

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 21 August 1985

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

QUESTION TIME

NOTICE PAPER

The **SPEAKER**: On Wednesday last the member for Newland asked me during Question Time whether there would be a cost saving if the questions on notice were printed in full in, say, Tuesday's Notice Paper only and not repeated on Wednesdays and Thursdays. There are a number of factors which have been taken into account in the consideration already given by the Table Officers to the possibility of reducing the cost of preparing the Notice Paper. In relation to questions, the main areas of concern are the requirements of the Standing Orders, the rights and convenience of members, the efficient production of the printed questions by Table Officers and the Government Printer, and the efficient answering processes within ministerial offices and the departments.

The change proposed by the member for Newland would certainly result in a direct saving of printing costs though not, of course, in the costs of typesetting. The saving on printing could be up to \$7 000 a session depending on the number of weeks and questions. However, that simple change would not take adequate note of the other factors mentioned. For example, it would offend against Standing Order 129, which indicates that questions handed in by the required time on any sitting day should be printed in the next day's Notice Paper, and also against the principle that all items of which notice is given, whether they be Bills, motions or questions, remain on notice until completed. It is also essential that no bottlenecks are created for officers of the House, the Government Printer, Ministers, their officers and departments and *Hansard* in the process of editing, printing, answering and recording the answers.

There are alternatives to the suggestion of the honourable member which may overcome these problems. These matters are being given further consideration and, if appropriate arrangements can be made, some cost saving procedures will be implemented. I can indicate that the likely changes will involve the printing of new questions only on Wednesday's and Thursday's Notice Papers and all questions on Tuesdays. It is possible that the questions will be printed separately for Tuesdays, that is, all questions unanswered from the previous week plus each day's new questions would appear in a supplement to the rest of Tuesday's Notice Paper. The saving under this method would not be as great as the amount mentioned previously. Suggestions to improve the cost efficiency of the House are welcome from any member and I congratulate the member for Newland on his assiduous consideration of these matters, and assure the House that its officers are constantly examining areas of expenditure with that in mind.

NATIONAL WAGE CASE

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier advise whether the South Australian Government will intervene in the September national wage case to call for the next wage rise to be discounted in full for the inflationary effect of the depreciation in the dollar? The budget papers make it very clear why discounting must be sought to stop the price effects of

the depreciation flowing through to wages. Budget paper No. 1 states at page 70 that, if the increased price of imported goods is built into the ongoing inflation rate, not only would the benefits of depreciation to the Australian economy dissipate, but the sustainability of the whole recovery process would be threatened.

The Opposition asked the Premier in this House on 1 August what his Government's policy was on this vital matter and whether the State Government would intervene in the wage case. In reply, the Premier said that it was premature to make any pronouncements. However, in view of the warning I have quoted from the budget papers, and the imminence of the next national wage case, is the Premier now prepared to say whether the South Australian Government will intervene to seek full discounting?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have already dealt with this question since the delivery of the budget in a number of forums in the media. I will certainly repeat to Parliament what I have said there. What has changed since 1 August, of course, is the delivery of the federal budget and the federal Treasurer's comments on this matter and his indication of the approach that the federal Government intends to take.

My Government supports the federal Government in its wages policy and in its prices and incomes accord and will continue to do so. As the Treasurer stated it, the matter that has been raised—discounting for devaluation—will be discussed in detail with the appropriate bodies before the Commonwealth determines its particular form of application. We will certainly be advised of the outcome of those considerations and, as I say, unless there are very strong reasons to the contrary, we will support the approach taken by the federal Government.

However, let me remind the House again that one of the chief planks of economic recovery in the past three years has been the prices and incomes accord: it is vital that that prices and incomes accord is preserved and is not jeopardised. My Government has been a strong supporter of that. In so doing I believe it has assisted the Commonwealth Government in very successful economic policies.

Just remember that for two years we have had around 5 per cent growth rates and a further 5 per cent is predicted for this coming year. Those growth rates are quite remarkable in the contemporary situation: first, no other developed economy in the world is looking to that sort of performance at the moment and, secondly, they are remarkable even in terms of the sort of economic growth we had in periods like the 1950s and 1960s. It is vital that we do not jeopardise that. I repeat, on the question of wages, it must be looked at in the context of the prices and incomes accord. It is our intention to work, as we have done, with our federal colleagues and support their approach in that case.

POSTCARDS

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport inform the House whether or not he is aware that a company posing as a charitable organisation is selling postcards of various values in shopping centres in the metropolitan area in Adelaide? I have been approached by a constituent who has been sold a postcard in a metropolitan shopping centre after being approached by an older person who stated that the proceeds would go to a charitable organisation.

The postcard bears the imprint of 'Wheelchair Publications', 'Disabled and Handicapped Publications' and 'Australian Multiple Aid Publishers'. I have investigated these names and none of these companies is registered in South Australia as a charitable organisation. The postcard appears

to be similar to postcards sold by a company in New South Wales that was prosecuted in that State for falsely posing as a charitable organisation. Investigations revealed that the company was providing 50 per cent of the takings as a commission to the pensioner who was able to sell the postcards, pocketing the rest. This fraud was exposed when a pensioner attempted to sell the postcards in the State Administration Centre in Sydney. Many shopping centres would not allow hawking of goods on their premises unless for charitable purposes, but I have grave doubts that these particular companies are charitable organisations.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am aware of the situation referred to by the member for Henley Beach. I advise him that officers from my department have undertaken investigations, and certainly it appears that those organisations are not registered under the charities organisations in South Australia or under the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act, which is in my ministerial jurisdiction. I also advise the member that the matter has been placed in the hands of police and that investigations are proceeding.

TAXATION

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Because 65 500 South Australian taxpayers will be forced into higher tax brackets as a result of last night's federal budget, will the Premier call for income tax relief in the tax package to be announced next month? The federal budget has given no tax relief, which means that another 65 500 South Australian taxpayers will move into the higher tax brackets this financial year—45 500 into the 46 cent bracket and 20 000 into the 60 cent bracket. In other words, 19 per cent of taxpayers will be affected by bracket creep—as it is called—this financial year.

Despite this, the Premier has described the budget as sound, even though he told the tax summit that there must be a substantial reduction in personal income tax of the order of 25 per cent. That was the Premier's starting point, oft repeated. Because the second half of the budget—the tax package—will not be announced until next month, I ask the Premier whether or not he is prepared to call on the Hawke Government for income tax relief, or whether his strong support for last night's announcement means that he has abandoned the position he took at the tax summit.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Until the last sentence of the Deputy Leader's statement I thought that he had not understood the way in which the federal budget has been presented this year. It was made quite clear by the federal Treasurer that last night's document addressed the expenditures, revenue predictions and general economic situation for the Commonwealth over the next year. It is quite a remarkable document. It not only postulates growth rates, as I said earlier in this session, of some 5 per cent, but also it has kept within the trilogy that the Government has proposed in relation to public sector expenditure.

For instance, in terms of the deficit, that deficit has been substantially reduced by the Federal Government. In terms of real increased expenditure, it is the lowest real increased expenditure for many years. Even going back to Fraser's time, we heard a lot of rhetoric about cutting back the size of the public sector and very little action; we heard a lot said about tax indexation, which bears on the Deputy Leader's question, and it was offered in the fistful of dollars and taken away again after the election. Therefore, let us not talk about tax indexation in that sense.

If the Deputy Leader then understands that that is all that the budget is dealing with, the second part, in relation to the way in which revenue is collected, will be determined in September. My answer to the question is, 'Yes, I am

hopeful that we will see some changes made in the personal income tax level.' They will obviously not be as substantial as they would have been had proposals at the tax summit been successful.

Unfortunately, the tax summit was not able to reach agreement, particularly on option C—the radical proposal of the federal Treasurer—because there were many problems surrounding it. I might add that the task of those at the tax summit was made very much harder by the sabotage that was played upon it by members of the Liberal Opposition standing outside, having two bob every way, attacking any proposal that was made on behalf of particular interest groups, but not putting anything substantial in its place. Their behaviour made the whole debate most unworkable and most unproductive.

Therefore, throughout I have maintained a consistent attitude and I maintain it now; the current structure of our 'pay as you earn' tax system is inequitable. It is encouraging avoidance and we should try to do something about it. My views are known by the Federal Government. I hope that in the package that is announced in September something will be done in that area. However, you bet your life that whatever is done in a revenue neutral context we will hear our friends opposite complaining about any other area of change that may in some way, whether minimally, equitably or whatever, affect other groups. It is about time some responsibility was exercised by those opposite.

SMALL BUSINESS

Mrs APPLEBY: Will the Premier say whether the Government intends to pursue the ideas outlined in the Opposition's proposal for small business? I refer particularly to the proposal that 'a Liberal Government would coopt retired business people with occupational, managerial and entrepreneurial skills, which could be shared with owners and managers of new small businesses'.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thank the honourable member for her question. I have considered elements of this proposal, and I must say that the most striking part of the policy presented by the Liberal Opposition is the demonstration of the ignorance of the Opposition of what is actually being done for small business as far as the Government is concerned. So many of the things contained in the policy have already been set in train by the Government, and indeed have been accomplished, whether by legislation, administration, or otherwise. That is a fact, and is one reason why all the surveys taken have shown that small business is enjoying its greatest profits and greatest confidence for nearly 10 years. So, those people who write to small businessmen saying what a terrible thing it is to have to operate in South Australia and how dire the South Australian scene is are not paying regard to the actual experience of most areas of small business in this State.

In relation to the policy, a report last week announced a major initiative in the small business area proposed by the Liberal Opposition. In the unfortunate circumstances that a Liberal Government was elected, we are told that it would establish this scheme, as referred by the member for Brighton (soon to be the member for Hayward).

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Just looking ahead! The scheme referred to by the honourable member involves a Liberal Party proposal to coopt retired business people with occupational, managerial and entrepreneurial skills which would be shared with owners and managers of new small business. It is stated in the proposal that, 'The absence or inadequacy of one or more of those skills is the greatest single cause of

small business failure.' That is almost a direct quote from the policy document that the Labor Party issued in 1982.

I am glad that three years down the track the Liberal Party has caught up, but I suggest to honourable members opposite that they had better look at what we have done in South Australia, and I shall refer to the schemes launched by the Small Business Corporation. I note that an Opposition backbencher claimed the other day that the Small Business Corporation was something devised by the previous Liberal Government. However, the fact is that members opposite refused to go down that path, and it took our policy and our commitment to do it.

