society, so I would call them blighters, because they are a form of blight. They are so dangerous that I support the concept the member for Davenport is putting forward in an attempt to eradicate them this year, but as in the case of millipedes and the African Daisy, people took long to respond.

*[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]*

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** I will now take the European wasp debate a little further. I reinforce the comment made by the member for Davenport that, if the scientists and research people think that we can eradicate this pest, then we should set out to do that this year. I have a personal conviction that it is too late to do that. In saying that I want members of the House to be conscious of the sorts of difficulties faced in relation to this pest by CFS volunteers and others will have during bushfires. If a vehicle passes over a European wasp's nest, or an individual kicks such a nest disturbing the wasp under hot conditions, they will attack the disturber and bite many times.

I can see that before long we will have to provide all CFS volunteers with a face guard or some sort of net to protect them from this pest. I said just before dinner that the problem is that in all cases, whether involving African Daisy, European wasp or the millipede, those who are in power and have an opportunity to do something about these problems ignore them until it is too late. I hope that my

judgment is wrong about this matter and that the same thing will not happen on this occasion.

I will speak briefly, while the Premier is in the Chamber, about a problem that exists at Happy Valley Primary School. The two Ministers responsible for this area, and the Premier, should take a keen interest in this matter. The Happy Valley Primary School is situated on Education Road, which does not have fully made footpaths. The Education Department has provided a reasonable amount of car parking space for the primary school. Directly opposite the primary school, which has an enrolment of 600 students and is still growing, is a child-care centre that was the original primary school.

On the northern side of the Education Department land is land which belongs to the Engineering and Water Supply Department and which comes under the control of the Minister of Water Resources. I, along with some others, lodged a request that some of that land be made available as a car park for the primary school and that another part be made available for agricultural science courses to be run by the neighbouring Aberfoyle Park High School. The Minister of Water Resources said that he would not let the land be used for agricultural purposes because of the likelihood of increased pollution of the reservoir, if it were used for that purpose. He said that the land was to be planted with native trees and that all human activity on it would stop. I am prepared to accept that argument. However, I am not prepared to accept the stupid argument put by the Minister of Water Resources (and I hope the Premier takes note of this), that the land next to the school cannot be used as a car park because it is likely to increase pollution run-off from the area.

The cars that people bring into the area are already parked in it—on the road, in front of people's houses or in the vicinity of the school. If there is any pollution from those cars the only place into which it can run is the same drain as if we used the land alongside the school belonging to the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I have not tried to stir this matter politically before and have tried to use common sense, but surely the Minister and his departmental advisers can understand that not one more motor car will turn up: it may be that there will then be fewer cars in the area, because if people know that their children can cross the road in safety because there is less confusion of motor cars backing in and out of drives and narrow gaps, some of them might allow their children to ride their bikes to school.

While that confusion is there at the moment, parents want to drive their children to school because of the protective nature of parents—and rightly so. There is a very simple decision for the Minister of Water Resources to say to the Minister of Education, 'You can have three acres of that land for car parking and it can be developed over time.' I defy the Minister, his officers or anybody else to prove that there will be one more drop of pollution enter the drain that goes alongside the reservoir.

There is no logical argument in that. No-one on this earth can prove it or show any justification for that argument, because the motor cars are parked in the area that the water runs off anyway. All that we are doing is taking the cars out of the street and out of people's drives and we are giving the kids who go to the kindergarten, the child-care centre and the primary school a reasonable chance.

It is in an area that is sensitive politically: we all know that. The school has not done the wrong thing by stirring it up for political purposes: most other areas would have. All I ask for is just commonsense. I challenge the Minister of his officers to bring forward one bit of evidence to show that there will be an increase in pollution in the reservoir by parking the cars 30 metres away on a piece of land than by having them parked along the street. Some of them might

be 150 metres away. There is no logic or commonsense and there is no way that anybody can say that there is a greater pollution content.

In fact, if the Minister thinks about it, and they put the run-off from the car park (if they seal it) into a sump and we pump out the sump every three or six months and cart it out of the area, there will be less pollution going towards the reservoir drain that runs around the reservoir—not into the reservoir—and by that method it would decrease the possibility of any pollution getting into the reservoir. I ask only for commonsense. The school has made a reasonable request: it has stayed quiet, and we can no expect it to do so under the circumstances. I know that the member for Mawson has some children going there and that she would have been contacted. If she has not, I would be absolutely amazed.

**Ms Lenehan:** No, I have not been.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** If the parents have not contacted her I am dumbfounded. She was at a meeting at the child-care centre with me when the matter of car parking was raised. I do not want to go any further: I want the member for Mawson to think back to that meeting and to what was raised there 18 months ago. I ask the Government to take up the challenge.

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** Tonight I address my remarks towards the contents of a letter that I received today at Parliament House from a Mrs Meredith Tiller, Liaison Officer for the Combined Northern Netball Association. She writes:

On behalf of the Combined Northern Netball Association I wish to bring to your attention the enclosed report. As Government funding is essentially the life-blood of our sport, the issue is of utmost concern to all South Australian netballers, but particularly relevant to country associations. It is our belief that politics have no place in sport.

What is the issue that she brings forward? It concerns the way in which ministerial funds from the Department of Recreation and Sport have not been allocated at this stage to the netball association.

So that people understand the background of the story, I will briefly trace some of the history as it relates to the current situation of the South Australian Netball Association. In 1982 the registered netballers of South Australia, through the elected members of the SANA State Council, were asked to give direction to matters critical to the SANA. Mrs Tiller writes:

I refer directly to the then proposed erection of a State headquarters at Edwards Park. A clear majority vote in favour of this scheme led to the subsequent erection of this headquarters. On completion of this project, due to escalating costs, a financial short-fall was envisaged . . . subsequently, through our elected members of the SANA State Council, the association advised our acceptance of a \$1 levy per registered player for a one (1) year period only, to establish further funds to enable the building project to continue.

Apparently there must have been disagreement among the associations because two associations, the Southern United Netball Association and the Uniting Church chose to withdraw from affiliation with the SANA. Mrs Meredith Tiller continues:

In the interest of democracy this was their prerogative . . . at all times since the SANA has maintained a clear majority of registered players of 4.5 to 1 ratio, within in the State of South Australia.

1985 is no exception, with the SANA having approximately 45 000 players as compared to a combined total of 8 000 registered players for SUNA and Uniting Church.

How dare Mr Slater, Minister of Recreation and Sport, presume that we, the netballers of South Australia, all 45 000 of us, will accept his proposed scheme for developing an alternative triangular structured management board, which includes these 'rebel' associations, to administer netball to this State.

We have already a democratically elected SANA State Council, charged with the responsibility of administering netball in South Australia. These associations are most welcome to once again reaffiliate with this State body if they so desire. However, for the Minister to assume that we, the netballers of South Australia, will accept a new management structure, enabling these 'rebel' associations to dominate, is entirely out of order and would be grossly detrimental to the well being of our sport.

She concludes by saying:

Your threat—

this is referring to the Minister of Recreation and Sport—to hold the entire State of South Australia's netballers to ransom by withholding funding is blackmail, which belies the dignity of your office and should be treated with a contempt that befits it.

It is disturbing to have received this correspondence together with accompanying correspondence relating to further details of the matter. It appears that negotiations were carried out with either the Minister or his advisers to see whether the netballers could be reconciled. When it appeared that reconciliation was not possible they were told that the increase in the funding that had been forthcoming previously towards the salary commitment would not be met until the netball associations sorted themselves out—until, as this letter is addressed, one body is formed.

Why should that pressure be put on an independent body which had nothing to do with the breakaway movement? Why should it be told it was virtually responsible for the breakaway? Obviously, it was not responsible for the breakaway. A memo submitted to a council meeting of the SANA by Katrina Giles states:

As advised at last Council Meeting regarding the Department's verbal advice that we would not be receiving our proposed increased salary subsidy, we have since had a letter to confirm that this is so (hand delivered) with words to the effect—

For some time I have been concerned about the non affiliation of so many netball players in South Australia. Although I have been advised that some commitment is being made in an effort to redress the problems that exist in this State I understand the matter has not been completely resolved.

Therefore until the matter is resolved to the extent that the sport of netball becomes unified and not fragmented as is currently the situation, a decision on your application for financial assistance to employ a full time development officer will be deferred:

Again, after a meeting, the comment was made:

Let them know in no uncertain terms that we felt it was 'blackmail'.

Subsequent to that a meeting was held and at that meeting it seems that the situation was again not resolved. That meeting was followed by a letter from the Director of the Department of Recreation and Sport, Graham Thompson, who, amongst other things in his letter to Mrs Norton, the Administrator of the South Australian Netball Association, said:

As explained at the meeting, my Minister is concerned that there is a structural division within such a major sport as netball.

The letter further states:

If all three groups were supportive of developing an alternative management structure for netball as outlined above, and were prepared to work together toward this objective, then I would recommend to the Minister that the department engage an independent management consultant to assist and facilitate this development.

The letter is signed by Graham Thompson, Director. It is a clear sign that, because the Netball Association was not going to follow the Government's line, the Government was saying, 'All right, we will withdraw funding.' How is the Association supposed to proceed with its 1985-86 budget? The submission to its council states:

One of our main concerns now is the funding for our clinics and courses set down in our development plan for 1985-86.

I do not know how it is going to go forward. In a final comment, Katrina Giles said:

To make things even more infuriating, the Minister lacks what we all would call 'common courtesy'.

It is not explained further, but it appears that the Netball Association is most distraught and upset at the way in which the Department of Recreation and Sport and the Minister have mishandled the funding towards its salary submission. I hope that this matter will be resolved forthwith, so that the Netball Association knows where it is going and will not suffer the repercussions that have obviously occurred to date.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** I am pleased to concur with the remarks made by my colleague the member for Goyder. I have been in receipt of a similar document from the same source, because the Associations that have complained are located in the electorates of Goyder, Light, Rocky River and also into Eyre. The matter that has been raised, places very grave reservations in my mind about the sort of advice that the Minister has been receiving and upon which he has been acting. I appreciate that there are always two sides to the coin, and I will be more than pleased to hear from the Minister in answer to this matter. Action has been heavy-handed and not to the benefit of this sporting group which has been forced into the position that my colleague the member for Goyder has outlined.

I am also pleased that the Minister of Education is with us, because I wish to congratulate him on the support that he has given to the staff and parents of the Gawler High School. It would have been better if the name of the high school had not been mentioned, but it is one of those inevitable situations where, whenever a problem arises, there tends to be a nomination or identification of a facility and that does not do that facility or organisation any good.

That is why I took certain action against the member for Unley when he sought to mention the name of a company without having heard the other side of the story from that company. I leave the issue at that point, other than to say that identification of individuals or an organisation can be quite disastrous for that individual or organisation.

In the case of the Gawler position, I am led to believe that there is full support of the college council with the staff. I know the staff particularly well, just as I know of some of the difficulties that they have experienced over a period of time. I recognise that a number of people have been misled into giving support where support was not warranted, and I would like to believe that the whole matter is resolved completely long before I stand on my feet to speak. Might I say in defence of the staff, it has had the difficulty and problem of knowing of the death of a past student who was directly involved with an association of that high school in the not so distant past.

That was quite damaging to the community as a whole and, if the matter was allowed to get out of hand, it could be very damaging to the future of many of the students of the school. It is one to which I believe my colleague the Hon. Michael Wilson, the shadow Minister of Education, has also added his support this afternoon in seeking necessary responses from the Minister as to just what is the position or the problem associated with drugs in our school system. It is not one which is easily resolved or for which an answer can be provided immediately, but certainly it is one to which any thinking member, not only of this place but of the community at large, would want to give their full support.