Among the schemes implemented is one that this fanciful new Liberal Government would implement. We call it the pathfinder scheme. This is a consultancy for small business, and the pathfinders, as the brochure which has already been printed and distributed indicates, are local business people with a wealth of specialised experience in commerce and industry. Some of them are semi-retired, yet keen to pass on the benefit of their experience.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. Last night I warned the member for Peake that objects were not to be displayed in the House. The same rule applies to the Premier, and he will cease displaying whatever object he now has in his hand. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will not display it, but I will continue to quote from this pamphlet. It points out that these people will pass on the benefit of their experience to small business. In formulating this proposed policy for some future Liberal Government the words were almost not only taken out of our 1982 documents but from our 1984-85 pamphlet. In fact, a number of people have taken advantage of the scheme instituted by the Small Business Corporation. I am glad that we can give it a bit more publicity. It is a very useful and good scheme.

I conclude by inviting members opposite to find out what is actually happening and to assist in the publicising of those ventures. If the Leader of the Opposition requires a special briefing on what the Small Business Corporation is doing, I will be very happy to make arrangements for him to have that.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Torrens.

CAPITAL WORKS

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: As the Premier has strongly supported the federal budget, will he say whether he accepts the significant cut in capital works spending for South Australia, and whether the Government has assessed its impact on the South Australian construction industry? The federal budget has significantly reduced specific purpose payments for capital works in South Australia. Tasmania is the only other State that has incurred a cut in this area. The reduction for South Australia means that, in real terms, we will receive this financial year about \$50 million less than in 1984-85. These cuts have implications for programs like education, building and development and water resources. For example, capital allocations for schools are down, in real terms, by \$4 million and housing assistance is down by \$5.5 million.

In addition, no Commonwealth funding has been allocated for upgrading the Adelaide International Airport, whereas significant commitments have been made to Perth, Townsville and Sydney International Airport (I must say here that the \$14.1 million allocated to Townsville makes nonsense of the Minister of Transport's protestations

regarding representations that he made to the federal Government).

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In my comments on the federal budget I made it quite clear that one of my disappointments about that document was the cut in capital expenditure. That was signalled in May at the time of the Premiers Conference. We knew what we were going to receive, and it is a cut that has been taken in common with most other States. When you look at capital works you have to look at the ebb and flow of those works. It is difficult to take a particular year in isolation.

I might add that I thought cuts were welcomed by those members opposite who continually harp and bleat about public expenditure and public deficits and who demand that both the Commonwealth and the State do something about it. It is very interesting that when they are working on the other side of the equation they suddenly discover that capital expenditure by Government provides jobs and activities, not only for Government but also for the private sector. They then bray and demand that we bring forward all these programs. They like to have it both ways.

Leaving that aside, I have expressed my disappointment about those capital cuts, and I do not think that they are appropriate. We have not been able to assess their precise impact, but I make it clear that, in a couple of areas such as assistance to the Grand Prix and assistance to the filtration program, amounts were provided in 1984-85 which are not repeated this year. It therefore makes the real reduction appear greater than it is.

That does not overcome the fact that it is a reduction and, particularly at the Premiers Conference, we have expressed our concern about that. However, such is the healthy position of the State's finances that I hope we will be able to implement a program of activity in this State that will ensure there is plenty of work in a burgeoning construction sector. This is one of the areas where this State is forging ahead.

Members opposite argue, on the one hand, that everything should be done in the private sector and, on the other hand, attack us for not spending enough. We happen to believe in the mix. We can see that more private sector capital expenditure is coming through in South Australia that will in part compensate for any reduction in public expenditure. I thought that that was the philosophy of members opposite. On this occasion, today in Question Time, for their short-term political purposes that does not suit them. I remind them of that and suggest that it is about time that they showed a bit of balance in their approach to public sector activity.

TAXATION EXEMPTION

Mr PLUNKETT: Does the Minister of Recreation and Sport support the announcement in the federal budget regarding the exemption from tax payments of horseracing and greyhound clubs, as well as the fact that horsebreeders will be able to import horses for breeding without having to pay sales tax and, at the same time, will be allowed to write down the cost of sires and brood mares on a diminishing value basis?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I support the initiatives taken by the federal Government.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Was the question your idea?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: No. Members opposite, whose record during their three years in office was pathetic, should not scoff at initiatives that help this important industry not only in South Australia but throughout Australia generally. Obviously, members opposite are not aware of the importance of last evening's announcement. The Australian indus-

try has been suffering as a consequence of the activities of New Zealand breeders, who have had a competitive advantage, and this has been resolved by last evening's announcement which will mean that Australian breeders, especially South Australian breeders, will be able to compete. At one stage South Australian breeders were regarded as the leaders throughout the Australian industry, and that position still holds to some extent. I am surprised that the Opposition should scoff at the three initiatives that have been taken.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The member for Bragg, who is regarded by the Opposition as its spokesman on these matters, probably does not know which end of the horse eats, and he should be the last person in this House to question anyone about the racing industry.

Mr Ingerson: You just want a cheap political advantage.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I do not, but I am glad that the honourable member has mentioned this, because from time to time in this House he has asked a series of questions about TAB.

Mr Gunn: And you haven't had the answers.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I always have the answers, even for the member for Eyre. The member for Bragg has previously asked me questions about TAB and radio station 5AA.

Mr Becker: When are we getting some answers there?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I will provide some if I am allowed to respond.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the House will come to order.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: This matter is connected with the racing industry and its viability in South Australia. The member for Hanson should be the last one to interject but, no doubt, he regards the member for Bragg as his major competitor for the shadow Ministry of Recreation and Sport. The only reason why he will not make it is that he has trouble with his own show.

The SPEAKER: Order! Last evening I had occasion to warn the honourable member for Peake, and I now warn the honourable Minister that unnecessarily inflammatory statements, although I cannot control them under the Standing Orders, should not be indulged in; nor, most certainly, should personal reflections. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The member for Bragg often asks me questions about the racing industry, especially about station 5AA, so I now tell him and other members that the negotiations undertaken by Festival City Broadcasters have been successful and have resulted in the purchase of regional stations that will be a great asset to the racing industry in this State.

I have often wondered whether the member for Bragg is 100 per cent supportive of the racing industry or, indeed, supportive of TAB or 5AA. At a very delicate stage of the negotiations the member for Bragg issued a press statement. Headed 'TAB purchase of two country radio stations', it states:

The Opposition has questioned the State Government over TAB seeking to purchase two country radio stations.

Why do they question it? It further states:

The House of Assembly member for Bragg, Graham Ingerson, revealed this morning that TAB had finalised negotiations to purchase radio 5RM and 5AU at Port Augusta, at present operated by the 5KA network. Since TAB took over the radio stations, 5AA had transferred broadcasts from 5DN and most country areas have been missing out. To some extent this situation will rectify the matter, but the Minister of Recreation and Sport, Mr Slater, must give assurances to the Riverland and Port Augusta that this will not affect the current high standard of local commercial radio service which they enjoy.

The honourable member wants two bob each way, in other words. I wondered why. It has come to my attention—and I have been reliably informed—that during those negotiations another company, which was a consortium of Adelaide business people, was also bidding for the purchase of those regional stations. I am reliably informed that the member for Bragg had a financial business interest in that company. How else would he get that information for the press statement? If that is the case, I believe he has used and abused his position as a member of Parliament.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: There was a conflict of interests. I have been reliably informed that that is the case.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order and ask the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition to assist me in maintaining some decorum. I make two points. First, I have no control under Standing Orders as to the Minister's answers. Honourable members have decided that I have no control. I place on record my extreme displeasure at the comments levelled at the member for Hanson, who is known to interject very rarely, if ever. Comments were made about him, but I cannot stop the Minister. So far as the current situation and allegation are concerned, the member for Bragg will be accorded full protection by the Chair. That will include an immediate question if he wishes to ask it, or proper arrangements, after consultation with Mr Clerk, as to a personal explanation. In the meantime, I ask the Minister to proceed, acknowledging to the House that I have absolutely no control over what the Minister said whilst at the same time saying to the House that honourable members should consider what I have begged them to consider at least seven times during this session—giving me that control.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I rise on a point of order. It is my distinct recollection that, in a memo to all members of the House of Assembly following the passage of the pecuniary interests legislation, you indicated, Sir, that it would be improper for any member to refer to the pecuniary interests of any other member in any debate, question or resolution in the House. Can you advise whether my recollection is correct and, if so, whether the Minister has breached the ruling given in that memo?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The next person to step out of line will be warned and I also have Standing Order 169 well in mind. I am taking advice. I cannot recollect having given that ruling, but I shall certainly have it checked immediately. I repeat what I said: I must invite the honourable Minister to continue. By the same token, I shall see that the rights of the honourable member for Bragg are fully protected.

Mr INGERSON: I rise on a point of order. I would like to be given the opportunity, when the Minister finishes his answer, to reply immediately.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will take advice on that matter.

Mr Ingerson: Or make a personal explanation—

The SPEAKER: Order! The situation is one of discretion. Normally, no matter how serious the allegation, the personal explanation would not be given until the end of Question Time, but in the circumstances I will exercise my discretion and will permit a personal explanation forthwith after the Minister has completed his answer to the honourable member for Bragg.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I simply want to say that I challenge the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party to check out whether that is the case as I have stated it and, if so, I ask them to take the necessary action, because

I do not think that the member for Bragg has acted properly in this matter. If that is the case, he should resign.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bragg.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MINISTER'S REMARKS

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

Leave granted.

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member will now resume his seat, I give warning to all members of the House that the next person who breaches the Standing Orders will be warned and the other consequences will follow—whether it be the Government benches or the Opposition benches carries no weight with me. I call the honourable member for Bragg.

Mr INGERSON: I categorically deny the statement made by the Minister of Recreation and Sport and demand an apology and its immediate withdrawal, as it is incorrect. That can be checked by my personal pecuniary interest record placed before this House.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Torrens.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I rise on a point of order. I request your ruling, Sir, on whether the Minister of Recreation and Sport was in contravention of the Members of Parliament (Register of Interests) Act 1983 in making the allegation which he did against the honourable member for Bragg.

The SPEAKER: Order! I wish to take further advice, and I will give a ruling tomorrow.