Next I want to briefly mention the position which has arisen in recent weeks by the heavy handedness of the traffic department in relation to wide load permits. This has been a contentious problem for many years. The farming community has been concerned over a period of time with the fact that wide loads of hay may not be transported on

Saturdays or Sundays, and they have lived with that. There would have to be a question, with the changed circumstances and the nature of the vehicles which cart hay today, whether it was necessary to continue that prohibition on Saturdays and Sundays. However, it has got out of hand in the general transport field. Last Monday week, persons who manufacture or transport grain bins were advised that in the future they would only be permitted to transport those grain bins provided they had a pilot vehicle to precede the vehicle on which the grain bin was loaded.

I am informed that there are no known cases of accidents involving the transportation of grain bins in the last four years, and that is as far back as I have made the research. For these people suddenly to be told that the movement of these bins to the point of sale or on to the farm must be preceded by a pilot vehicle, adding additional cost to the farming community when they are on the ropes, is a bureaucratic bungle of considerable proportions. It is no better than the situation which now prevents a number of houses being transported by direct routes to where they are to be deposited. Rather, they are sent by circuitous routes to the same point. For example, a wide house to be delivered from the Adelaide metropolitan area to Stirling must go almost to Blanchetown, then via Sedan, to Murray Bridge and back to Stirling.

**Mr Oswald:** It's absurd!

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** More than that, it must have a police escort. Because of the distance involved and the speed at which they are allowed to travel, the whole of the group transporting that house must stay out in a caravan or hotel overnight, so increasing the cost of the delivery. The member for Mawson this afternoon wanted to go in to bat for people who are interested in housing. At a time when housing is a critical issue and finance is a real problem, we have a Government that condones the additional cost of transportation of vitally needed home units.

The most recent example is that of persons who transport wide loads from interstate. Not only do they have the difficulty of ringing from Sydney when they want to travel in South Australia with a wide load and waiting for Australia Post to deliver the permit to them at the border, but also they were refused the right to travel on 26 April because that happened to be a Friday that came after a Thursday holiday. Because a number of people were going to take a four-day holiday period, transporters were unable to carry out their normal transportation activity on that Friday.

How can a department overrule common sense to this degree? My friend and colleague from Eyre has frequently referred to difficulties that arise within the Highways Department depot at Port Augusta and to the problems that have caused great cost and difficulty to transporters of stock. It is high time that the Government showed a little nous and managerial skill, pulled these people in and brought the whole matter back into reasonable balance.

Another instance of this Government's allowing management to take over arises with persons who are interested in fish. I wonder how many members know that at present there is a move afoot to register fish in aquariums. The Chicklid Society has been advised that aquariums and the number of fish that they have will be registered and that they are not allowed to let the fish breed.

**Mr Blacker:** You tell that to the fish!

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I ask you! You tell it to the fish. What does one do? This is coming out of this Government's management at present.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Appleby):** I call the member for Elizabeth.

**Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth):** I rise to draw to the attention of the House a matter which is of some concern in the

northern suburbs and elsewhere in South Australia and which relates to the proposed expansion of the army artillery testing range at Port Parham. In company with a number of other members of Parliament, and the member for Goyder, on Sunday last I attended a meeting of concerned residents and users of the Port Parham beach area.

We heard a number of speakers address the question of the expansion of the army testing range. The question at issue here is whether some 30 000 visitors a year will be able to continue to use what has developed into an important recreation area for South Australians, particularly for those who live in the northern suburbs of Salisbury, Elizabeth, Munno Para and Gawler. There is also the question of the 160-odd permanent residents who have beach shacks there and who make their full-time residence in Port Parham.

While I understand that the army has a need to test artillery, one must view with some scepticism the need to extend the area as widely as is proposed. The new safety template for the artillery testing range will include all the permanent shacks now based at Port Parham and, over a period, it will inevitably mean that the Port Parham beach area itself will be closed to visitors. Although the initial proposal of the army does not provide for the immediate closure of the beach, it is inevitable that over a period of time unexploded ammunition will lie on the beach, because the army will be unable to recover every unexploded shell and, inevitably, the area will be closed.

It may take 10 years or it may be only five years, but in the end that important recreation resource will be closed to the people of South Australia, particularly those in the northern suburbs. This proposal must also be viewed in conjunction with the projected development of a national and international airport north of Adelaide. Although that proposal is still very much in the planning and conjecture stage, there is no doubt that, if one ignores the impact of these two proposals taken together, one can see considerable detriment to the long-term planning for the development of Adelaide.

If the airport were to proceed and the army proceeded with the extension of its testing range, a vast area of land, particularly beachside areas, will be closed to the public of South Australia. In addition, development to the north of Adelaide beyond the existing boundaries of Gawler will be severely curtailed. I do not think that sufficient consideration and importance has been given in the debate so far to the combined impact of the two proposals on long-term development in the north. I am talking not about five, 10 or 15 years, but 50 years into the future.

To allow the army to expand that testing base without adequate consideration of the really long-term impact of the proposals would be a serious detriment to South Australians. I am aware from discussions with the Minister for Environment and Planning that the Government is opposed to the extension of the base. That is a reasonable position for the Government to take at this stage. Although I understand that there are arguments on the other side of the coin, I think the long-term potential impact in South Australia, not only recreational but also development aspects, means that we must give very serious consideration to that proposal.

I trust that the Government will lodge a strongly worded submission with Canberra to ensure that the Federal Government is made aware of these implications. While the defence forces of Australia must be supported in their efforts—and I believe that normally the army and the other defence forces provide excellent support for Australia's national defence—one must seriously question the expansion on this scale of facilities so close to the metropolitan area. What other capital city would permit a facility of this

kind so close to the expanding fringe of its outermost development?

The long-term future development of that part of the northern area will be very much determined in the next few years. This proposal will be resolved in a matter of months, and the airport proposal, of course, will be resolved in a matter of a few short years. Between them, the two proposals will have a very serious impact on the development of the State, and the decisions taken by Canberra and by the State Government in relation to both those issues will be quite critical for the long-term development of the north. I not only speak on behalf of those in my district who use Port Parham in considerable numbers for recreational purposes, both for holidays during the summer months and also for day visits, but I also ask that consideration be given to the long-term impact of this proposal. Both proposals are well worthy of consideration, and I ask that the Government keep them strongly in mind in discussions with Canberra on this subject.

**Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition):** This week the high taxer is seeking to be seen as the axer. The long distance runner—

*Ms Lenehan interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** It is all very well for the member for Mawson, who has been doorknocking during the recess. She would well understand what I am talking about from the response that she would have been receiving from the doors of the electorate in relation to the massive escalation in taxes and charges that has occurred over the past 2½ years. I am sure that she has no answer for the people of her district, because the track record is there. It is clear, it is specific and it cannot be qualified. The long distance runner is no doubt sprinting towards the election with a package that he calls the biggest tax cuts in South Australia's history.

**Ms Lenehan:** What have the polls said?

**Mr OLSEN:** I am delighted to talk about polls. It is very interesting. Over the past 2½ years the Premier's Press Secretary would visit every newsroom distributing the latest Morgan polls as soon as they were released. However, the Press Secretary has not visited any newsrooms in South Australia over the past six months with the latest opinion polls. We well understand why: because there is no message in them that he would like communicated to the electorate of South Australia. But like his simulated helicopter ride on Saturday—

**Mr Ingerson:** It did not even get off the ground!

**Mr OLSEN:** Exactly; he did not get off the ground; the helicopter sat there flat on the ground, and the vibrations came through on the commercial. Let me first put into perspective the Premier's claim about the historic nature of these cuts. In today's dollars the tax cuts implemented by the former Liberal Government in 1980 were worth as much as those announced by the Premier on Monday. Let us establish that fact: they were worth as much as the cuts announced on Monday. However, the former Government's cuts were far more significant and required further decisions. The former Government's tax cuts represented 7½ per cent of total State taxation collected in the 1979-80 financial year. The cuts announced on Monday by the Premier amounted to much less as a proportion of total taxation—that is, 4.5 per cent of likely tax revenue this financial year.

The former Government's tax strategy also involved firm action to keep the lid on Government spending so that lower levels of taxation could be maintained. As a result, by June 1982 State taxation in South Australia per capita was the lowest of any State in Australia. That is a track record of which the former Liberal Government can be

justly proud, and one which will never be emulated by the present Administration.

Since then, according to the official ABS figures, taxation has risen by 50.2 per cent—they are not my figures, but figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics. That growth is the highest of any State, not to mention that it is the highest growth rate in South Australia's history. There is only one reason for that growth: it has nothing to do with the deficit left by the former Administration, but it has everything to do with the big spending policies of the present Government and its failure to control waste and inefficiency in Government departments. Total Government outlays over the past two years in real terms have increased above the inflation rate by 20 per cent.

To meet this escalation over the past two financial years the Premier has collected an aggregate of an extra \$375 million in State taxation—\$114 million more in 1983-84, and \$261 million more in the last financial year. The Premier claimed, and falsely, that he had put up taxes to cover a \$60 million deficit, although, in fact, he has collected more than six times that much in extra tax in the last two Budgets. Now he is to give back \$41 million. Tax relief is long overdue. We know what the net effect of that will be in relation to ETSA tariffs: the first quarterly bill for next year will have \$2 taken off it. That is 20 cents a week. Big deal!

**The Hon. Michael Wilson:** For how long?

**Mr OLSEN:** That is the other point: it is a one-off. The tax relief, the remitting of the turnover tax to ETSA is only for this year (which just happens to be a election year). What about next year and the year after that?

**The Hon. D.C. Brown:** It will come back on in the year after that.

**Mr OLSEN:** I am sure that it will come back on; they will pick it up the year after that. The fundamental problem with the Government's policy is that it has no strategy to ensure that these cuts are nothing more than a vote buying exercise and a response to the opinion polls. The Government has no policy to control the cost of its departments and agencies. The Minister on the front bench opposite would well know that: he is responsible for the North Adelaide swimming centre, in relation to which a few million dollars have simply been poured down the drain. There has been a total lack of control in the relevant agencies. I can understand his embarrassed silence, as one cannot defend the indefensible.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr OLSEN:** As well as record revenue raising measures, some of the largest departments and agencies have plunged into significant deficits. The E & WS Department is more than \$20 million in deficit; the State Transport Authority is more than \$80 million in deficit; the Housing Trust is more than \$10 million in deficit; and ETSA is \$5 million in deficit, and that will be increased this financial year. In addition, the Consolidated Account deficit exceeds \$50 million. In other words, this administration is running up an enormous deferred deficit for future Governments to deal with. It has done nothing to control costs. Its public sector employment policies are now placing enormous strain on the State's finances. The annual cost to the public sector employment growth generated by the Government now amounts to about \$46 million.

As well, the Government is now embarking on a spending spree as the election approaches. Today alone it has announced new spending amounting to almost \$9 million for three separate projects. Big spending and big deficits are why the tax package revealed on Monday would be nothing more than a tax pause if Labor was to be re-elected. Inevitably, taxes would have to rise significantly again under a

re-elected Labor administration to underpin its big government philosophy. Indeed, even with the tax cuts that the Premier has announced it is highly likely that State tax collections will rise again in real terms this financial year.

The Premier has been rather coy about that. Yesterday, when he had the opportunity on both 5AA and SDN to debate these matters with me, he refused. He is not prepared to debate these issues in a public forum. It comes back to the point why other Ministers have been stung into silence. The Premier cannot defend the indefensible in a public forum. Even though he has now received the estimates from Treasury, he will not tell the public how much in total it will pay in State taxation this financial year. That leaves a significant question mark about the true impact of this tax package. Tomorrow, the House will have the opportunity to further debate four of the taxes that the Premier intends to cut, but significantly there will be no legislation to deal with the ETSA levy. It is interesting to note that. In dealing with this matter let me remind the House of a number of statements made about the levy in recent times. It was said (and I quote from *Hansard*):

The Premier, Mr Tonkin, has a vested interest in high electricity charges because his Budget received 5 per cent of all ETSA revenue. Any rise in tariffs helps to solve the Tonkin Government's embarrassing budgetary problems. Rises linked to the supply cost of electricity are one thing but rises linked to revenue raising, backdoor taxation, are quite another and should not be accepted.