FEDERAL BUDGET RURAL RELIEF

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Will the Premier now withdraw his remark made earlier today, wherein he publicly claimed that farmers should be pleased with the federal budget announcement last night and said, 'They have nothing to grizzle about'? The Premier was reported on radio last night and again this morning as having supported the view that farmers had done well in the Keating budget announcements so far. My attention has been drawn to the details of the Treasury report wherein, first, there is no restoration of the machinery investment allowance applicable to the rural sector in the forthcoming budget period; and, secondly, there is no real relief of significance to the liquid fuel users in the country arena. Indeed, there is no relief for petrol purchasers whatsoever and there is only partial rebate on the fuel freight subsidy allowances that were applicable to all country people in Australia prior to 23 May 1985, when some \$116 million was taken away and approximately \$45 million was given back, in Mr Keating's announcements, in the form of distillate only excise rebates.

In Mr Keating's announcement there was no mention of taxation deductibility for expenditure in the year of investment by primary producers in any new development work. There is no assistance or incentive to other than the particular grain farmer who may be in a position to buy a large harvester. There is no mention of additional funding. In fact, the report reveals that there will be less funding available to the States for rural industry assistance to farmers in necessitous circumstances, providing only additional administrative funding for the State departments of agriculture involved. In other words, according to the report, there is more money for the administration of a fund which

will have less money in the current financial year than it had in the previous financial year in South Australia.

The extension of the distillate excise duty rebate of 2.4 cents per litre to fishermen is new, and is most welcome. However, as for farmers in the pastoral, grazing, dairying, and horticultural (other than specifically in the viticultural) arenas, there is, according to the report, no other relief to primary producers at large. Will the Premier review his provocative statement to the rural community and acknowledge that the federal Government has again forgotten that sector of the community from which the nation's most significant export income is derived.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member has taken the remark completely out of context. The context should be placed on record. My remarks came in an interview which immediately followed an interview with a representative from the National Farmers Federation. I did not hear the full interview, but simply heard that representative complaining about the federal budget and making a number of very negative comments. My response to that was that it is a pity—and I am just paraphrasing. I do not have a transcript of what I actually said, but this was my intention—that everybody always looks for the negative things, the things that are wrong, and ignores anything positive that has been done.

In the case of the rural community there were a number of quite positive things in the budget. One cannot deny that. In that context I felt it was a pity that it is the usual gut reaction which says, 'All right, we have got this. This might seem as if it is doing something on the surface, but let us find out what is wrong with it and let us talk about that.' In retrospect, perhaps I might have been too hard on the NFF representative, because I recognise that very often the media specifically seeks that response. I know in my case that, when asked to comment on the federal budget, I am usually asked the question, 'What is wrong with it and what do you complain about in it?' I guess inevitably one tries to think of something to complain about.

Invariably something can be found, as my statement itself has proved. So, all I am saying is that there are positive aspects in the budget, and by treating any concession made as if that means absolutely nothing, as if it is a matter of total inconsequence that will not solve any problems at all, is a funny way to try to get something done for industry. I think that that kind of negative attitude simply does not get activity or support from government.

The honourable member might recall a debate on *Nation-wide or Four Corners*, involving representatives of the rural industry, who expressed gross dissatisfaction with politicians and what had been done for the rural industry, particularly by the traditional representatives in the Country or National Parties. They expressed their total disaffection with that. The Federal Labor Government, through Mr Kerin's agricultural ministry, has attempted to address the very real problems of an industry which is totally dependent on overseas prices and trends. It has been caught very hard: sugar and other commodities are in a lot of trouble, not because of policies of the Federal Labor Government but because of the difficult international marketing situation that applies. I would have thought that the way in which the federal Government has addressed the restructuring of industries, the reduction of protection, and all the other measures are things that should be welcomed by the rural community.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: While I am not suggesting in any way that all their demands were met and all their needs were fulfilled by the federal budget, I was expressing my disappointment that the reaction to anything being done by Government is along the lines of, 'Forget about that; it is

not enough; we take that for granted. What is next? I think that that sort of negativism is crippling our economic confidence in the future, and is one of the reasons we cannot do things like tax reform, which is so urgently needed in the economy.

LADYWOOD DRIVE PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

Mr GREGORY: Can the Minister of Education say whether the Education Department has approved funding for the installation of pedestrian controlled lights on Ladywood Drive, adjacent to the Heights School and, if so, when can it be expected that these lights will be operational? I have been advised that the Road Traffic Board has approved of the location of the pedestrian controlled lights on Ladywood Drive adjacent to the school at Brunel Drive. I was advised of this following investigations, questions and demands had been made by me, after residents on the eastern side of Ladywood Drive had approached me about the dangerous situation on Ladywood Drive for children attending and coming home from school.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Education Department has approved funding for the installation of these lights. The matter was first raised with respect to an assessment being made of the need for lights at the site in question five years ago. However, on that occasion there was no evidence of enough demand, in terms of the number of students crossing the road or the number of cars passing by during the measurement times. The ratio required by the Road Traffic Board is 50 students per 100 vehicles being at the site between 8.30 and 9 a.m. and between 3.30 and 4 p.m. While the location did not meet the grade on that occasion, more recent measurement by the Road Traffic Board did indicate that the need now exists for the installation of lights.

As a result of a policy change in July 1976, the Education Department pays for school crossings that are installed, for the flashing light standard—the police beacon standard of traffic crossing. Very often it is more appropriate that a crossing be pedestrian actuated, or there might be a siting change requested by the local council with respect to the lights. In those circumstances, local government is expected to make a contribution, and that is in fact what is happening in this case. The total amount involved will be about \$18 000: \$15 000 from the Education Department and \$3 000 from local government. The proposal is to go before the local council in September and would presumably be approved by it. Subject to approval by the local council, we anticipate that the letting of contracts and the construction of the lights will see the lights operational by April 1986.

CHILD ABUSE

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Will the Minister of Community Welfare explain his department's procedures for investigating reports that children in care centres licensed by the department have been the victims of sexual abuse or assault? Yesterday the Minister revealed to the House that the husband of a former family day care giver had been charged over matters relating to the abuse of children. This is the man who was involved in allegations relating to the sexual assault of a four-year-old girl.

Those allegations were first reported to the department two years ago. However, I understand that the matters over which the man has now been charged relate to incidents that have occurred within the past month: in other words, while the man and his wife still held a departmental licence to provide an Intensive Neighbourhood Care program. This

raises further concerns about departmental procedures for checking allegations—

The SPEAKER: Order! As I understand the honourable member, the honourable lady is recounting proceedings before the courts.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: No, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think that the honourable member for Light can read the honourable lady's mind. Can the honourable member for Coles give me an assurance that the matters that she is now recounting are not before the law courts?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes, Mr Speaker. This raises further concerns about departmental procedures for checking allegations of this nature. There is evidence in fact that the department has difficulties in undertaking this task. This matter was raised in a letter written by a woman to the Premier in October 1984 after she had spoken to a member of the Minister's staff. The letter states:

There seemed to be a general attitude that children make these things up. The member of Mr Crafter's staff stated that if they acted on all such reports they would be acting on one every day.

That statement suggests that the department receives many reports relating to abuse or assault of children. In view of the charges that have now been laid in one particular case, I ask the Minister to explain exactly what procedures the department adopts for investigating such reports and whether these procedures have, in his opinion, been adequate in the past.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for her question. The procedures that have applied in respect of the matters raised were those brought down by the previous Government and applied by this Government. However, as a result of the Ombudsman's report in this case, further additional steps have been taken. I also point out, with your guidance, Mr Speaker, that in the circumstances of this case the child who allegedly has been abused by this person was not placed within that family by the Department for Community Welfare; it was a private care arrangement. The first I heard of this matter was when it was raised by the Leader of the Opposition in this House.

In fact, I understand that the parents of the child were advised of the allegations, at that time unproven, that had been made against a person living in that home. It has again been referred to as a centre, but it is in fact a home where care is provided for children. I think that is an important distinction. However, the Director-General has brought down new regulations to deal with these issues and I am happy to make a copy available to the member for Coles. I also point out that I believe there is a need for constant review of these procedures.

The member for Coles inferred that the department did not act at the time the complaint was made. I think she misquoted that correspondence to the Premier. In fact, in this case the police investigated the matter, as did certain authorities (other than the Department for Community Welfare), including the Health Commission. This went to multi-disciplinary panels which further considered the matter, so it is not true to say that the matter was not investigated: it was investigated by authorities outside the department. Nevertheless, we need to be constantly vigilant in such matters, which are of the gravest concern to all honourable members and to the community, in order to see that every step is taken to ensure that these procedures are adequate.

The Director-General of the department has met recently with the Commissioner of Police and the Crown Solicitor. The report of the Task Force on Child Abuse will be released, as the Minister of Health has said, within the next few days and hopefully, as a result of these measures and by constant

review of these procedures by the Ombudsman's office and the experience of people working in the field, we can reform the law where that is required and we can maintain effective procedures to minimise (I do not think we can ever eradicate) these most unpleasant instances of child abuse in our community.

TAXATION LETTER

Mr MAYES: Will the Minister of Community Welfare have investigated a letter circulating in the Unley District suggesting that it is from the Taxation Department, and will he report to the House? I have been given copies of a document which has been sent to businesses around Adelaide and which is causing great concern to the operators of those businesses. On opening the envelope, the recipient sees the heading 'Australian Taxation Office' under a Taxation Office letterhead. The letter states that his or her taxation affairs are being examined and that an interview has been arranged. The letter is initialled above the typewritten name R.W. Kelton (Deputy Commissioner of Taxation) and is followed by a second sheet of paper which details certain documents that are ostensibly required to be produced at the interview. It is not until the reader has turned to the third page that it is realised that it is all a hoax and part of an attempt by a firm calling itself 'Preston Marketing' to sell its information booklet *Audit Handbook*. A copy of the letter in my possession states:

Dear Proprietor, The attached letters are not an official request by the Commonwealth Taxation Department.

The heading on this page states 'Preston Marketing' with a post office box number in Modbury, South Australia. The letter continues:

I have a comprehensive booklet of my experiences and methods used by the Taxation Department, which I believe will greatly assist you.

The letter then sets out details of the booklet and the way in which the business person can, for \$26, seek to have a copy delivered. Some businesses, concerned about the way in which this material has been addressed to them, have contacted my office regarding the manner of approach and the use of the Taxation Office heading. Will the Minister have this matter investigated and report to the House?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question and for the advance notice that he has given of it, as a result of which I have sought from the Commissioner of Public and Consumer Affairs his comments on this practice. The Commissioner is most concerned that this company has chosen to use these deliberate shock tactics to sell its product and that this has caused distress to many small businesses and the principals of those businesses in the community. He has received numerous complaints about this form of marketing. However, the Commissioner cannot use his investigative powers in such a matter because it involves firms and so does not apply to consumers, in respect of which he is limited by his Act.