This is the punchline:

We will not allow State charges like transport fares, electricity and hospital charges to be used as a form of backdoor taxation.

There is one thing in common with all those statements: they have the same author. It will not surprise the House to know that the author was the present Premier. All those statements are little more than three years old. The last was more than a statement: it was a promise given in the Premier's election policy speech of 25 October 1982. It was a commitment calculated to give the impression that a Labor Government would remove the 5 per cent turnover tax on ETSA. The impost was first imposed by the Dunstan Government, which means that the trust is a tax collector for the Government.

In the last two Budgets the Premier has collected about \$50 million from that tax. Last financial year the tax amounted to about \$27 million. Now the Premier will give ETSA \$11 million back, but only this year. Significantly, in the context of the Premier's election commitment and his constant condemnation of the former Government over this tax, the largest amount the former Government collected in any one year from ETSA was \$14.8 million.

Last year the Premier received almost twice as much and, even remitting \$11 million, that will still mean that the tax will cost South Australians more than at any time under the former Government, so when the Premier talks about the levy and remitting it on a one-off basis, all he does is expose his utter hypocrisy and his complete failure to act as he suggested he would before the last election and eliminate that turnover tax.

This afternoon, when answering a question on this matter, the Premier attempted to make the point that the former Government had not eliminated this tax. The fact is that, unlike the Premier, the former Government did not at any time promise to do so. Our taxation policy between 1979 and 1982 gave higher priority to relief in a number of other areas, but given the extent of the rises in tariffs in recent years, it is obvious that a reduction in this levy on a permanent basis, rather than just a one-off basis must be given the highest priority.

In his answer this afternoon the Premier also attempted to dismiss the impact on the Electricity Trust of the Government's revised arrangements for repayment of Gov-

ernment loans. In fact, the decision is having a significant effect on the finances of the Electricity Trust. Last financial year an increase in interest rates payable on Treasury loans and the Government guarantee fee of .5 per cent payable on all other ETSA borrowings cost the trust more than \$13.1 million, or \$2.1 million more than the Government is to remit through the levy, so restructuring the loans of ETSA to bring in an extra \$13.1 million to the Treasury is now going to be remitted but \$2.1 million, saved and kept by the Treasury as a form of backdoor taxation.

**Mr Ashenden:** How will the residents of Unley react to that, do you think?

**Mr OLSEN:** The residents of Unley, and the residents of many other marginal seats, and the electorate at large in South Australia will see the taxation package for exactly what it is—phoney and a sham. They were conned once in 1982: they will not be conned again.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Would the honourable member please address his remarks to the Chair rather than confer with members behind him?

**Mr OLSEN:** Madam Acting Speaker, I am not conferring with any members behind, but rather responding to interjections. I turn now to the associated question of gas prices. I think it is important to put the gas prices in their proper context. After taxes and charges there is no issue which the Premier has attempted to misrepresent and confuse more than gas prices. His statement on Monday was another typical example. The Premier said that a 12 per cent rise in electricity tariffs from December 1982 was due totally to the Goldsworthy gas price agreement and the Premier has attempted to give the same reason for subsequent tariff increases.

Nothing is further from the truth, because the action of my Deputy Leader in 1982 saved rather than cost South Australians money. It saved them the cost they would have been forced to pay under the gas contracts approved by the Dunstan Labor Government in the 1970s and well the Government knows that. If the Deputy Leader had not intervened following the arbitrator's decision handed down under the terms of the Dunstan gas contracts, South Australia would have been hit with an immediate retrospective gas price rise in 1982 of 80 per cent, with the prospect of even further price rises in 1983, 1984 and 1985. The arbitrator's decision was an 80 per cent hike in gas prices. The Deputy Leader achieved some relief from the arbitrator's decision in extremely difficult circumstances.

In 1982 the arbitrator's award was halved, saving South Australian consumers \$16 million in that year alone and the price was set for the following three years at levels well below those which would have prevailed had annual arbitrations continued. If the Deputy Leader had not intervened ETSA would have needed a minimum tariff rise of some 19 per cent in December 1982.

The best legal advice available—and the Government has the files and can note the legal advice that is on file within the departments—to the former Government was that court action would not have overturned the arbitrator's 1982 decision because of the binding nature of the agreement approved by the former Dunstan Government. Rather than criticising the Deputy Leader, it is time that Government members and the Premier adopted a mature attitude which identifies and admits that the Dunstan contracts have been the cause of South Australia's difficulties in relation to gas prices. They are signed and they are on file.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I rise on a point of order, Madam Acting Speaker. I wonder whether you can make the fairy circle on the other side shut up. One member has his back to you.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I do not uphold the point of order, but I suggest that all members in the Chamber keep their tone and volume down and allow the speaker to be heard.

**Mr OLSEN:** On the other side of the argument, the Government has been keen to boast about the expanded exploration effort in the Cooper Basin. What it does not admit is that this effort is the direct result of an agreement reached between the Deputy Leader and the producers in 1982 guaranteeing a four year multimillion dollar exploration program in return for those price increases. In summary, under the Dunstan Government's contracts South Australia would have faced an immediate 80 per cent increase in gas prices, the prospect of even higher prices in the following three years, and no guarantee of a further exploration effort on the present scale.

It is beyond doubt (I do not think that it can be questioned) that South Australians would now be paying much more for gas and electricity had there not been that intervention in 1982. It is simply cheap and irresponsible politicking to suggest otherwise, and the files and legal advice to the Government of the day are available to confirm this, and the Government well knows that they exist. I am sure its members have read those files. This is something that we have become used to from the Premier when he talks about the vital question of energy policy. The simple fact is that his Government has no policy relating to energy and did not even produce an energy policy before the last election. It certainly does not have such a policy now. For example, what answers does the Government give on the future of our gas supplies. The Premier is reported in a statement in the *Sunday Mail* of 18 September 1983 (almost two years ago) as promising to have this vital issue resolved within a fortnight. South Australia is still waiting.

In any settlement that is arrived at the State Government must give the highest priority to rationalising contracts for the supply of Cooper Basin gas to both South Australia and New South Wales, yet there is no indication that the Government is prepared to bite the New South Wales bullet, is prepared to bring the Wran Government to the negotiating table about the longer term contracts. However, if the New South Wales contract signed more than two years ago is not addressed at the same time as the South Australian contract this will simply perpetuate the disadvantages that South Australia has had to bear under the current contract situation.

If a contract is signed that fixes supplies and prices for South Australian consumers for the next 10 years, and New South Wales retains assured supplies to the year 2006 with no fixed price arrangement, then New South Wales can continue to receive South Australian gas at a cheaper price than can South Australian consumers—in other words, South Australians are exporting their gas to New South Wales and subsidising New South Wales consumers while paying more for their home consumption. That has to change. The current Government has had two years to do that. The Premier said that he would fix this matter within two weeks, and that was two years ago.

**Ms Lenehan:** You messed it up.

**Mr OLSEN:** The member for Mawson has not been here for long enough to understand it was the Dunstan Government that signed the gas contracts, not a Liberal Administration—not the current Administration but the Dunstan Administration. What the Dunstan Administration did was guarantee gas to Sydney until the year 2006 while only guaranteeing home consumption until 1987. It fixed pricing arrangements for us that meant New South Wales had our cheap gas while we paid high prices for it. It was a betrayal of our rights. It is our gas: we should have had priority on it, not New South Wales.



Discussions that were established several years ago, relating to those gas contracts, need to be quickly brought to a successful conclusion. There needs to be a priority in identifying the problems and fixing them. The failure of the Government to achieve that is just one of a litany of failures in the key mines and energy area. The reduction in the mineral exploration effort, the land rights impasse, the closure of uranium mines and lapsed uranium enrichment negotiations, and continuing uncertainty over the establishment of a petrochemical plant are some of the others. The development of our mineral and petroleum resources should be a significant base to assist the long-term and prosperous development of South Australia.

Soon, the State will have reason to appreciate just how important they can be. The Budget papers are likely to indicate a significant boost in royalties from the Cooper Basin as a result of the liquids project initiated, negotiated and developed by the former Government. Indeed, I understand that the royalties this year may amount to about \$43 million, \$2 million more than the Premier is proposing in tax cuts. That demonstrates just how significant the significance of our mineral and energy resources can be for South Australia.

This is not limited to the royalties payable for the right to extract a resource, but includes the employment opportunities that will result from processing our petroleum and minerals within this State. Unfortunately for South Australia, the Government has been more concerned with discouraging rather than encouraging further exploration, yet the Premier now likes to label as knockers the people directly responsible for getting projects like the Cooper Basin liquids scheme and Roxby Downs up and running for South Australia.

He offers the same insult in his hastily produced television commercial that is being screened this week. Significantly, however, two of the projects featured in the commercial—Technology Park and O-Bahn—were initiatives of the former Government. I find it interesting that 2½ years ago Roxby Downs was a 'mirage in the desert'. Today, it is being championed by the Government. The Labor Party, with the exception of one member, voted against that Indenture Bill in this Parliament—and it expelled him from the Labor Party for backing that vital project for South Australia.

O-Bahn was a Liberal Government initiative; Technology Park was a Liberal Government initiative. The original contract for ASER to try to raise the finance overseas was let in March 1982 by the now shadow Minister of Education, then Minister of Transport. They are the major projects started by the former Liberal Administration. I do not mind if the current Government picks them up and runs with them, because they are good projects for South Australia and they will be good in generating jobs in the future for South Australians. But, let us not forget who got those projects up and running for South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The extent of noise in this Chamber is not from responsible members. I suggest that the member for Todd may wish to completely desist from speaking.

**Mr OLSEN:** I was referring to the TV commercial and saying that the projects that are featured in it were Liberal Government initiatives. That is clearly established. At least, there is one statement in the Premier's commercial with which I can agree—South Australia is winning again—because soon it will have a Liberal Government.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** The honourable member for Hartley.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I do not wish to be difficult, but would ask members to act responsibly and listen to the person speaking, rather than making the speech for them.

**Mr GROOM (Hartley):** That was a very disappointing contribution from the Leader of the Opposition. Once again, he is seen to be knocking South Australia. I know that for members opposite it is painful to hear these comments about the Leader of the Opposition. However, they have to live with the fact that they have a negative Leader, and that comes out in all the opinion polls. Even recently when the Premier issued what he called a report card on South Australia's positive achievements (which was clearly designed to make South Australia attractive) the Leader of the Opposition the next day came out with a report card that downgraded South Australia. That is the attitude that emanated from the Leader of the Opposition.

Do not pontificate about taxation. We know what happened during the years 1979 to 1982. We know that members opposite ran down the finances of this State; they financed their taxation measures out of capital works. Because they were coming to an election at the end of 1982 they handed out money like confetti. An amount of \$9 million went to drought relief—not that I am saying it was not a worthy cause. However, there was no budgetary appropriation for it.

If members opposite had won the last State election they would have massively increased taxation in 1983 because they could not have run the State otherwise. However, it was this Government and this Premier that was left a legacy of a \$63 million deficit. I congratulate the Government on its fine record in office and its very responsible attitude. It has only been because of good management that we have got ourselves in this position whereby the Government is able to reduce taxation by \$42 million—a remarkable effort.

Members should look at South Australia's turnaround compared with the three years between 1979 and 1982. Employment is increasing; unemployment is going down; job vacancies are rising—34 per cent higher in April 1985 compared with April 1984; housing—a 100 per cent increase in private sector dwelling approvals; South Australia's population is on the increase because people are coming back from Queensland.