The advertisement does not appear to contravene any South Australian consumer protection laws, but it is important that the community be aware that this form of advertising practice is not welcomed and is causing distress to people. It is hoped that wise business practice will see it withdrawn soon. The Department of Public and Consumer Affairs understands that the material to which the advertisement applies is not yet even available to those who wish to purchase it. However, it is up to each person who is contacted in this way to decide for himself or herself whether a risk to the extent of \$26 for a book, a copy of the Freedom of Information Act—material they have not seen—and postage is worth while.

HOUSING TRUST RENTS

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Housing and Construction immediately make a statement to correct the false impression given by the Premier that all Housing Trust rents have been frozen for the rest of this year? On 4 August the Premier made a statement about Housing Trust rents, which has been interpreted widely as amounting to a freeze on all such rents. On channel 10 television news that evening the Premier is reported as saying:

What the Government is saying is the time has now come, under this agreement, to reassess the whole base of Housing Trust rents and, in our view, we should not adjust rents while we are undergoing that adjustment process.

Since that statement was made, the Premier, the Minister and other Government members have repeatedly referred in this House, without qualification, to a freeze on rents. On 7 August the Premier clearly implied, in reply to a question, that the freeze covered tenants enjoying concessional rents. However, the opposite is the case. The Opposition has received many complaints from Housing Trust tenants who, in fact, are having their rents increased during the rest of this year, contrary to what the Premier and the Minister have said. I quote just one of the many examples that have been brought to the attention of Opposition members. It concerns a war widow who had been told that her rent is to be increased by 9.1 per cent from Saturday. She has also been told that this will be subject to a further review in six months. In view of the widespread confusion and concern which the Government's unqualified statements have caused, I call on the Minister to outline the true position.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I should have thought that the member for Light would fully understand what is meant by the review of rents that is being undertaken by the Government at present. In fact, in my press statements I have clearly informed the media and the public of the meaning of the rent freeze. However, for the honourable member's information, I will yet again say what the rent freeze means. A couple of weeks ago, in response to a question asked by the member for Elizabeth, I gave the exact reasons behind the Government's imposing a rent freeze while we undertook a review. That was based on our argument that trust rents should be equity based rather than increased across the board.

I informed the member for Elizabeth and the House the reason for that, and I thought that that statement was understood. It was obviously understood by the member for Elizabeth and by members on this side, but not by the member for Light. Last week the *Messenger Press*, which circulates in the honourable member's district, contained a press release on the front page which clearly informed the public in my district that the rent freeze affected only those people who were paying full market rents.

Through no fault of their own—whether they be aged, unemployed or on sickness benefits—certain people receive a rent reduction from the Housing Trust which costs this Government a fair amount of money. The member for Light has criticised the Government's action in a report in the *Advertiser* stating that when we froze the rents it would cause a deficit. He criticised the Government for doing exactly that—giving rent reductions. He tried to get out of it later in a personal explanation.

If the member for Light, as spokesman for the Opposition on housing matters, knew the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, he would know that I as Minister of Housing and Construction have to undertake to review rents annually. I am doing that, but I have also confirmed with the federal Minister that, in line with this review, I am meeting the terms of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. At

the same time, those people who are receiving rent reductions, by way of a subsidy from this Government, and paying possibly the lowest rents anywhere in Australia, are not covered by that rent review. As soon as the review is finished and as soon as we set a new formula, which I am sure will meet the approval of this and the federal Government, the whole rent structure will be established for those Housing Trust tenants.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The member for Light is trying to create mischief. I admit to some confusion out in the electorate, but that confusion is being promoted by the member for Light, the Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition generally.

Members interjecting:

REGISTER OF INTERESTS

The SPEAKER: Order! Earlier today the member for Coles raised a point of order on whether the Minister of Recreation and Sport had breached a ruling I gave in 1983 as to discussion in this place concerning the Register of Interests. The member for Torrens later called for a further ruling as to whether the Minister had breached the Act. The ruling I gave on 19 October 1983 can be found on page 1172, where it states:

Before calling for any further questions, I feel in duty bound to draw the attention of members to the provisions contained in section 6 (1) (a) and (b) and 6 (2) of the Members of Parliament (Register of Interests) Act, 1983. I lay full emphasis on subsection (2) and the consequences that follow from that subsection. Section 6 (1) states:

A person shall not publish whether in Parliament or outside Parliament—

(a) any information derived from the register or a statement prepared pursuant to section 5 unless that information constitutes a fair and accurate summary of the information contained in the register or statement and is published in the public interest;

or

(b) any comment on the facts set forth in the register or statement unless that comment is fair and published in the public interest and without malice.

Section 6 (2), on which I place particular emphasis, states:

Where a person publishes within Parliament any information or comment in contravention of subsection (1), the person shall be guilty of a contempt of Parliament.

The Minister, in my view, made no reference to the Register of Interests and I rule that, although the remarks may have been offensive, they did not breach my previous ruling or the Members of Parliament (Register of Interests) Act, 1983.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 20 August. Page 421.)

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): I add my tribute to those of other members, first, to the late Mr Clark for his services to this Parliament and also to the late Mr Hunkin for his services both to the South Australian Parliament and particularly to the South Australian Public Service. Mr Hunkin, of course, has been a great South Australian. His contribution, particularly to the Public Service through the Public Service Board, has been outstanding. I know that he was admired by Premiers of both political persuasions and, in particular, was a very close personal

friend of and highly admired by Sir Thomas Playford during his long term as Premier of this State.

The Address in Reply debate is traditionally a time when one can raise a number of matters of both broad and local interest, as I intend to do this afternoon. The first matter I wish to pick up is the federal budget, brought down last night. I will refer to that budget's impact on transport in this State. No doubt exists that the federal budget is a bad omen as far as South Australia's transport needs are concerned. For example, funds for normal road construction and maintenance in this State have been reduced, with a cut of 10 per cent in real terms. In addition, money for rail projects must now be allocated from the funds provided. So, in fact, funds available for road construction and maintenance are even less than the amount reduced by 10 per cent in real terms.

Although there is an increase in funds under the Australian Bicentennial Road Development program, this once-off program ceases in 1988. This increase in funding, which combines both the increase in funding under the ABRD program and the reduction under the other program, means that even the total increase in funding still does not cover the increase in costs or the increase in the consumer price index to be experienced this year.

So, in real terms, taking both the normal road program or funds and the ABRD additional program and putting them together, this State will suffer a reduction in real terms of funds available for road construction and maintenance. On top of that, we have to fund any other rail projects out of that money as well.

It is interesting that South Australia gets only 7.2 per cent of all funds made available for the Australian Bicentennial Road Development program, whereas normally we can expect to get between 10 per cent and 12 per cent of the national funds. I am delighted that the Minister of Transport is sitting in the House at present, because there is no money in the budget whatsoever to fund additions or extensions to the Adelaide international air terminal, even though Sydney, Melbourne, Townsville and Perth all got millions of dollars for new facilities.

It is appropriate that I read to the House the sort of moneys that are handed out to the other States and on which South Australia missed out: Brisbane Airport has \$83 million for this financial year; the international terminal in Perth gets \$33 million this year; and the Townsville terminal gets \$1 million as part of a \$14 million expansion. On top of that, other moneys have been made available to Sydney—\$36.4 million. Yet, Adelaide could not score \$1 for the extension of the international air terminal.

I highlight this, because the present Minister of Transport assured me in this place only last week that he and his Government were doing everything possible and had made very strong representations to the federal Government for funds for that extension. I challenged him to table in this Parliament the documentation as to the letters he sent to the federal Minister. He refused to do so, I suspect because there is very little or no such documentation.

I further suspect that if he had revealed it by tabling it, it would have shown that he had been less than honest with this Parliament and with the South Australian public during the preceding 48 hours in making the claims that he did on South Australian radio. Again, I challenge the Minister of Transport to table all correspondence between him or, of course, his predecessor as Minister of Transport (Mr Roy Abbott) and the federal Minister asking for funds to extend that air terminal.

I ask the Minister to give an assurance that he will now table that information. It appears that he is sitting there absolutely mute. That is why, despite the Labor Party's slogan 'Make South Australia win', once again South Aus-

tralia has lost out to the Joh Bjelke-Petersen Government in Queensland, the Burke Government in Western Australia and the Wran Government in New South Wales. Not \$1 to be spent here in South Australia!

It is particularly interesting, because only yesterday the Minister made a statement to the *Adelaide News* that he was still confident that South Australia would get these funds. Shortly, I will look at the record of South Australia's poor deal from the federal Government when it comes to transport matters and at how the Bannon Government has failed to be effective in lobbying the federal Government for a better deal for this State. It has been absolutely ineffective.

I highlight the fact that there are no funds in this year's budget for standardisation of the rail link from Adelaide to Melbourne, a project which Mr Roy Abbott (as Minister of Transport) said should have a high priority and for which he had written to the federal Minister asking for funds. Such a project is essential: standardisation of the link from Adelaide to Melbourne would provide the standard rail link connecting all capital cities throughout Australia.

Studies carried out by Australian National have shown that such a standardisation would be economical in terms of getting a financial return on investment. The costs are not great—apparently between \$15 million and \$19 million—to standardise from here to the South Australian border, with a third rail link between here and Murray Bridge, then a standard link only from Murray Bridge to the South Australian border. Again, this State has failed.

I am concerned to see that no money is provided in the budget for what are essential export-import facilities at Adelaide Airport. We all know that when the air terminal was built in 1982 there was no guarantee of any flights coming here whatsoever. However, we now know that something like seven international flights come into that terminal each week. Consequently, there has been a significant increase in freight coming into the State and going out on those international flights. That has meant that South Australian exporters are now better able to compete on international markets compared to producers interstate. Two enterprises in this State growing cut flowers benefit. Producers can take the flowers straight to the airport and put them on international flights that land in Singapore within 10 to 12 hours, thus enabling them to meet market demands on a very rapid basis with excellent quality produce.

Similarly, fresh fruit and vegetables—particularly fresh fruit from the Riverland—are transported in this way. But, if one looks at Adelaide Airport one sees that there are virtually no facilities whatsoever for both imports and exports of freight. Yet, that is essential if this State's commercial base is to prosper, develop and expand.

We boast of being a high technology State and of the headway being made in terms of our companies competing against companies in South-East Asia. One such company is Austek, which is now marketing its product—a high capacity, well advanced microchip designed in South Australia—in South-East Asian countries, and which has the prospect of shipping to Singapore and Hong Kong, which produce so much electronic equipment.

The next obvious step forward is to provide facilities for freight forwarders, but I know of no action by this State Government to bring about such improved facilities. Therefore, I call on the Government to start implementing such a program immediately and to provide facilities on the airport ground to enable forwarders to lease space or erect their own structures to provide ample refrigeration (which exporters have complained to me does not exist at present), ample loading, transfer and other facilities, including office space for documentation and processing of tariff and customs claims.

Further, I highlight the raw deal that the federal Government has given to this State over the past 2½ years. Let us go through the issues: first, the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line, which was going to do so much in terms of allowing this State to export containers of products directly out of the State through Darwin to South-East Asia. That would have virtually opened up the centre of Australia and the one State that would achieve the greatest benefit from that was South Australia. As soon as the Hawke Government was elected, it abolished or scrapped that proposal even though it was promised by the previous Government.

Secondly, we have a federal Government that, since it came to power, increased tax on the price of fuel by 5c a litre. That Government has imposed an additional 5c a litre in that period. Yet, the South Australian Government—also a Labor Government—seems to sit meekly by and watch the federal Government do that without raising even a whimper against that impost on fuel. It is ironic that it has imposed an extra 5c a litre on fuel when the federal Government is collecting \$7 000 million a year from motorists through taxation on either petrol or motor vehicles, but is returning only 17 per cent of that to roads. What did this Government agree with the federal Government on funding for roads over the next five years—a 6 per cent cut in real terms in funding for South Australia over that period.

That is the sort of cooperation we have between the Bannon Government and the Hawke Government, to the detriment of South Australia. I find it absolutely ironic that the federal Government is taking more money from the motorist and giving less back for roads. As a result, a recent federal study of roads indicates that the national road system is deteriorating at an alarming rate. Due to the failure to spend money on upgrading the road system, not only will the roads break down, but congestion and accidents in metropolitan and rural areas will increase as a result. That study came up with some alarming figures on the increase in road accidents and deaths that will occur each year from now on because of the lack of expenditure on improving our roads.

Further, the Hawke Government decided that it would breach what I thought was an absolute undertaking it gave that the ABRD program (the Australian Bicentennial Road Development program), which was based on two cents a litre special tax on fuel, was to be put straight back into the road system. The Hawke Government decided to index that two cents a litre based on CPI and to put the indexed amount into general revenue—in other words, to the Government's own gain and the disadvantage of the motorist.

Another fundamental promise and program has been dismantled and breached. The Hawke Government has, further, failed to provide any funds to maintain or upgrade the Adelaide to Victor Harbor railway line so that this State can set up a tourist train service on that line. We all know of the reply that came back from the federal Minister six months ago rejecting that request from the State Government. I suspect that the reason why the Premier has, for about four months, been sitting on the report about setting up a historic steam train service from Adelaide to Victor Harbor is that he is unable to get \$1 out of the federal Government to maintain or upgrade the line before handing it over to a group like Steamranger.

One finds that under the Hawke Labor Government in Canberra there is a series of proposed closures of country railway passenger services in South Australia. The Adelaide to Victor Harbor railway service is shut under the Hawke Government. There is the proposed closure of all country passenger railway services with the exception of the Mount Gambier service. Although there has been some talk that that service may be reduced, I understand that that has been rethought and the service might be improved.

The services to Peterborough and Port Pirie are proposed to be scrapped, and the State will have to fight that in arbitration. I have already indicated that we are wasting our time on arbitration. If those closures are to be successfully fought the one and only thing to do is to hurry up and negotiate a political settlement with Canberra on a Minister to Minister basis so that South Australia can get something out of it. I guarantee that, under the Bannon Government, South Australia will lose.

In addition, one finds that some of the road funds have been redirected into other forms of transport, such as rail construction programs. As I said, the latest news is that there is no money in the present budget for the standardisation of the Adelaide to Melbourne railway line. That highlights the extent to which this State has missed out. We now need a Government that is prepared to take some hard action for South Australia, to stand up and fight in Canberra, to ensure that we get some of these bare essentials in terms of trying to operate a growing economy.

The next matter I wish to take up briefly is the train collision that occurred last Monday. This matter is currently under investigation by the State Transport Authority. I look forward to receiving that report and I presume that the Minister will be able to present it to the Parliament either tomorrow or early next week. We can thankfully say that no-one was killed in that collision, which could have been a very serious one. A number of people with a certain amount of information on the rail system have asked me to raise a number of questions.

I tell the Minister that I ask a series of questions with notice in relation to the collision on Monday 19 August. The questions are:

1. What type of signalling indications are on the track?
2. How does the type of signalling protect train movements?
3. Was the signalling system functioning at the time of the collision?
4. Are there standard instructions to crews of a disabled train?
5. Are operational instructions adequate in all circumstances?
6. Did the drivers of the trains involved observe all signals?
7. Were there any detonators and flares on board the first train?
8. What efforts were made by the crew of the first train to warn the train behind that a breakdown had occurred?

In preparing the report and presenting the full investigation to Parliament I ask that the Minister look at those specific questions.

I also ask that the Minister look at this further matter. We all know that the Noarlunga line has become the busiest line in the Adelaide system in terms of the carriage of passengers, and that now the 2 000 series trains, including the express trains, operate from the Adelaide station to Noarlunga. I understand that south of Marino—and I am not referring to the section of line between the Adelaide station and Marino—the actual signals that indicate to a train driver that the first train has gone right through are a large distance apart and were designed to handle goods trains on a very infrequent basis, rather than high speed express passenger trains.

I understand that it is not uncommon for express train drivers to largely ignore signals south of Marino. I have been given information that because those signals are a large distance apart the train drivers tend to go through them on either the caution or the red light, knowing that the other train is probably well in advance. I understand that some drivers do this on a regular basis. I ask that the

Minister investigate whether or not it is a common practice for train drivers to go through either stop signals or caution signals on the section of rail south of Marino, whether the signals are so far apart that they are not designed to handle express trains and, therefore, the drivers on a regular basis do not bother to wait for the signals to change knowing that there was a scheduled smaller distance between the trains than the signals would pick up.

In fact, I am told by a passenger that it is not uncommon at the Hallett Cove Beach station to see one 2 000 series train pulling out as the next train is pulling in and that those two trains are on the one signalled section of the track and therefore clearly breach the signalling by being in that position. I do not wish to lay any accusations in relation to those matters at present—it is not for me to say. I simply highlight those claims to the House and ask that the Minister follow them up.

The next matter I take up is a local matter and I notice that it has concerned you, Mr Acting Speaker, as member for Henley Beach, although I point out that it is as a result of a very cruel decision made by the federal Labor Government which has not yet been rectified through pressure from the State Labor Government. The federal Government decided to cut all funds for preschool education. This will have a severe effect on a number of the kindergartens in my electorate, and I will talk about one of them. The Jessie Brown Kindergarten at Belair, even before the latest cuts by the federal Government—which was \$3.7 million a year—needed the parents of the children to raise \$200 per child per year to meet the operating costs of the kindergarten. That is a far greater contribution than parents of primary and secondary school children have to make. It makes a mockery of the claims that we have a so-called free education system. The most recent cuts will impose an additional \$200 a year per student on the kindergarten unless the State Government is willing to provide extra funds to cover these Federal cuts.

Unless the federal and State Governments are prepared to make up for the cuts in expenditure, the parents of the children at the Jessie Brown Kindergarten will have to pay about \$400 a year per child for their children to attend the kindergarten on a half day basis. I find that absolutely incredible. It is certainly against the objectives of a good and improved education system, and it will impose an unfair burden on the parents involved. If those cuts and burdens continue to be imposed on the preschool system, the system will collapse and our education system will take a very large step backwards.

I have already written to the State Minister of Education and the federal Minister for Community Services about the cuts in funding. I have requested the State Government to pick up the shortfall. I have received a reply from Neal Blewett, Acting Minister for Community Services. He is a South Australian Labor Minister. I am disappointed that the reply is not even worth reading to the House. He fully acknowledges that the federal Government has abrogated its responsibility in this area and says that it is up to the State Government to pick up the tab. That is incredible, as I thought that the federal Government had some interest in the whole education system, from preschool and primary school to secondary school, and then tertiary education. However, it appears that the federal Government has decided to completely abrogate its responsibility in the preschool area. As a result, an unfair burden will be placed on the States in having to pick up that load.

The Liberal Party has made a commitment in this area and has promised that a Liberal Government would allocate \$3.7 million to cover the federal cuts. The Liberal Party believes that preschool education is too precious to suffer such a setback. I also point out to the House that the Jessie

Brown Kindergarten at Belair had to pay \$700 in 1983-84 towards the cost of a bushfire sprinkler system. The kindergarten is in a very high bushfire risk area: it is above a number of the worst gullies possible, and therefore must face one of the highest fire risks of any kindergarten in this State. The parents of the children attending the kindergarten had to pick up \$700 of the bill to provide the fire protection for the children.

That was bad enough, but earlier this year the kindergarten had to pay \$740 to the Engineering and Water Supply Department to have the kindergarten connected to the sewerage system. To date the State Government has refused to pick up the kindergarten's request for the Government to pay that connection fee. So, with what I would describe as very basic services for our preschool children, we find that the State Government is not prepared to fund, first, the \$700 bushfire protection measures and, secondly, \$740 to connect the kindergarten to a deep drainage system to replace the existing sewerage system.

There are other kindergartens in my electorate which are facing similar financial problems and which will face considerable hardship unless the decision to cut federal funds is reversed (which did not occur in the federal budget) or the State Government is prepared to pick up fully the total amount of funding involved, that is, \$3.7 million. The consequences for kindergartens such as the Jessie Brown Kindergarten if those cuts continue will be that they will have to cut the number of staff and will have to pick up their entire operating costs. The kindergarten has already picked up 80 per cent of the operating costs (excluding the costs of salaries of the staff). If these cuts by the federal Government occur they will have to pick up 100 per cent of operating costs. I still believe that we should provide a basically free preschool education system for all children at the age of 3½ years and over. However, apparently, the Government does not agree with that.

Mr Becker: Hudson mucked it up.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Hudson may have mucked it up: the present Government has made it worse, while the federal Government has made it considerably worse. I gather that it has no basic commitment to preschool education in this State or anywhere in Australia.