Members opposite should go to building sites to find out how many tradesmen have come from Queensland to get jobs in South Australia. I ask members opposite to talk to the people on the building sites and they will find that the tradesmen are coming from Queensland. Retail sales are higher. What is the Opposition's answer, its solution? It has gone to England, to Maggie Thatcher, and brought back some privatisation policy. That will be the Achilles heel of members opposite because that policy means nothing more than selling off the most profitable public institutions, and members opposite know it.

What will happen? No person who is employed in what I loosely call the public sector is safe under a Liberal Government. Transport workers and outside staff of councils are not safe, because the Leader of the Opposition said that he will change over to private contractors and change their status. The same applies to people working in the E & WS Department—no person's job is safe. What will we see under a Liberal Government? In the 1981 Budget 1 600 jobs were to go. If a Liberal Government is elected we will see more of that type of thing. Council day workers and persons working for the Department of Housing and Construction will not have safe jobs. That is the only way—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** Look, the Liberal Party is going to sell off Qantas. Its profit last year was \$62.3 million, and they have millions in assets.

**Ms Lenehan:** TAA.

**Mr GROOM:** I am glad the member for Mawson mentioned that.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! This is the last warning I will give the member for Todd. I also suggest he show respect for the Chair.

**Mr GROOM:** TAA has only made one loss in 31 years.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** I rise on a point of order. I ask for your ruling, Madam Acting Speaker, on whether, when you are on your feet, it is correct that the member speaking should resume his seat.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** That is correct, but I took it that he was resuming his seat.

**Mr GROOM:** I know that honourable members opposite do not want to hear the truth. They did not want to hear it from Mr Valder, their Federal chief. He told the truth, but they did not want to hear it. The member for Eyre tried to take a point of order; he did not want to hear it because it was designed to embarrass the Liberals. So it did, because Valder is the first one to tell the truth. We can take TAA—it only made one loss in—

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** On a point of order—

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. BROWN:** I rise on a point of order. I question whether it is not in breach of Standing Orders for a member to be devoting time to a notice of motion that he has given for 21 August 1985—a motion dealing with exactly the same substance and the same matter he is now putting to the House.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Some leniency can be given in this type of debate. However, I suggest that the member for Hartley take into account the motion he has on notice.

**Mr GROOM:** I hope members opposite will enter into that debate, so I will get on to their record of taxation charges and other imposts from 1979 to 1982. Honourable members opposite will know that I researched the regulations of this Parliament between 1979 and 1982 and found that there had been 194 increases.

*The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** I am pleased that the honourable member is leaving, because I can now continue. I know that honourable members opposite do not like hearing the truth about their record—they will try to cover up. They told the people of South Australia in September 1982 that they had a balanced Budget. What a misrepresentation! And they have the gall to attack the Premier! They misrepresented the budgetary position to the people because they were coming into an election period.

The record deficit that South Australia faced—the highest ever deficit—of \$63 million was not the balanced Budget that they presented to this Parliament. What a misrepresentation they gave to the people of South Australia! Also they increased taxes, charges and other imposts. The records of this Parliament show that between 1979 and 1982 they increased a total of 194 taxes, charges and other imposts.

I gave them the benefit of the doubt and did not put things onto my list that were put on the list of honourable members opposite. That is their record. I know that they do not like hearing it. The Premier, through excellent financial management, brought this State out of an economic recession—its most serious economic recession since the depression—brought about by the type of policy of honourable members opposite. Woe betide South Australia if they get back into office. We know what will happen. Jobs will be in jeopardy. In the 1981 Budget—

*Mr Ashenden interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** The member for Todd can laugh. He told the Parliament two years ago that he would reduce public sector employment by 2 000 and that is on the record of this House. That is the type of policy the public can expect from honourable members opposite.

I predict that privatisation—the policy in which they propose to sell off profitable public ventures—will be their Achilles heel, as will be the negativism of the Leader of the Opposition. I read his fortune in the *News* this week. It stated that he was not going to win the next election—we all know that. However, it also stated that he will travel and achieve a good position and that it may be a foreign posting. I will be interested to see where he will go.

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** Perhaps now we will hear a bit of truth. That had to be the greatest lot of nonsense that I have heard for a long time. What about the \$35 million that the Hawke Government gave this Government to balance its Budget? What happened to that? Where has that come in the \$42 million overrun we currently have? If we are to have a little of the truth, let us have some facts. What about the \$5 million that the Hawke Government gave for the Grand Prix grant that was not in the original program? Who has fudged to the people about that? Where is that \$5 million? The Government could not run a budget if it tried. What about the aquatic centre? We have the Minister here tonight. He could not even remember for 12 months that it was more than \$4.2 million. It took him, the builder, the planners and everyone to tell him it was not \$4.2 million. Eventually he came out and said, 'I think it is \$7.8 million, but I really do not know what it is going to be!' What is it today? That is the real question. What is it today? Nobody knows—

**Mr Becker:** It leaks.

**Mr INGERSON:**—except, as my colleague says, 'It leaks' What about this great Minister that we have? What is the final price of the aquatic centre? Every time one goes to the sporting associations, what do they say? 'We put in an application for a grant and we cannot get any money. Why can't we get any money? Because it has all gone into the aquatic centre. That is why we cannot get any money.' Then what happens? They go along and say, 'When will we get the money? Perhaps we'll get it in four years time. Why will we get it in four years time?' The answer is that the Government has used up all the money in the recreation and sport area for the next four years. That is the problem. Who caused it? The Minister on the front bench, because he could not even listen to the builder who told him that it was a \$7 million contract before he started. He could not even read the fact that it was over a \$5 million budget, and he kept on saying for 12 months, 'It is \$4.2 million.' How many months did he fudge?

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr INGERSON:** Yes, as somebody said, just keep on plugging the holes—a few more dollars here and a few more dollars there. Then who suffers? The sport and recreation people. Let us look at this sport and recreation area. What do we have? We have leadership with no direction. What does everybody say? If we can find the Minister awake, or if he has not got his head down on the pillow, perhaps we might get a decision. What decisions have we had? Let us look at the decisions.

We have had a three-year inquiry into the TAB. We have had a committee, set up by the Minister, that reported back to him, but he said, 'No, I won't have that. We will have another committee.' What has happened to that committee? That committee has reported and has been disbanded. What has happened? Not one single decision has been made by the Minister.

What about the administration grants? The Minister goes along to all the sporting associations and says, 'Look, what we have to do is to have professional staff. We must have professional administrators.' But what does he do? He says, 'Next year you can have less money than you have this year, the year after that you can have less, and the year after that you can have less, but what you will do is tie their salaries into a fixed income.' So what is he doing? On the one hand he says, 'I will take it away from you', and on the other, he says that he will push up the cost. Then he says, 'I need to have professional administrators.' Who would work under that sort of nonsense? Nobody would work when all they are going to get is the Government asking them to do a good job and then taking their money away from them all the time.

We have had three years of non-decision of the TAB. The trotting industry is in a mess. The greyhound industry is in a mess. Why? Because the Minister will not make a decision as to where the TAB money ought to be going in the future. What has the Costigan Report said? South Australia has proportionately the biggest SP betting in the country. What has the Minister done? He has done absolutely nothing about it. He cannot do anything about it, because he is asleep all the time. Why can he do all those sorts of things? What happens? He is the man for non-decision. He ought to be called, the Minister for Non Decision.

What about the red tape? The associations have said, 'Would you please put in some forms and tell us what you are going to plan for the next three or four years?' What does the Government do? The associations put in the forms and their direction for the next three years. But the Minister and his staff say, 'Gee, this is a bit hard.'

We have a couple of things here that we do not understand. Send it back to the administrators. Let them do a bit more work. Let them look at these lovely administrative forms and we will look at them again. Then back it goes to the Minister. What does he do? He sends it back because it is too hard; the administrators in the department cannot work it out. Then he says to the administrators, 'You are a bit slow in getting this material in. I have to make these grants. An election is coming up and I must get these things out.' That is the sort of thing that has happened.

We have a Minister who says that we must promote junior sport. Yet what has he done for junior football—the biggest single participation sport in South Australia? He has reduced the grants for junior football. Instead of encouraging football, he has said, 'You cannot have any more money; it has all gone to the aquatic centre. We have to keep on feeding it money because of the leaks there.' The money just runs away. What does he do for the children? He says, 'We need good junior programs.' However, he has done nothing for them. It goes on and on.

What about the Minister's fiasco at the Olympic sports field? He is not even game to tell the people of South Australia that the Government has decided to upgrade it. Is this to be another election issue? Why does he not tell the public of South Australia that he will spend about \$800 000 upgrading the track? Anyone would think it was an election year! The national games are to be held in January. But how can the project begin if the Minister does not let people know about it?

The Minister ties in a few little hooks and spanners and virtually says, 'You are not running the place too well. We will tie you into a management committee which will have a member of the Department of Recreation and Sport on it.' I do not want Government departments, regulation and red tape involved in the delivery of sport to the people. We all know what Governments do when they become involved. We have a Minister who says, 'Let us get into sport and intermingle.' That must be the biggest single mistake that

this Government could possibly make. Why does it have to get involved in sport? Because we have the best organisations in our society already involved. Volunteers are interested in these sporting groups.

*Mr Plunkett interjecting:*

**Mr INGERSON:** What has the Minister done? He has had three years to look at the TAB, yet he has done nothing. Three groups are out there now wondering where they are going. It has taken him three years to make any decisions.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** He talks on 5AA.

**Mr INGERSON:** Yes, every now and then he talks on 5AA. That will cost only a couple of million dollars for the community, which does not matter. It will come out of TAB money anyway.

Getting back to the Olympic sports field, which is most important, we have the national games in January, yet the Minister cannot even make an announcement so that people can get on with the job. He continually sends out letters saying that we have to set up another committee. He is the greatest non-decision making Minister of Recreation and Sport that we have ever had. Tomorrow, he might make a decision!

**An honourable member:** *Yes, Minister.*

**Mr INGERSON:** Perhaps it is *Yes, Minister*. He might have a few advisers, but then again he might not. Obviously he has not, because he is not making any decisions. The netball association is getting on reasonably well, but who is interfering? The Minister wants to get in there and make it a tripartite committee. If he says there is nobody, perhaps he should look at the letters he is signing. In what other associations is he involved? It could go on and on. In the country people say that the Minister told them they could not have anything for four years. Why not? The money has gone to the aquatic centre. Everyone knows that that is right. The Minister knows that the builder told him it was a \$7 million project, yet for 12 months he told this Parliament that it would cost only \$4.2 million.

**Mr RODDA (Victoria):** Tonight we have listened to many varied versions of where the money will come from and where it is going.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** What about Penola?

**Mr RODDA:** It is a lovely place, but it is not without some problems. I cast members' minds back to 1979-80 when the then Government of which I had the privilege to be a member took some firm action in the area of capital taxation with regard to death or succession duties, gift duty and land tax in certain areas. I think that initiative resulted in casting off revenue amounting to some \$40 million. It was at some cost to the Treasury, and there had to be some underpinning. We heard echoes of that yesterday in relation to the Tonkin era. That decision of the then Government stabilised capital in this State and was the foundation for such stability in this community. We should not forget that.

Previous to that I recall that large properties were broken up and quite substantial businesses had to find capital during uncertain times. In fact, very extensive insurance policies had to be entered into, placing a strain on the liquidity of those undertakings. I can recall the situation when I entered this place in 1965. Capital taxation was being used by Liberal and Labor Governments. However, it was to the credit of David Tonkin and his Government that capital taxation was removed. Up until then people were leaving the State and moving to Queensland and Western Australia where these taxes had been abolished. We were also seeing large properties being sold.

The member for Hartley made the point that people are now returning to South Australia. Indeed, that is the case. In fact, there are many people in my district who rue the day that they decided to leave South Australia, sell off their

extensive properties and move to Queensland. There is nothing wrong with Queensland, but it has a different climate from this State's, and some people found that they could not face up to the change of climate and decided to return to this State.

The abolition of capital taxation has had a wonderful effect. It has brought stability to business. When we are discussing the Tonkin era (as it was referred to yesterday) we should not lose sight of the fact that that decision cost \$40 million, but it was an investment of stability. We have heard much about income tax in recent times. While income tax is not within the province of this Parliament, it has an effect because each year we see our Premier and his officers making an annual pilgrimage to Canberra; it has an indirect effect on capital investment within the States. Of course, recently we had the spectacle in Canberra of a large gathering of people all looking for ways to relieve the income tax burden. Some solution must be found to this problem, notwithstanding the fact that there was no agreement among the representatives in relation to a commodity tax of 12.5 per cent. If some form of taxation relief cannot be found, we will miss out on the creation of the necessary capital injection into new industries. I point out that I am not unmindful of the needs of people on the lower rung of the ladder.

Of course, I acknowledge that there is an area of earnings which is exempt from taxation; then there is the middle scale, but in relation to the higher scales of taxation (and as members of Parliament this is relevant to us) one does tend to raise an eyebrow on discovering the income tax that has to be paid. It is quite a substantial amount. There could be some leavening of that. I think there is room for a commodity tax. Such a system provides people with the choice of how they spend their money. There must be a way by which a commodity tax could give some relief in the income tax area, leaving it to the entrepreneur, who shows by his business enterprise that he is in a position to spend money in this country. The money earned in Australia and ploughed back into capital undertakings is something that should not be lost sight of.

Whilst we may hit out and engage in cross-fire in the Chamber, which is all very good and very much part of the political system, there is no getting at the nub of the question. State Governments are told by their Federal counterpart what the position will be in relation to a large portion of State funding. I think I have sat in on nine Budgets, and Ministers are subject to this awful business of negotiation. The Minister sitting on the front bench opposite would not be unmindful of the cuts that he has had to make in that first bid. It is quite a shock for Ministers when the departments make their first bid. That is the situation that State Governments find themselves in.

There are very big incentives to develop our resources. In his rather fiery speech, which I found quite entertaining—I always like the vigour of the honourable member—the member for Hartley referred to natural resources. Indeed we must (and we do) get royalties, and these help the State budget. Across the spectrum of activity in Australia we must find a way to provide relief in the income tax area, and take up that matter with other matters involving indirect taxation.

I applaud the development that is occurring in Australia which will boost the tourism industry. It is a large industry. The Leader mentioned the ASER project. Despite the criticisms that have been expressed across the floor of this Chamber there is fundamental support for that sort of development. The Grand Prix that will be held here in a few months time is another undertaking that will establish South Australia in the eyes of the world. This all represents progress, and in my last session I look with great pride on

what has been achieved by South Australians for South Australians. Of course, it also forms part of the Australian scene.

I want to conclude on the sobering thought that everyone must look at the question of providing some relief in the taxation area. That is not in the province of this Parliament, but of course we feel the effect of it. We should not forget that we stabilised our capital structures by scrapping death duties which were causing so much embarrassment to many people. That was a very sound undertaking. I support the motion.

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** Members on both sides have made contributions to this debate. There has been distinct criticism and spirited defence of the Government's performance over the past three years. Now that we are three months from election time, it is appropriate to refer to a pamphlet circulated in my district a few weeks before the last State election. There was a photograph of the Premier and the pamphlet was headed 'Elect a Bannon Government. We want South Australia to win'. It is a statement by the Premier itemising certain things that he would achieve, and now is the appropriate time to analyse some of the statements in that pamphlet to see whether the record of the Bannon Labor Government stands up to the promises made. Clearly, the pamphlet did not work in my district because, although the Labor Party *Herald* stated that the Party had the best candidate ever to run against me in 1982, I am still here.

**Mr Ashenden:** And you'll be here for a lot longer.

**Mr OSWALD:** Yes, I would imagine so. I will take this opportunity to consider some of the statements made by the Premier. First, in regard to jobs, the Premier said:

A Bannon Labor Government's goal in office will be to get South Australia back to work.

The Bannon Labor Government claimed to have established 20 000 jobs. What it can claim is that it put 3 300 people on the public payroll. I remind honourable members that in the private sector 20 000 jobs were created, but that has nothing to do with the Bannon Labor Government. All it is doing is taxing to the extreme, almost bringing some businesses to bankruptcy. An increase of more than 50 per cent in taxes and charges has been passed on to the business sector, and it is reeling. It was further stated:

We will establish a South Australian Enterprise Fund to assist the expansion of industry in our State.

I am not too sure where the enterprise fund is. That is another failure. Further it was stated:

We will stimulate the housing industry to build homes and create employment.

I will concede that there is a stimulus in the housing industry. It was further stated:

We recognise the full job creation potential of small business.

It is one thing to recognise the potential, but it is another thing to encourage it, and the Government has failed in that area. Once again, it has looked upon the business sector as a source of taxation and revenue, as a means of funding socialist policies. That statement applies to both Federal and State Labor Governments. It is the role of small business to create jobs, not to create wealth for a socialist Government, and that should be remembered. It was also stated:

We will provide incentives to attract high technology industries to establish in South Australia and at Technology Park in particular.

What is the result? Failure! It is no good talking about it now. We are three months from an election and the Government still has not delivered the goods. It was further claimed:

We will introduce a direct job creation program. We will involve local government and community organisations in our training and job programs.

I point out that this has happened, but with a combination of Federal and State capital about \$77 million has been invested in these programs. However, there are still more people out of work in South Australia now than when the Bannon Labor Government came to office. That is fairly significant if we are talking about the whole philosophy of job creation schemes and their ability to create long-term work. It is proof that it does not work. Once again, it has not worked here. Certainly, \$77 million has circulated around the State, and I imagine that that is a good thing, but the bottom line is that there are no more jobs in South Australia than there were when the Bannon Government took office. It is one thing to say that the Government has created 20 000 jobs, but we must compare the 1982 position with the present situation: there are more people out of work. We just cannot get away from that aspect.

There are promises galore, but on the back page there is an item under 'Health' in which I do have some interest. It states:

A Bannon Labor Government will stop any further funding cuts to our public hospitals.

I could spend the next half hour, if it was available to me, talking about axing the funds at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. We proved our point during the Budget Estimates Committees last year. It is a fact of life that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital received a real cut in funding this year despite the fact that the Labor Government said that it would stop any further funding cuts to public hospitals. Of course, the inference there is: elect us and we will increase funding for public hospitals. Under the heading 'Prices' the Premier said:

A Labor Government will re-establish a proper system of price control.

I pose one question to the House, and I say, 'Ask the petrol resellers and see if they agree that this Labor Government is going to re-establish a proper system of price control.' On this whole area of price control the Labor Government has been impotent, and it certainly will not have an opportunity to redress that. If Labor is re-elected, it will have to look at this question very seriously.

I refer also to the 'Environment' heading. All I can say in this respect, because time is running out, is that the Labor Government has lost the environmental vote. I saw that demonstrated at the launch of the Jubilee Point project, which the Labor Party completely boycotted for one purpose only: because it did not want to be seen to be involved in a project that could be environmentally sensitive. Call that political cowardice, call it what you like: it did so because the fact is that the Labor Party chose to boycott it. It is now frightened of the environmentalists; that is just another voting group within the community which it knows Labor has lost. Under 'Resource Development', the document states:

A Bannon Government will give strong backing to resource and mineral development.

That is all very well, and I imagine that the Premier was talking about the non-uranium salts in mineralisation. However, as soon as the Premier made his famous statement, which appeared in the *Australian* of Wednesday 1 February 1984, under the heading 'Roxby halt would cost us office: Bannon', powers went to work on the left wing of the State convention and the system changed. We now have the Labor Government supporting Roxby purely to stay in office. It is not doing anything about the Honeymoon or Beverley projects. In fact, one has now been aborted because of the Labor Government. It is only hanging on to Roxby because, without Roxby, it will be out of office. It is not

honest like the Liberal Party which says, 'We need Roxby and we need development in that mine.'

The question of taxes has been dealt with at great length, and I do not have time to go through it again, other than to remind the House what it says, as follows:

The ALP will not reintroduce succession or death duties, and we will not introduce new taxes.

That is a blatant untruth in an attempt to deceive the public, because the Labor Party thinks the public is gullible, which of course it is not. Under the heading 'Women', the document states:

We will pursue policies to achieve genuine equality of opportunity for women.

That has been an absolute failure on the part of the Labor Party in its three years in office. It is probably reading our policy released by the Liberal Party on women's affairs in order to get some good points from it. I have an article written by Kym Tilbrook under the heading 'Here is the ALP outlook for women: slow process'. It goes on to state that women's affairs are not attracting any attention, that it is a disaster in the branch structure and that it is going to sit up and do something about it. We all know the reason why a couple of backbenchers who have the ability to sit on the front bench are not sitting there now: it is because they put Ms Wiese in as a Minister in an attempt to catch women's votes. I feel sorry for the member for Hartley and the honourable member who sits next to him, who were in line to come down to the front bench.

**Mr Ashenden:** They thought they were.

**Mr OSWALD:** They probably were in line. However, the Government appointed another Minister in the Upper House purely to chase the women's vote. We will leave the Labor Party to work out that matter internally. Labor has obviously lost the women's vote. Once again, it appears that the Labor Party is all for women, when in fact it is not.

In relation to transport matters, the Labor Party has not kept its promise. Transport fares have escalated, and at some future time I would like to pursue the Labor Party's policy on transport in order to show what a disaster it has been for those who live in the western, south-western and southern suburbs.

**Mr ASHENDEN (Todd):** I wish to address myself to an issue that is of extreme importance to residents within the suburb of Surrey Downs. I am very pleased that the Minister of Housing is here tonight, because the problem that exists in that suburb rests fairly and squarely on the shoulders of that Minister. I would like to outline the background to a problem that presently exists in that area. The Minister may not realise just how serious this problem is. Although I have not yet seen this week's *Leader Messenger* newspaper I have been advised by telephone that there is an article in that paper that indicates that the residents of Surrey Downs are so angry with the present Government that it is likely there will be civil disobedience practised by some of the residents in that area.

The background to the situation is this. The Education Department some years ago purchased land in Surrey Downs which was to be utilised for the development of a school. Through no fault of the Government, because it is well known that the number of children attending schools is diminishing, it decided, quite rightly, that it was no longer necessary for a school to be built on that land owned by the Education Department. There is no argument with that at all. However, the problem arose because the residents of Surrey Downs built their homes in that area believing that they were building in a residential 1A area where they would be surrounded by homes of an equal standard to those they were building and where there would be a school in close proximity.

Through no fault of their own that land is no longer needed by the Education Department for a school. However, the present Government has made a decision to establish a Housing Trust estate on that land, and this is where the problem arises. The Minister has already attempted to place a wrong interpretation on my actions because of what I am doing for the residents of Surrey Downs, so let me stress and place firmly on the record that I have absolutely no quarrel with the establishment of Housing Trust residential homes in my electorate. In fact, if the Minister cares to do so he can go through correspondence to the previous Minister of Housing, the Hon. Murray Hill, and he will find that I was the person who instigated the development of a Housing Trust estate in St Agnes, which at the time sat fairly and squarely in my electorate of Todd and which remains fairly and squarely in the new electorate of Newland for which I am a candidate.

It is on record that I pressed the previous Government for the development of a Housing Trust estate in my electorate. Let me make quite sure that the Minister does not attempt to indicate that I am anti-Housing Trust. However, the difference between the development in St Agnes and the one at Surrey Downs is that when I pressed for the development in St Agnes there were no homes in the surrounding area—in other words, when any home owner decided to build in St Agnes he or she knew that it was planned that there would be a Housing Trust development in that area so that they could buy the land in full knowledge of that development.