In his Address in Reply speech last night the member for Fisher may have created the wrong impression when referring to the subdivision of the Craighburn land north of the Sturt River. The member for Fisher referred to a statement made by what he described as 'another member of the House'. He did not specifically give a name, but I am obviously that member because I have made a number of statements in relation to the Craighburn land.

I have advocated that that land north of the Sturt River should be retained as open space, available for community use. It is a State Government responsibility to ensure that such open space is obtained but without in any way disadvantaging Minda Incorporated, which carries out such an excellent service for disabled children and others in the community. I certainly support the point made by the member for Fisher in his speech concerning the excellent work of Minda Incorporated. No-one who has seen its work and the results of that work could criticise it in any way. In fact, I am a trustee for one of the people at Minda Incorporated and so I fully understand the excellent community service that is provided.

In recommending that the Government should purchase the land that is not required by Minda Incorporated for its own farm and its own purposes, I advocate that the Government should purchase the land over a number of years. I have not said, as suggested by the member for Fisher, that the purchase of that land should be on the basis of fixing the price of the land at the beginning and then paying that

fixed price over a 10 or 15 year period. There is no credibility in that at all and it would impose an unfair financial burden on Minda Incorporated.

In relation to purchasing the land over a number of years, each parcel of land would be purchased for the full market price applicable. Rather than impose the burden of purchasing the land on one or two State budgets, that burden could be imposed over a number of years. From discussions I have had with the board of Minda Incorporated I understand that such an arrangement would fully satisfy the board. In other words, Minda Incorporated does not insist on handing over all the land at once and obtaining immediate compensation. It is willing to hand over the land in segments, provided that the State Government is prepared to pay for those parcels of land the appropriate market value. The member for Fisher may have had the wrong impression about my views on this matter.

I now want to take up the issue of the Old Belair Road, which one would have to say is the worst road in the metropolitan area, particularly when one considers the large volume of traffic which uses it—over 5 500 vehicles a day. It is nothing more than a public disgrace, having been that way for at least 15 or 20 years. I can recall as a small lad waiting for the big day when the Government would resurface the Old Belair Road. That was back in the 1950s, but nothing was done. Through the 1960s nothing was done, and through the 1970s still nothing was done. During the term of the previous Liberal Government, as local member for the district involved and a Minister in that Government I conferred with the then Minister of Transport and pointed out that something must be done immediately about the Old Belair Road. I appreciate that the member for Torrens (then the Minister of Transport) immediately proposed a three year program, involving, first, the installation of a roundabout at the bottom of the Old Belair Road where it meets Blythewood Road; in the second year, the upgrading of Blythewood Road; and in the third year the resurfacing of the Old Belair Road, including widening of that road at the appropriate spots where there are dangerous rocks poking out.

That program was due to have been completed just before Christmas in the 1984-85 financial year. The then Minister of Transport gave me that undertaking during the Estimates Committees last year. However, at the same time the Gas Company suddenly decided that it wished to lay a 6 inch gas main through the middle of the road. I suppose all members would say, 'What is new?' It appears that the Highways Department and other Government authorities still are not liaising in order to ensure that work is carried out well before any major resurfacing or restructuring of a road takes place.

However, I have since received two assurances: one I think from this Minister and one from the former Minister (the last one may have been given since this Minister has been appointed) that that work will be completed by Christmas of this year, so I look forward to the resurfacing of the road.

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I understand that nothing has been done in relation to electricity conduits at the bottom end.

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: At present I understand that the weight restrictions will be maintained. It is my belief that that should be the case and I think it would be unfortunate if trucks and buses were allowed to travel up the Old Belair Road. As the shadow Minister of Transport (and I presume not long from now the Minister of Transport), I would fight that and would insist that trucks and buses not be allowed up that road.

As the Minister is present, I bring to his attention the need to upgrade both intersections at the top of Old Belair Road and James Road. I recently wrote to the Minister requesting that he look at these matters. At the present time the intersection of James Road, Sheoak Road and Upper Sturt Road is extremely dangerous. The Minister has undertaken to install a school crossing very close to that intersection and I ask him, as a matter of urgency and as part of the overall program for the resurfacing of Old Belair Road, to also upgrade that intersection.

The other intersection which needs upgrading is the intersection at the top of Old Belair Road and Sheoak Road, which is the main intersection that carries a very large volume of traffic. It is dangerous and extremely difficult for people living immediately below on Old Belair Road to get into and out of their properties. I ask the Minister to look at what sort of action can be taken to improve the safety of that intersection.

Mr S.G. Evans: They are resealing—

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Yes, I noticed last week that a short strip of bitumen has been laid on that road. The final point I wish to raise is again relating to some bureaucratic action taken by the State Department of Transport. For 2½ years I have been fighting a campaign against the bureaucrats in that department for the way they have administered overweight, over-height and over-length restrictions that they impose on the road system and the difficulties created for people who wish to obtain permits to take over-dimension loads on to the road. That department has a group of bureaucrats who seem to act almost regardless of any instructions they receive from the Minister of Transport, irrespective of who the Minister of Transport is, and almost regardless of the economic impact of their decisions upon the people who have to carry the goods within our State. Again, I suppose it highlights that the Government believes in the Public Service to the nth degree and believes that the Public Service should have almighty power, regardless of how well that power is used.

In relation to the issuing of permits on a period basis, I went to the former Minister of Transport's office down below in company with the Commissioner of Highways. I received an assurance that there would be no change as to the basis on which permits were issued for over-dimension loads. For instance, the earthmoving contractors, the boring contractors and other groups like that would be allowed to obtain a 12 month permit to take overweight or over-dimension loads wherever they liked, provided that they met the necessary safeguards and conditions laid down by the Highways Department.

I am told that some of those annual permits are now being revoked and are being replaced with permits either on a one-off basis, or on a fortnightly basis. To obtain a permit, drivers apparently have to guarantee the specific routes they will take. How can an earthmover contractor do that? He needs to be able to guarantee what plant he will be moving and during what period. That, of course, is impossible to predict even a week in advance, let alone a fortnight, or in some cases a month in advance.

The Minister gave me an assurance that those permits on an annual basis or for a period basis would continue. I heard the Minister and the Commissioner of Highways say that, but I now find that that is no longer the case. Apparently, under the new Minister, the bureaucrats are again riding over him roughshod and they have reversed that earlier decision.

Approximately a week ago a case was brought to my attention of someone who was trying to bring through South Australia an appropriate road train. It was an off-the-shelf road train, if you like, or the standard truck that one purchases. The truck was capable of carrying about 110 tonnes.

He was applying for a permit to allow a road train of up to 76 tonnes to operate in South Australia.

Mr Peterson interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: He would only be able to operate that road train up to Port Augusta and then he would have to split the load. The Highways Department or the Road Traffic Board bureaucrats have refused him a permit because the front axle weight of that truck would be over that which is required, but well below the legal limit of this State. They are saying that, when you have a road train, the axle weight on the front axle must be significantly less than that which would be required otherwise. They are also saying to him that he has to meet that condition when his petrol tanks are full. In his case the vehicle takes about .3 to .4 tonnes of fuel. How can he give such an assurance when his vehicle could be all over the place in relation to the amount of fuel being carried? It would be absolutely impossible with a large Kenworth truck, which has a Cummins diesel, for him to comply with the requirements now being imposed by the South Australian Road Traffic Board through its various inspectors.

This is just one of literally dozens and dozens of cases I have taken to that department. I am fed up with it. It appears that successive Labor Ministers are totally impotent when it comes to trying to get anything through the heads of those bureaucrats, or to get the system changed.

Mr Peterson interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Too right, as Minister of Transport, I can assure the member for Semaphore that, if he gives me a fortnight, we will fix it once and for all. If anyone digresses from the new conditions laid down by the Liberal Government, we will also fix them once and for all, because we cannot put up with the sort of bureaucracy that has occurred time after time for the past 2½ years, costing companies in this State thousands and thousands of dollars.

I understand that all members of this House recently received a letter from Sherwell, a company that manufactures field bins for farmers. I understand that that letter was sent to the Minister as well as other members. I also understand that neither the Minister nor his officers of the Highways Department or Road Traffic Board have yet replied to the man involved, but I understand that under the conditions now imposed upon that company the owner will not be able to take loads more than four metres wide up the Mount Barker freeway. For instance, if he wishes to take a field bin to Hahndorf, he will have to take it out through Nuriootpa, Birdwood, and in that direction, on roads which are narrower, not as safe, and on a route which is probably four times the distance of the Mount Barker freeway route.

What is wrong with taking a wide load of more than four metres up the Mount Barker freeway, provided that you do it at the appropriate time (which might be a Sunday morning) with the appropriate escort vehicles and other warnings, including a police vehicle?

It has been done in the past and, to my knowledge, there has been no accident, yet suddenly these bureaucrats have imposed these new conditions. This man has been operating on this basis for 12 years without an accident. He has despatched over 900 units in the last 12 months, about 400 of those having been delivered by his own drivers or towed home by farmers to such places as Murray Bridge, Pinnaroo, Bordertown (via the South-Eastern Freeway), Orreroo, Kadina, Gawler, Yorketown, and anywhere else where grain is grown in the State. The remaining 500 bins were delivered by low loader contractors who also operate with an excellent safety record.

So, 900 units have been delivered in the past 12 months without a single accident to my knowledge, yet these bureaucrats have suddenly come in with a new set of conditions,

including one stating that the South-Eastern Freeway cannot be used, even though, as a dual highway, it is the most suitable road in the State for such traffic. Despite that, this man has been barred completely from using the South-Eastern Freeway. The cost of delivering a field bin has almost doubled, from \$1.20 a kilometre to \$2.30 a kilometre. That increase has been occasioned without justification and with no accident record that would suggest that there should be a change, but simply because the bureaucrats are running wild in the office of the new Minister of Transport. Accordingly, I challenge him to do something about it. Yet, even though I am criticising his department and referring to problems in it, he has not the decency to stop and listen to my arguments: he seems to be engrossed in a trivial conversation on another matter with the member for Hartley.

I have further criticisms on how this board has operated. I have been told by people who were recently in this House that in New South Wales, if one wishes to transport a wide load, one picks up the telephone, asks for the head office, asks for a permit, and one is given a permit number and the load may be transported, the permit being posted out later. Not so in South Australia. If a driver is bringing a wide load from Victoria into South Australia, he must stop his vehicle at Bordertown, on the Victoria/South Australia border, hire a car, drive to Adelaide and apply meekly, on his knees, to these bureaucrats for a permit. Then, having secured the permit, he must drive back to the border with it and he can proceed once he has the permit in his hand. That is incredible. This Government talks about breaking down the red tape, whereas it is not only retaining but increasing the red tape in the transport industry.

I have received yet another complaint in the past month. It has become common practice for architects designing large buildings and even houses to specify, in cases where galvanised iron, colorbond or other flat roofing is required, the measurements of the iron to fit the roof, and an excellent firm such as Lysaghts will cut the material to the exact length specified. This is the sort of thing that has applied on the remand centre and on the renovated casino building. However, I understand that, whereas it has been standard practice for these long loads to be moved on Sunday mornings with appropriate police escorts, this group of bureaucrats has suddenly decided to stop that practice and has refused to issue a permit. At least, that was so until I got in touch with the Minister's office and said that, unless they did something within a day or so, I would drop the bucket. I have had to do a crude 'Gunny' on this. I threatened that, unless action was taken to reverse these petty bureaucratic decisions, I would expose them in the House. In that case we got somewhere, but I understand that there are still problems in that area and the bureaucrats are laying down conditions and trying to stop these long loads from being transported even, for instance, on Sunday morning when there is little other traffic on the road.

Because of the restrictions imposed, the length of a sheet of iron must be broken and this involves additional expense, maintenance problems and the likelihood of a leaky roof. I could go on for half an hour with such complaints against the bureaucrats of this department, and I am glad that the Minister is now taking notice because it is on his head to ensure that something is done quickly. In his first month as Minister, he has been steamrolled by this group as if he did not exist, and I challenge him to start influencing these people. If the Government believes in deregulation, reducing bureaucracy, and smaller government, it is time that Ministers showed it.

Mr Peterson: How about road transport for the submarines?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I hope that the submarine is built in South Australia, indeed in the honourable member's district, but anyone wishing to build a submarine here must realise that the builder must contend with the worst group of bureaucrats anywhere in Australia. Indeed, I hope that the contractor takes that into account and loads the costing accordingly to cope with this group of people. Three specific individuals seem to be involved every time, but I will not name them. Every time a complaint is lodged, it seems to boil down to those three people. I challenge the Minister to take up these issues and get something done as a matter of urgency. The Earthmoving Contractors Association has written to the Minister. I hope that the member for Semaphore is not trying to distract the attention of the Minister of Transport because the Minister should be listening to this.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Appleby): Order! I suggest that the honourable member address the Chair.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I certainly will, Madam Speaker. I will address you as I always do, but I wanted to ensure that the Minister of Transport heard these criticisms that relate to his department.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Will the member for Todd and the member for Unley please refrain from speaking across the Chamber?

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I think it is inappropriate for the member for Unley to challenge another member across the House to come outside and say something.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I do not think it is the place of the honourable member for Davenport to be concerned with that: he should be addressing the Chair.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I say it because I am concerned about the standards of the House and I think it is inappropriate for any member to threaten another member to come outside and say something. It is inappropriate for the member for Unley to do so. The Earthmoving Contractors, having written to the Minister, received the following letter in reply:

I refer to your letter of 8 July 1985, addressed to Mr M. Knight, Chairman of the Road Traffic Board, a copy of which you forwarded to me concerning the issue of permits for overweight and overwidth loads. I have been informed by the Chairman of the board that your letter of 8 July 1985, is, in the board's view, misleading in respect of the matters discussed at the meeting between representatives of your association and officers of the Highways Department Permit Section on 19 June 1985. I understand that the Highways Department's Technical Services Officer has subsequently discussed the matter with Mr J. Chamberlain, Chairman of your association, and has written to him on 23 July 1985, in response to your letter.

I shall not go into details. The Minister has suggested that the matter has been resolved, but it has not been resolved. The earthmoving contractors are far from happy with the way in which these regulations are being administered, and they would add to my comment this afternoon in asking the Government immediately to reform that whole area. I ask the Minister to ensure that the bureaucrats out there do not unfairly impose any further restrictions on people until that review has been completed. I conclude my remarks there and thank the House for the opportunity to participate in this Address in Reply debate.

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I support the motion before the House for the adoption of the Address in Reply and, in so doing, briefly pay a tribute to His Excellency the Governor and Lady Dunstan for the way in which they discharge the duties of their office. In my 10 years of office in local government in this State it was my pleasure to come into contact with a number of people who have occupied the office of Governor. Whilst it would be invidious of me

to make any comparisons, His Excellency is worthy of praise for the way in which he undertakes his work.

I also pay my respects to the memory of the late Mr Jack Clark, one of my predecessors in this place. He occupied the first position of member for Elizabeth in this House, although occupying the seat of Barossa before that. Mr Clark's activities and work for the electorate of Elizabeth I am sure will be well remembered by its residents and he will be respected by this House for the work he undertook whilst here.

I turn my attention, first, to the question of youth unemployment. It is a very serious matter which I am sure concerns all members of this House and, certainly, it concerns me, as the representative of an electorate with a high percentage of people in that category. For example, statistics to 30 June 1985 show that, in the 15 to 19 year old age group, there were 1 163 people out of work in the Elizabeth and Munno Para areas and for the 20 to 24 year old age group there were 1 039. Between them they represent well over 50 per cent of all people registered to receive unemployment benefits in the Elizabeth and Munno Para council areas. That is certainly a frightening statistic, and I am sure it will be of concern to the Government. Any step it is possible for the Government to take to assist people in that position should be taken.

The youth training scheme proposals announced in last night's federal budget will make a significant contribution towards helping to ameliorate that problem. One wonders whether, in the initial phases at least, the TAFE training colleges will be able to cope with the additional demands placed on them. Certainly the States will have a significant contribution and commitment to make in this area. The federal Government has sought the cooperation of State Governments in this regard.

The TAFE colleges are in danger of being overloaded by the expanding provisions of the federal training scheme, and I am sure that the State Minister of Education will be giving that matter serious consideration in the immediate future to ensure that the State colleges are able to cope with the influx of additional trainees that will come from the scheme. I sincerely hope that the federal and State Governments will be able to come together in this approach because, by working together, it is the only hope that young people have of gaining increased employment opportunities. Although growth in the economy is the only way to provide adequate long-term job opportunities, no doubt exists that measures such as those announced by the federal Government last night are a significant contribution towards assisting young people in the short term. They need additional training and need additional resources to be placed at their disposal.

In this context it was also very pleasing to see in the budget last night a substantially increased allocation for the CYSS program. CYSS has been operating for many years now and, although it has occasionally come under criticism as simply being a bandaid scheme, it has a significant role to play. It was under threat at one stage in recent years, but received a reprieve from the federal Government and was last night granted a substantial increase in funds. I hope that that is perhaps a forerunner of things to come in the State budget for the CITY program, because there can be no doubt that the two programs deserve a substantial degree of Government support. Young people benefit from both CYSS and CITY and I hope that the State Treasurer, in bringing down his budget in a few days time, will give that matter serious consideration and allocate further resources to the CITY project.

One reason for my mentioning this matter to the House now is that I have just been working to achieve a higher exposure of the CITY project team in Elizabeth. Only yes-

terday I received a reply from the Minister of Labour in which he states:

As you are aware, the CITY program already has an office at Salisbury which serves the communities of Salisbury, Elizabeth, Munno Para and Gawler.

One office located in Salisbury to serve the regions of Salisbury, Elizabeth, Munno Para and Gawler is simply not enough. The Minister has failed to realise the number of unemployed young people in that area and the needs which those people have. To say that the CITY office in Salisbury, no matter how dedicated and resourceful the staff may be, can serve the needs of that whole region in light of the figures for Elizabeth and Munno Para alone, is absurd. While the Minister will be fighting for additional funds in the budget, I hope that they are available because, if they are not, we will be unable to provide the services that young people in that region, and in Elizabeth in particular, need so desperately.

It has recently been my pleasure to help the local CYSS project to sponsor a request to both the federal and State Governments and the local council for a combined CYSS, CITY, Elizabeth council and Department of Health project in the Elizabeth Centre location. As members will be aware, when considering the choice of real estate only three factors need consideration: location, location and location. Unfortunately, both CITY and CYSS in the northern region have suffered very badly from their location in the past. The CITY office is situated somewhat out of the way in the city of Salisbury and the Elizabeth CYSS project is located in a very obscure place in Elizabeth Vale—a place which most young people in the area find difficult to get to.

The management committee of CYSS is particularly dedicated and would very much like to expand its activities to address the needs of a greater percentage of their target audience—a substantial number of people being in that target audience—and would like to transfer their operations to a more prominent location immediately adjacent to the Elizabeth City Centre.

The only way they can afford the rent for that property (the more accessible the location the higher the rent) is by making it a combined activity with, for example, the CITY project for the State Government, a youth health worker from the Department of Health (I understand that the Minister of Health is sympathetic to that project), and perhaps a youth centre sponsored by the Elizabeth City Council. If all four authorities were to come together in the project there would be some chance of success. If, as the Minister of Labour has indicated in his reply, he does not propose to allow CITY to participate in that project, it will be a very negative factor in the long-term viability of a combined operation and may even prevent it getting off the ground. If that is the case, it will be a matter for great regret and the young people of the area will be severely disadvantaged as a result. I shall continue my efforts in conjunction with the CYSS management committee, the Elizabeth City Council and the local regional office of the Department of Health in an attempt to establish a combined centre adjacent to the Elizabeth City Centre, as that is the only way we can address the needs of those people.

Another matter to come out of the federal budget last night was a shift towards equality in unemployment benefits and education allowances for young people. That is a particularly important step. Until now it has been profitable, in a limited financial sense, for unemployed young people to go on the dole rather than return to full time education. The unemployment benefit has been in excess of that provided for those who remain at secondary school or embark on tertiary education. That is a very negative reward system. One should reward those who return to active full-time education as they are contributing to the skills base in the

community and, therefore, their activity should be rewarded and not discouraged by the federal Government's programs.

It is very pleasing to see that over some few years the federal Government is going to shift the basis of its financial assistance to young people to ensure that there is not a financial disadvantage to them to stay in full-time training. We should not reward those who choose unemployment over training. However, that does not mean to say that in adopting a training policy we should support simple cuts in youth wages, as has been suggested by some in the community.

Although that would certainly contribute to the demand for youth employment, it may well do so at the expense of those already in a job. We might well find, as I read in some papers produced by the Parliamentary Library recently, an expanding environment in which adults are displaced by young people simply because their wages are artificially reduced, in order to increase youth employment. That would be an unfortunate trend.