However, what has happened in Surrey Downs is that residents have built beautiful homes—it is a delightful suburb—on which they have spent their life savings and for which they have entered into heavy mortgages. These are homes in which they want to spend the rest of their lives. It is the biggest investment that they can make. What has happened is that this Government, despite the wishes of those residents—and I stress, despite the wishes of the Tea Tree Gully Council—is proceeding with the development of a Housing Trust estate.

The Housing Trust, quite rightly, does not invest in the homes it builds the amount of capital that the residents of Surrey Downs have invested in their homes because the Housing Trust's main aim is—and never forget that the Trust was established by a Liberal Government—to provide housing for those persons who unfortunately cannot afford to purchase a home of their own. It must of necessity build a home that is of lesser value than those already built in Surrey Downs. I do not care whether the developer in Surrey Downs is the Housing Trust or a private builder. If homes of lesser value are to be built in that area it must affect the value of the surrounding homes: that is what my residents are concerned about. Just as the residents who do not have a home have every right to expect to have one, so have my residents the right to protect their investments.

The point is this—and I stress it—that I am fighting for my residents because the present Government is taking an action which those people could not have foreseen and which will affect their lifetime investments. Those residents have rights to protest at the fact that a development will occur that will negatively affect the value of their investments.

This area can have a maximum of only 80 homes built on it. Two hundred metres away we have the Golden Grove development where 30 per cent of the housing will be built by the Housing Trust. In other words, only 200 metres away we have a development that will cater for the needs of those persons who are looking for Housing Trust development, but the point is that separating Surrey Downs from that development is what will be a major four-lane highway. Therefore, I make the point on behalf of my residents that the development that is occurring is not necessary and is

not a development that they could have foreseen, but is a development that will seriously impact on the value of their homes.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr ASHENDEN:** The answer to that question, to the member who interjected out of his seat, is that it is a well established fact that the value of property is heavily dependent on the value of property surrounding it. Therefore, when houses of lesser value are built it must impact on the value of the homes there. That is an established fact, and any real estate developer will confirm that. I again stress to members opposite that I have no opposition to Housing Trust development provided that—

*The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:*

**Mr ASHENDEN:** I have already pointed out that in St Agnes I fought for and obtained a Housing Trust development, but it was put there before any other development. That is the point I am making: the residents of Surrey Downs could not have foreseen what this Government would do. If it had been established firmly that a Housing Trust development was to be built there before these people had spent their money, I would not have supported them here tonight, but this Government is forcing it on these residents and on the Tea Tree Gully council, which has firmly in its minutes the statement that it opposes this development. Yet, this Government will tread all over the Tea Tree Gully council's wishes and of the local residents and proceed with a development that could easily be placed just across the Golden Grove Road in a development that it controls.

I assure the residents of Surrey Downs that I will fight to the end for them to ensure that the development that is placed in Surrey Downs is at least the equal of the homes that are already there. I will fight for the residents of Surrey Downs and for their rights. They have rights: they have every right to protest at the Government's heavy-handed, ham-fisted attempts to dominate them. I will get on the record that the Tea Tree Gully council rejected the application of the Housing Trust. That rejection was fully supported by the Planning Appeals Board, to which the Housing Trust turned when the council rejected its application. Despite that, this Government is proceeding with that development.

A Liberal Government will work in close cooperation with local government. This situation would never occur under a Liberal Government. I again assure residents of Surrey Downs that as long as I can I will fight for them. They are right; the Government is wrong. There is no doubt about that at all. I hope that the threat of civil disobedience that the local residents had to make never comes to pass, but that is the anger that this Government has developed in the residents of Surrey Downs, and I will support them to the utmost.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles):** Tonight, I raise a matter that was drawn to my attention today, relating to the Electricity Trust of South Australia and the charges that it imposes—not for the supply of electricity but for the provision of services such as maintenance and repairs. In fact, the three matters that I propose to raise in this debate are all related in one way or the other to the Electricity Trust.

The first and most important is one which I consider to be a quite unwarranted and outrageous charge imposed on constituents of mine as a result of accidental damage to a power line on a neighbouring property. The background to the story is this. On 25 April this year my constituent was trimming the next door neighbour's tree, with the permission of the next door neighbour, when one of the branches knocked a piece out of the coil on the neighbour's power line. That incident immediately cut the power and my constituent then rang ETSA, and they came out and fixed

the problem. There was no indication at that stage that there would be a charge.

On 26 June—two months after the event—my constituents received a bill for \$250. They rang the trust and went to the office, but were told that they must pay the account. My constituents were told that they would be charged for six hours labour, although they claim that the job took two seconds. I think that that might be somewhat of an overstatement. I imagine that the job would have taken a matter of minutes, and perhaps if one adds travelling time from the maintenance depot to Rostrevor, a total of one hour.

One of the workers told my constituent that if she had not said that it was the fault of herself and her husband there would have been no charge whatsoever. In addition, when the maintenance crew attended the job there was no indication that there would be a charge. This afternoon I rang the trust to see whether I could sort out what appeared to me to be an extraordinary situation, which surely must have been the result of an error on someone's part. However, I was told that there was no error. My constituents had been unfortunate or unwise enough to embark on a tree trimming program on a public holiday.

As a result the emergency crew that was on call-out was receiving double penalty rates. The minimum call-out on a public holiday is apparently three hours. The total account of \$250 amounts to \$125 for each crew member. I do not dispute for a minute that in a situation of that nature, when maintenance staff are dealing with live wires, that there should be two and not one person. I do not dispute that safety requirement for one moment. However, if one divides \$250 in half, it is \$125 per man for what, albeit the claim is that the job took a matter of seconds, would have been at maximum from call-out to call-back, one hour, taking into account travelling time. That \$125 for an hour's work is not a bad rate at all. I am sure that no member in this Chamber would dispute that that is a very high rate.

**Mr Ferguson:** What time was this?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I understand that it was in the afternoon. It was a public holiday, but during daylight hours. I challenge the validity of a charge of that nature. Even with double penalty rates and a minimum three hour call-out time, there is no way that the trust cannot be imposing a substantial additional charge to the wages it is required to pay maintenance crews. This matter needs investigation and I will certainly take it up with the General Manager of the trust. I am aware from personal experience of call-out crews coming to a home—in this case my home—on a weekend to attend to a fuse that had blown. There was no call-out charge on that occasion and it did not take a great length of time. I doubt that the policy has changed in the meantime. Several issues are raised within that one issue. One is the massive cost that the community pays for penalty rates. Another issue is the cost structure of ETSA, which imposes on two innocent or unwitting people a charge of \$250 for accidental damage incurred in trimming a tree.

*Mr Trainer interjecting:*

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Mr Deputy Speaker, a member opposite is interjecting out of his seat, and perhaps he should be made aware of that. Another matter relating to the trust is one in which the trust is fulfilling its obligations whilst another Government department is not. I refer to the longstanding campaign of the Morialta Residents' Association to have undergrounding of electricity wires along Wandilla Drive which follows the course of Fourth Creek and the boundary of Morialta National Park.

The Morialta Residents Association has, amongst its members, a number of extremely highly qualified people all of whom are interested in conserving the unique and extremely beautiful nature of the area. That is why for years they have been seeking the undergrounding of wires. They

have taken the initiative to canvass all residents in the area seeking their agreement to pay their share of the costs. The trust is willing to pay its share of the cost. Guess which department is not willing to pay its share of the costs as a neighbouring property owner? I refer to the National Parks and Wildlife Service. The Government is the landowner of Morialta Park—a park in an extremely vulnerable area in relation to bushfires, a park very much visited by tourists to South Australia. The landowner in this case, the National Parks and Wildlife Service, is refusing to come up with a measly \$4 000 as its share of the cost of undergrounding.

The Scott Report made very clear that the area around Fourth Creek is vulnerable and needs protection in case of bushfire. It is one thing to ask for vast sums of money and to be irresponsible about doing so. It is one thing for this Government apparently to be spending upwards of \$300 000 on promoting its own image, but surely it is another thing for the Government to provide its share—a comparatively small sum, in fact, an insignificant sum, when comparing the amount it is spending on other projects—of \$4 000 to be what in effect amounts to being a good neighbour.

I have no doubt, as I have confirmed it with the senior officers of the Athelstone Country Fire Service, that the entire area north of Morialta Park, including the suburbs of Rostrevor across to Athelstone and over the border of my new electorate of Coles as well as into the new electorate of Todd, would be very much at risk should a southerly wind develop in the event of a bushfire in Morialta Park. It would rip through the low foothills country and across residential areas, making many people extremely vulnerable. I call on the Minister for Environment and Planning, now the Deputy Premier, to ensure that his department fulfils its obligations and comes up with its share of the money necessary to enable undergrounding of electricity wires in Wandilla Drive. It should be done promptly and with no further argument or debate after a case that has been well made by members of the Morialta Residents Association.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** In the driest State on the driest continent in the world one commodity is obviously of tremendous importance, namely, the supply of water. In the South-East of South Australia we live on our water supply. We have a limestone plateau extending from Kingston in the South-East into Victoria. I believe it is the largest limestone plateau in the world. Underneath that limestone plateau is the water that is so essential to life, to existence itself. I believe that the Government and the Engineering and Water Supply Department in South Australia are playing games with the South-East water supply. I say that because already I have been in communication with the Waste Management Commission in South Australia on an informal basis and I learnt that, although the Waste Management Commission is not directly involved because of statutory limitations with the control of development outside the metropolitan area, it nevertheless has expressed concern at what is happening in the Adelaide Hills, in the Barossa Valley area, in the Onkaparinga Valley and elsewhere, in so far as vast problems have already been created over the decades from the amount of effluent discharged not so much by secondary industry by way of large factories but in the form of effluent from wineries, piggeries, dairies, the very large chicken farms, and so on.

In the South-East, we have recently had announced in a relatively quiet manner the establishment of a very substantial piggery. I am told that there will be about 1 000 sows and that means that for the entire 12 months of the year, there will be the potential for 10 000 pigs to be bred and reared on the one spot. I am informed by the Waste Management Commission, which I asked for information, that each pig gives off effluent, excreta, which is the equivalent of the excreta of 10 human beings. So here we have

a piggery with 10 000 pigs per annum, the equivalent of a town of 100 000 in terms of the amount of effluent, excreta, which has to be disposed of. I say that the E&WS Department appears to be playing games, because the Mount Gambier District Council had decided in its forward planning that it would allow small rural subdivisions. In the earlier part of this year, it had some 15 or 16 subdivisions which it had tentatively approved and which were before the State Planning Commission for final approval.

The district council was told to hold fire, not to proceed with those subdivisions, and one of the reasons I was given on inquiry was that there was a pollution potential. Now, one of those small holdings was in fact to get rid of a dairy. It would have reduced the amount of potential pollution in that immediate environment. The others were simply for the establishment of houses on existing farms or farmlets but, no, the E&WS Department came to Mount Gambier with the Planning Commission officers and told the district council not to proceed, and as a result those subdivisions have been disallowed.

Now, where is the consistency when you have a new piggery established on the outskirts of the city? It is actually situated on a proclaimed water reserve on Casterton Road about seven miles from the centre of Mount Gambier. When the Premier came down to the South-East to have a look at the Finger Point discharge site where the effluent emerges into the sea from Mount Gambier, he quietly said that if they could find a way of getting rid of the whey from the dairy factories and reducing the volume of effluent going out to sea, then we might possibly have a start to the Finger Point sewage scheme. We knew of this when we were in Government and we still decided to proceed with the sewage scheme irrespective of what happened to the whey. The Premier did say that a piggery would possibly be established which could absorb a quantity of the whey and then reduce the volume of effluent.

I decided to nip along and have a look at the potential site for the piggery. What do I find when I arrive there? The bulldozers have already cleared the site in Stony Paddock, which is concentrated behind a large group of pines in the Myora Forest Reserve; a trench has already been excavated through the forest for the laying of an electric cable; five very substantial power cable supports have already been placed in site in Stony Paddock; and Casterton Road has been excavated and trenched so that the power line can be placed underneath it.

In other words, the whole scheme was very far advanced, yet the Government had gone about this very quietly. Local government had been assured that there was no pollution threat. The E&WS Department's assurance that the piggery (with a potential effluent disposal equivalent to that of 100 000 people) was no threat, yet the 16 small farm subdivisions to the north of Mount Gambier were a large threat, causes one to ask, 'What happened behind the scenes?'

I suspect that the Premier was looking for a reason to commence the Finger Point sewage scheme and is also looking for a reason to remove piggeries from the Adelaide Hills area—the Onkaparinga Valley—and get them away from the State capital. How safe is the effluent disposal scheme? The excreta will be ponded and then discharged on the forest floor—spray irrigated.

I suggest that in winter there will be a very high chance, with heavy rains, of effluent leaching downwards into the water table. When we were in Government the Hon. John Cornwall complained bitterly at the high nitrate content in water in the South-East water table, and rightly so, because the nitrate content is higher than the nitrate in the River Murray although the appearance of the Murray water is far inferior.

When one looks at the furore raised over the potential pollution from the Kingston coal mine in the South-East, one wonders why the E & WS Department has approved a piggery in such a blase fashion. There are other factors, too, which do not seem to have been considered. Local producers have been offered no assistance, yet the new piggery is selling on the same markets as do local producers.

What are the Government's criteria for helping a new business into a town? I was always under the impression that no substantial encouragement would be given if the new business was going to compete specifically with existing producers, but not so in this instance. Very substantial assistance has been given by the Government, possibly by way of a very large Government guarantee grant and perhaps in provision of land, in assistance with power, road construction through the forest and other things.

I am not sure what they are and I will place questions on notice to ascertain those points, if the Government will divulge them. However, the point that has to be made is that here it would seem to be a decision made more of political expediency than for any other reason: save face on Finger Point; get rid of piggeries from the Adelaide Hills area to the South-East in spite of the fact that we live on our water table which is already under threat from the decades of effluent discharged into it from a whole range of primary and secondary industries.

We have the factor that the local people are now being competed against by an industry that has been, we believe, considerably assisted by the Government through the IDC and possibly other agencies. As I said, I will place a number of questions on notice to the Premier and his senior Ministers for them to answer. I hope that they can come up with a much more sensible and logical reason for what they have done than I imagine they can.

I suggest that it is purely political expediency that has enabled them to come to that decision with regard to establishment of a piggery in the South-East and, at the same time, to discourage the Mount Gambier District Council from permitting a few small farmlets to be subdivided where very few people would add very little extra pollution to the district.

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens):** I cannot let my brief speech go tonight without mentioning the contribution of the member for Hartley, who has treated the House to another one of his histrionic efforts that we were used to seeing when he was a claimant for the Ministry. After his disappointment in not being appointed to the Ministry, I must say that I am surprised that he is still treating us to histrionic efforts which contain no substance. Although it will be a matter for debate in the future, I suggest that the member for Hartley should carefully read what the Leader of the Opposition has said publicly before he tries to mislead the House and the people of this State on the question of privatisation. As I have said, that will be for another time. The member for Hartley would be well advised to have a close look at what the Leader of the Opposition had to say on that subject.

In the time left to me I will briefly canvass some items in the record of the present Government. I do so because I think it is timely that the Government's record was placed on display. In fact, if I can coin a well-known Labor Party slogan, 'It's time.' The present Government is the Government of promises—promises, promises. The first and probably the most important promise ever made by a Premier (at the time, Leader of the Opposition) in the history of Government in this State was his promise before the last State election that there would be no increase in State taxation. Of course, as has been well documented in this place by the Leader of the Opposition, we have had a 50



per cent increase in State taxation since that promise was made. That will live with the Premier when he moves into Opposition in a few months time.

In the first two years of the present Government we saw a complete mismanagement of the public sector. I need mention only two facets of that mismanagement because they had a profound effect on the Budget of this State—a Budget that the Olsen Liberal Government will have to put right in a few weeks time. In the first two years of the Bannon Government, Government departments were allowed to overrun their expenditure by \$50 million, which is an extremely important figure. At the same time, the Government allowed 3 300 extra persons to go on to the public payroll at a cost to the taxpayer of \$37 million. That gives a total of \$87 million. That came from a Government that is led by a Premier who is spending \$500 000 at the taxpayers' expense, for personal publicity to promote him and his Government on the eve of a State election. That \$500 000 could have been better spent on trying to replace some of the money that the Commonwealth Government has filched from the Participation and Equity Program which was to help the unemployed of this State.

The Government is led by a man and has within it a Minister of Transport who before the last election poured scorn on the north-eastern busway project, as my colleague the member for Todd ably pointed out to the House last night. The project was described as an Irish joke. However, the Premier and Minister of Transport are now both out in the Tea Tree Gully area claiming credit for what they describe as their project, one that will revolutionise transport in this country and make Adelaide a world leader. That illustrates the Government's hypocrisy.

Under the present Administration there has been a cost escalation of Government projects to the tune of \$21 million. One need do little more than refer to the State Aquatic Centre, which matter has already been canvassed in this place today by my colleagues, particularly by the member for Bragg. However, I want to contribute something new to the debate on the Aquatic Centre, because it shows the incompetency of those on the Government front bench. When accused of mismanagement of the State Aquatic Centre project the Premier and the Minister of Recreation and Sport continually said, 'But we were given estimates by the private sector; we were given a plan and a costing by the private sector which came to only \$3.7 million or \$4.2 million. It is not our fault; it is the fault of the private sector.'

However, in 1981, as the shadow Minister, and in 1982, when he was Minister of Recreation and Sport, the present Minister had in his hands a report, which I commissioned, on the covering of the North Adelaide swimming centre to become a future aquatic centre. That showed in 1981 prices that the project would cost \$5 million. Blind Freddy could have estimated that amount. How could the Minister accept an estimate of \$3.7 million in 1984 when he already had in his hands a report, commissioned by the former Government, which indicated that the cost would be about \$5 million? That alone points out the incompetency of the Government.

*Mr Groom interjecting:*

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** The member for Hartley should be pleased that he did not get on to the front bench of the Government, because he would have to be tarred with that. At least at the moment he is clean.

The last issue with which I wish to deal concerns the extraordinary decision of the Government, advised by the former Minister of Transport, to do away with the north-south corridor. In so doing, the Government removed any future option for any future Government. It was the most extraordinary decision in transport planning to be taken

since the decision made by Mr Virgo 10 years ago to place a moratorium on the north-south corridor—before the Liberal Government, in which I was Minister of Transport, made a decision that the corridor would be reduced to that amount of land required for a four-lane corridor and that the excess land would be sold off.

*Mr Mayes interjecting:*

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** The honourable member ought to get his facts right.

*Mr Mayes interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Housing and Construction):** I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

**Mr BLACKER (Flinders):** This Bill is for the appropriation of \$485 million for the Public Service of the State for the financial year ending 30 June 1986. I believe that that sum has increased four-fold in the relatively short time in which I have been in Parliament, and it is of some concern to me that an interim measure involves a sum of such magnitude. I appreciate that the Premier explained why the extra \$100 million is required, but by the same token I believe that too large a sum is being appropriated in one hit.

I take this opportunity to raise a number of issues; first, I take up the points made by the member for Light regarding the Road Traffic Board and its involvement with over width, over length and over height vehicles. Whilst this subject has been canvassed by many people from different areas, I wish to refer particularly to the rather ludicrous situation relating to height. A road train can legally have a height of 4.6 metres. In effect, a road train is two semitrailers with bogey drive and, in many cases, triaxle trailer followed by another trailer with bogey front and perhaps triaxles on the rear.

The problem relates to stock handling. Generally, a height of 4.6 metres is allowed in the northern part of the State, thus a doubledecker cattle crate can be used without injury to the animals. However, if the two trailers are split so that two single semitrailers are used, be they exactly the same vehicle jacked up with a prime mover under each, the height must be lowered to 4.3 metres. That is an utterly ludicrous situation. If logic were to apply, if the height was to be lowered one would have thought that it would relate to the road train configuration, but the height of the road train can be 4.6 metres—that is totally appropriate.

If the height is reduced to 4.3 metres, the gap in the bottom deck of the trailer in which the cattle have to stand is reduced so that the cattle have to travel with their backs down and their heads rubbing on the upper deck. Obviously, none of us wants to see that, as animals can be injured. I believe that the Parliament should endeavour to rectify the situation. I strongly advocate that transport vehicles with doubledecker cattle crates should be subject to a maximum height of 4.6 metres. All I can say is that some people in the Highways Department and the appropriate authorities should be embarrassed that such anomalies occur in this area.

I hope that in the next few weeks the Premier will be able to come to Port Lincoln to officially open the marina complex. We know that the project has had the blessing of the Public Works Standing Committee. The Government and the Opposition have supported it, and I am looking forward to the Premier's opening that complex. The marina is a unique project, involving private enterprise, local government, the State Government and, to a degree, the Federal Government. The combination of finances that will enable the project to go ahead should be examined, because this

project was set up as a model. I am not aware of a similar set-up anywhere else in Australia. Not one of those bodies that I mentioned—private enterprise, local government, the State Government or Federal Government—could, in their own right, justify the project.

I refer also to the fishing industry, particularly the prawn and tuna boat owners, who are in fact buying or leasing their berths and are contributing to Government coffers, not only with the initial deposit which they pay, but also on the annual lease. Not only is there the commercial aspect, but also there is the ability to attract a tremendous tourist industry, particularly the offshore sailing industry, which this State at the moment does not really have. The waters for offshore sailing in and around Port Lincoln and the gulfs of this State are as good as one could find probably anywhere in the world. I hope that South Australia and the marina project can be set up as the sailing mecca of the south and that every member of Parliament can at some time visit Port Lincoln. This would help promote not only Port Lincoln but South Australia generally.

I would also like to commend the water supply project at Coffin Bay. I wish the Minister of Water Resources were present tonight, because we do owe thanks to him for the part he played in establishing that project for that area. Despite some adverse publicity on television when, much to the regret of all people who were involved, a small misunderstanding arose and developed into an over-reaction, nevertheless the project is under way. Coffin Bay will benefit from the establishment of a reticulated water scheme. That is a project which would not, under normal circumstances, have been able to get under way.

I refer to some aspects of the winding up operation of SAMCOR at Port Lincoln. That subject has been debated heatedly within this House and elsewhere. A number of things which have happened in the winding up of that operation have disturbed me. I am quite convinced that I have probably seen only the tip of the iceberg, but I have been handed a copy of a tender form which was for the disposal of much of the plant and equipment from that undertaking. The supply and tender form was issued, and one of my constituents applied for it. He was looking for a particular item of machinery. When he received the tender form it looked good, but then an addendum form was attached entitled 'Deletions and amendments to the tender listing of SAMCOR, Port Lincoln, February 1985'. That document lists a series of items of equipment which have disappeared, and there is no logical explanation.

**Mr Lewis:** You mean they've just been ripped off?

**Mr BLACKER:** I do not know where they have gone, but they have disappeared. They were listed on the official supply and tender form. There are 34 or 35 individual listings to which there are amendments or deletions, and in some cases complete items of equipment have just disappeared.

**Mr Lewis:** Big items?

**Mr BLACKER:** Yes, in some cases they would amount to many hundreds of dollars, and that is a matter of grave concern. The matter would probably never have been brought to my attention had not one of my constituents been looking for a particular item of equipment that he believed would be sold by this means. When he received the original form he thought that he would submit his tender for that item. It was then discovered that that item of equipment had disappeared and I say 'disappeared' advisedly. In some instances there may be an explanation, but I have learned through word of mouth within the local area that there is no logical explanation for the disappearance of some of the items. I have been advised that some of the items that have disappeared have, rather ironically, matched identically the

requirements of another abattoir in the State. That is of considerable concern to me.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The question is—the honourable member for Mallee.

**Mr LEWIS (Mallee):** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I wondered once again whether I would have the opportunity to speak taken from beneath my nose before I got the call.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr LEWIS:** Well, it is the fourth time. I wish to draw members' attention to the mistaken impression that the member for Hartley and honourable members opposite have about the effect of privatisation on the State's economy. He and the fools opposite (and the public could be forgiven for thinking that members opposite are fools) believe that privatisation will result in a loss of jobs. In no circumstances would that happen. In those circumstances where members of enterprises that the Liberal Party proposes should be privatised are presently employing people who consider their activities and, as it were, their jobs in those enterprises to be viable, they, as employees, would be well advised (indeed, well served) if they were to buy the enterprises themselves. Then, the efficiencies of their labour could be turned into profits that they could enjoy in addition to their wages. Why on earth would that not be possible? Those employees would then enjoy not only the benefits of the wages that they got from the job but also the profits and, like everyone else in the private sector, would be able to make a reasonable contribution in the form of taxes such as any competitor with such an enterprise had to pay the State Government, anyway.

We are giving them not only freedom to participate as full citizens in the absolute sense: they will be able to have their jobs, the wages that come from those jobs and the profits their energies generate, and they also pay taxes like everybody else working in the same industries in the private sector. They will then share the responsibility of carrying the tax burden for those less fortunate than themselves. At present they merely hide behind the facade of Government enterprise (so called), which protects their enterprise from the necessity of making a reasonable contribution to the State's tax revenue because a Government taxing itself will soon disappear up its fundamental whatever—you cannot really take from one pocket to pay yourself in the same pocket.

I also point out to the member for Hartley, for his benefit, that unemployment is now higher than it was when the Government of which he is a member came to office. Therefore, it ill behoves him to be critical of the Liberal Party's record of addressing the problem of unemployment during its term of office from 1979 to 1982. It is indeed, as the old adage goes, a matter of saying that those who live in glass houses should not throw stones.

I will now address several matters relating to a particular Minister. We have seen the walking wounded in the Ministry, one of whom has had the good grace to resign, acknowledging the fact that he is simply no longer fit for the job as a Minister or as a member of Parliament. We wish him well in his retirement and regret the fact that he found the duties as a member of Parliament so onerous as to cause him that ill health and distress. I wish God speed to those other wounded members of the Ministry who ought to join him. I refer, in particular, of course to a number of Ministers in this House who really, whether they are lame physically or mentally, ought not be Ministers. The Minister at the table at the present time fits that category admirably. I refer that Minister to a scurrilous series of events that occurred at the Mypolonga Primary School. This matter goes back some considerable time and relate to a public

statement made in this House on 15 November last year that I subsequently refuted. The Minister asked me to retract my statements about him and, he alleges, members of his department.

I point out to the Minister that, subsequent to his making that statement, I produced statutory declarations from the people who had given me the facts about that matter, and I challenged him to come forth with evidence that would show the people who made those statutory declarations to me to be guilty of perjury. He has been unable or unwilling, or incapable and incompetent, in failing to address that proposition. The Minister should be castigated for his laxity in that respect. Nine months have now passed and, if it is not possible for the Minister to obtain, as he claimed to be capable of obtaining and, indeed, guaranteeing that he would obtain, those statutory declarations from his department and to give undertakings of like kind himself in nine months, he should resign.

The thing that I found particularly galling in the Minister's statement was that he said that it was cheaper to pay people to travel to and from that work site than to rent hotel accommodation in Murray Bridge. That is a gross deceit. Such a remark was attributed to him in the *Murray Valley Standard*, the newspaper of Murray Bridge, which circulates twice weekly, of 9 October 1984, on page 1.

**An honourable member:** A very good paper.

**Mr LEWIS:** Indeed. Very reliable, honourable journalists—men and women of integrity—operate that tabloid. It said:

On the cost of travelling expenses, Mr Hemmings said that it would have cost more to provide each worker with accommodation at a nearby Murray Bridge hotel.

I checked that and found him to be culpable, and indeed, guilty of a gross distortion of the facts. It would have cost the taxpayers in South Australia less than half of what it cost to pay the travelling expenses of the workers to go to and from Murray Bridge daily. It was a sweetheart deal between him and workers within his Department, and he has not got the guts to admit it.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** I would say so. I now draw attention to another matter to which I drew the Minister's attention in good faith and which he has mishandled and messed up. He has got his facts crooked again and attempted to mislead me and the people of Meningie. It is regrettable because in this instance he heightens a great deal of the tension in that community between people of Aboriginal extraction and others who live there. What was a Housing Trust home is now administered by the Aboriginal funded unit of the Housing Trust, and a family of Aboriginal extraction, with five children, occupied those premises. The tenancy used to be in the name of the man who lived there with his wife and the children who were with them, and it was transferred to the name of the wife for some funny reason.

The Minister told me—and I assured him otherwise—that the husband had deserted his wife and left home, and that that was why the tenancy had been transferred to the wife's name. To make matters worse, the trust then arranged for some rubbish removalists and cleaners to go into the premises and clean them up while the tenants sat around and watched the work being done. Imagine what effect that had on the residents in the town, whose taxes were paying for these layabouts to have their domestic, dirty linen and other rubbish removal chores done for them and for the pension and other welfare benefits that that same family occupying those premises was receiving. In fact, the man purported to be the husband and father of the children never left that home. So, the Minister and his department have been ripped off.

In spite of my attempt to discreetly draw that to his attention and have it addressed sensibly and sensitively, he has chosen to ignore it and, in consequence, tension is now extremely high. If there is violence it will be on the Minister's head, not on mine. I have done as much as I can. I have made it clear to the community that I abhor violence of any kind, especially when it relates to this kind of difference. The behaviour of the Minister is disgusting.

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

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray):** A number of subjects have been referred to during the grievance debate today and this evening. Many of my colleagues on this side of the House have referred to financial matters. A considerable number of subjects can be referred to in relation to the taxes and charges of the present Government. I look forward to the opportunity of being able to speak in detail on those matters during the Budget debate. I reiterate what has been said on a number of occasions: when the current Government and Premier came to office in 1982 they came in with a promise that they would hold taxes and charges steady. The Premier promised not to introduce new taxes and charges.

However, we have seen that taxes have risen some \$260 million. On top of that we have a new tax. No mention has been made of the financial institutions duty today, but I remind the public that that tax, which is a significant revenue raiser, is not affected in any way by the so-called concessions announced recently by the Premier. I remind the public of that, and look forward to being able to say more about it when the opportunity arises at a later stage.

I want to refer to a couple of matters. The first relates to the absolute lack of courtesy I have experienced on the part of a couple of Ministers in the current Government, one being the Minister of Education. On a number of occasions and for various reasons I have sought deputations with Ministers of this Government. Generally, those deputations have been granted. My colleague the member for Alexandra made the same point some time ago in this debate: it is only during the last couple of months, under this Labor Government, that I have been refused a deputation, as a result of a request being made to the Minister of Education.

I refer to it as an absolute lack of courtesy, because that is exactly what it is. I do not want to burden the House with the number of times that I have written to that particular Minister and have had to wait anything up to four or five months for a reply. One occasion related to urgent work required at the Stirling East Primary School. Representations and requests to meet the Minister were made by the school council, the principal, the staff and the community surrounding the school following a change in plan that was announced soon after the present Government came to office.

The previous Liberal Government made a commitment that development work would proceed. In fact, everything was going well until the current Minister of Education came on the scene. He immediately looked at priorities and determined that that project was not a high enough priority—obviously because of the electorate of which it is part—and determined that the work would not go ahead. When a deputation was sought the Minister refused to see representatives of the school council. I then wrote to the Minister at the beginning of April and still have not received a reply.

I have now put a question on notice asking whether there is any reason why I have not received the reply, and I hope that that will do something to push the Minister into some action and enable him to provide some information that is eagerly sought by representatives of that school.

It is not only that school but also the McLaren Vale Primary School, about which I have made representations. An urgency exists for work to be carried out there. I wrote to the Minister in the first week of April and again have not received a reply to that letter. It is an absolute lack of courtesy. I cannot see for the life of me why it should take that long for any Minister to respond, particularly when I know that a minute was passed to the Minister by his department some months ago with the recommendation. Obviously, the Minister is determined to sit on it.

**Mr Ashenden:** I had to wait 13 months.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** That is not the longest I have had to wait for correspondence to be answered by Ministers in this Government, but it is an example that I quote because I am particularly concerned about those two instances.

I also refer to a situation about which we have just been notified in regard to the Mount Barker hospital; the proposed \$2 million redevelopment project relating to that hospital has been thrown into jeopardy. I know that I need to tread softly in this regard, because final notification has not been handed down by the Minister of Health in this matter. I am using this opportunity to urge the Minister, if he has not made up his mind (and I have a sneaking suspicion that he has made up his mind and that it is only a matter of time before we will be advised that the \$2 million redevelopment project will not go ahead), to provide funding to enable that development to go ahead.

It is interesting to note that doubts that the project would proceed were first revealed just two days before the close of tenders. That is how far we have been able to progress with that development. It is rather interesting also that in last year's Financial Statement of the Premier and Treasurer on page 8 specific reference is made to this project as follows:

Subject to favourable reports from the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, we are also proposing to commence work on the Lyell McEwin Hospital, Stage I, the redevelopment

of Mount Barker Hospital and the redevelopment of the Wallaroo Hospital.

That is a direct quote from the Premier's own statement. I know that the redevelopment of the Wallaroo Hospital is progressing. I find it quite incredible that at this late stage we now learn that there is a chance that the redevelopment so badly needed in Mount Barker is not to proceed. I also refer to a couple of paragraphs of a letter written by a leading surgeon in South Australia.

**Mr TRAINER:** Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Now that I have only a minute left I will refer to one paragraph of a letter from a leading surgeon who wrote expressing his concern about the state of the operating theatre suite at Mount Barker Soldiers Memorial Hospital. The letter states:

During the past two years, I have operated regularly at this hospital on both hospital service patients and private patients. The standard of excellence displayed by the theatre staff far exceeds the standard of the facilities provided in the operating suite. The area is outmoded, inefficient, and very cramped. Yesterday I operated from 8 a.m. until 1.30 p.m. in an operating theatre measuring 15 feet by 15 feet. In the course of the morning's surgery, there were nine people in the operating theatre, and bulky equipment utilised included the operating table, the diathermy machine, the anaesthetic machine with its accoutrements, and a mobile X-ray machine.

Mr Speaker, I hope that the Minister of Health would consider the need for urgent action to be taken for this—

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

Motion carried.

Bill taken through Committee without amendment.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 10.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 8 August at 2 p.m.

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Tuesday 7 August 1984

**QUESTIONS ON NOTICE****SERVICE TO YOUTH COUNCIL**

6. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: Was the letter signed by the Premier endorsing the recent appeal for funds by the Service to Youth Council distributed to all homes in South Australia and, if not, in which metropolitan suburbs and country towns was it distributed and what cost, if any, did the Government incur for the printing and distribution of it?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** There was no cost to the Government. The other matters raised in the question should be directed to the organisations concerned.

**INDO-CHINESE REFUGEE RELIEF FUND**

7. **Mr OLSEN** (on notice) asked the Premier: Was the letter signed by the Premier endorsing the recent appeal by the Indo-Chinese Refugee Relief Fund distributed to all homes in South Australia and, if not, in which metropolitan suburbs and country towns was it distributed and what cost, if any, did the Government incur for the printing and distribution of it?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** There was no cost to the Government. The other matters raised in the question should be directed to the organisations concerned.