The federal Government has adopted the correct strategy in subsidising employers to take on young people and encouraging State Governments to do as this Government has already done, in fact, some few days ago in the tax cuts and lowering payroll tax and workers compensation for young people. Although the Government lowered workers compensation premiums by eliminating stamp duty on those under 25, it is an important step in the right direction. I congratulate the Government on that initiative taken in advance of the federal Government's request.

So, I would certainly like to encourage the Government to make additional funds available for young people in the State budget. I encourage the Minister of Health to participate in that project, because it is the only way to help young people. In the area I represent (and the member for Napier represents) 50 per cent of the people who are unemployed are under 25, which is a very serious statistic and one which we must address.

I now turn to another matter: I would like to make perhaps what is a somewhat radical suggestion, because I believe that the time has come for the Government to look at some radical restructuring in the way in which some of its operations are conducted. I am very pleased that the Minister of Transport is here, because I want to comment about the State Transport Authority.

The Government has recently embarked on a major review of Public Service administration and I understand that legislation will be laid before the Parliament in the near future covering a substantial review of public sector management. Part of the changes that the Government proposes will be to give more delegated authority to departments and to allow departments to manage their own affairs.

One aspect of the current administration of the State that concerns me is the proliferation of certain instrumentalities—not so much of statutory authorities and statutory authority management boards, but I single out three for special attention, not because I believe in any way that they are particularly negligent or that their boards are any less competent than any other, but simply because honourable members and the public will be more familiar with them and they are an easy example to take. I refer to the State Transport Authority board; the ETSA board; and the Housing Trust board.

In each case we have a statutory board comprising a significant number of people who are supposedly managing the affairs of the State Transport Authority, the Electricity Trust and the Housing Trust respectively, while in this House we have a Minister of Transport, a Minister of Housing and Construction, and a Minister of Mines and Energy, all of whom are responsible to this House and to

the people of South Australia for the management of the affairs of those departments.

Although I have considerable respect for some of the individuals who sit on those boards, I point out that in the 1985 context their services may no longer be required and that direct ministerial responsibility may be a more appropriate management path to adopt in the 1980s. Those authorities already have very competent and extremely highly paid chief executives at their head. The State Transport Authority, the Housing Trust and ETSA are all competently and expertly managed by highly qualified and highly paid professionals who sit at the head of those organisations and who, fortnightly, monthly or six weekly report to their respective boards. What real functions do those boards serve?

I suggest that when a 'political' decision is required—and I use 'political' not to mean Party political but simply government and public administration political—the Minister in charge of that area takes that decision with the advice and consent of Cabinet. It is not STA that decides what fares will be put up in the State; it is the Minister of Transport. It is not the Housing Trust board that determines Housing Trust rents in this State; it is the Minister of Housing and Construction and Cabinet. It is not the board of ETSA that determines electricity tariffs in this State: as we saw only a few days ago, it is the Premier, the Minister of Mines and Energy and Cabinet who determine what ETSA tariffs will be and what level they will be fixed at.

While those directions continue to be given, the value and meaning of those boards becomes less and less significant. In many cases the Minister has the need for expert advice. I draw attention, for example (selected at random), to the South Australian Energy Advisory Council which advises the Minister of Mines and Energy on energy usage and energy development in this State—a very competent and expert body made up of non-political people who are able to give the Minister unbiased and expert advice on how he should manage the future energy resources of this State—a worthwhile body.

I doubt that the ETSA board performs such a valuable task, although it could be said that it insulates the Minister from the day-to-day minutia of managing an organisation like ETSA, the Housing Trust or the STA. That is not true, because the chief executive officer of those organisations handles it. Certainly, under the State Government's new proposals for Public Service administrators, the chief executive officers would gain even more power and would be far better able to discharge those functions.

I suggest that when the Government is considering a review of public sector administration, it should also review very seriously the roles of the statutory authority boards that have been established over many years under Governments of both political colours but whose relevance to management in the 1980s is rapidly diminishing.

I now turn my attention to matters associated with land development. In this context, I congratulate the Attorney-General on the papers that he has recently provided to honourable members concerning the report of the task force which undertook the reform of home building contracts. A substantial review of the law is proposed in this area, and not before time. Although details of these proposals will bear much greater scrutiny, I am sure that when the relevant legislation is put before this House honourable members will have much to say about its detail.

I commend the Attorney-General on the broad aspects of the proposal: it is not before time. Home building contracts in the private sector—it is not the case with all builders but certainly many—are excessively legalistic and most people are quite unable to comprehend fully the implications of some of the complex clauses they are called upon to sign,

often with very little notice and certainly, in most cases, without the opportunity for independent advice.

The proposed cooling off period would be a valuable measure as would be the proposal for a standardised contract written in less than legalistic language. I certainly commend the Attorney for his initiatives in that area. However, further attention must be given to the area of the sale of land packages before the issue of lands titles certificates. I have had brought to my attention in my own constituency a number of cases in which people have signed contracts to buy land, unaware that titles had yet to be issued by the Lands Titles Office, only to discover that it would be many months before the Lands Titles Office was able to issue the respective titles. Builders and developers were well aware of that, yet they still allowed people to enter into those contracts.

Subsequently, considerable hardship was caused to the people concerned, yet they had very little redress because the contract was binding. Although the law covers, to some degree, contracts entered into before the issue of titles, it does not go far enough. I hope that the Attorney will give the matter further attention when bringing proposals before the House to review the law in this area.

I would also like to draw to the House's attention problems that I have experienced in the area of ETSA and water supply to land in this State. It is certainly the case that in a few remaining areas of my electorate neither electricity nor water supply is available. As honourable members will be aware, in the Virginia Basin area it is quite difficult, if not impossible, to obtain a water supply from the E&WS Department because of the limitations imposed on the water supply in that area.

That might well be a perfectly proper policy on behalf of the E&WS Department. I am sure that it is: they are protecting water resources in this State. However, purchasers in good faith often buy blocks of land with the intention of building, unaware that the E&WS Department will ultimately refuse them a direct water supply.

I believe that the form 4s, which must be given to people on the purchase of land, should be extended to include those cases where the mains water and mains electricity are not already supplied—and the number of blocks affected would be relatively small—by the responsible authorities, in the same way that certificates are obtained from councils about road widening and other relevant matters. Therefore, the statutory provision should be expanded in this area to ensure that consumers are fully protected.

I also bring to the attention of the House a case of what I believe is the wrongful resort to the corporate veil by a prominent airconditioning company in this State. In late 1984 a constituent of mine engaged the wellknown company of Brian Lane Airconditioning (or Brian Lane Engineering Pty Ltd as it then was) to install a full home airconditioning system at a cost of some \$5 000—a very substantial amount of money to the average family. The system was duly installed and operated quite satisfactorily, except for one room. My constituent made representations to the company and eventually received a letter dated 19 February 1985 in which the General Sales Manager of Brian Lane Airconditioning said:

We will be taking steps to adjust the airflow to the family room in the near future. In the meantime your understanding and appreciation of the above facts is recommended.

The letter then details some of the difficulties they had with that particular room. However, before the company could undertake those improvements it went into liquidation. That is not an unusual circumstance—companies go into liquidation all the time.

The proprietor of that company reopened new premises a few doors from his old premises within a matter of weeks,

but under the title of Brian Lane International Pty Ltd—a new company. The corporate veil having been firmly closed on the old company, a new one was established trading under a virtually identical name, yet the new company denies all liability and responsibility for the work undertaken by the old one.

Under the corporate laws of this State and, in fact, of the English system, that is perfectly true in law. The corporate veil is such as to place a very tight ring around the company's operations and, when that company goes into liquidation, its successors cannot be held liable for its work. It is a matter of considerable concern that the corporate veil can be hidden behind in this way to avoid warranty and repair undertakings which were clearly admitted by the company concerned. I feel very sorry for all those people who had airconditioning installed by that company and who now find that their warranty is void and that the same people are operating the same business a few doors away and yet deny all liability for the work they undertook a matter of months before.

This matter is of great concern and I ask that since it involves building work the Minister of Consumer Affairs should take it on board in the context of either extending complete home airconditioning systems to becoming work under the Builders Licensing Act and, therefore, requiring some supervision of these people. After all, the installation of a \$5 000 airconditioning system greatly exceeds in value some lower value maintenance work for which one would be required to be licensed under the Builders Licensing Act, and I believe that this could quite appropriately fit in that category—or, alternatively, a system of negative licensing could be introduced for home airconditioning installations because the purchases involved are quite significant and are equally as significant in value as used motor cars and greatly exceed the value of much building work undertaken in this State. I draw that matter to the attention of the Attorney-General.

I also draw to the attention of the Attorney-General, in his capacity as Minister of Consumer Affairs, some of the problems occurring with oil companies in this State. I support my colleague, the member for Semaphore, in his remarks yesterday about the need to control the price of gas if we are to have any long-term impact on the price of energy in this State. We still have the problem of the oil company retailers. Some years ago, in the early 1980s, there was the so-called modified Fife package, which was meant to fix up all the problems in the oil industry.

Unfortunately, it has not done so. We still have two complex matters to resolve: that of the retail price of fuel—and I understand the Premier and the Minister of Consumer Affairs are still continuing negotiations with the petrol resellers over that—and equally as important the problem of commissioned agents. I draw to the attention of the Minister the fact that BP in Sydney has recently moved to lift its profile in the retail sector by terminating agreements with 15 of its commissioned agents in the Sydney area—Australia's highest volume petrol marketing area. In the *Financial Review* of Thursday, 1 August, a spokesman for the company confirmed that BP had activated the night and day termination of clauses applying to 15 commissioned agents in sites in Sydney and described it as a marketing experiment. He said that the company intended to lift its exposure in the market and to sell petrol directly to consumers. Of course, BP terminated the agreements with their commissioned agents, many of whom had worked for 20 years or more to build up substantial small businesses employing a number of people.

I am sure that it is the intention of those companies to convert those sites into what might be described as 'gas and go' sites, where no-one is employed and consumers simply

insert a credit card into the oil bowser, obtain their fuel and depart. Hence, the name 'gas and go'. That is a significant threat to employment in this State and I doubt that it would have a favourable impact on prices, because the oil companies would simply pocket the additional profit rather than passing on that benefit to consumers. Therefore, we have those two important areas to address in the matter of oil retailing, and I am sure that the Government will need to give both of them close attention. I even go so far as to say that it would not be unreasonable to debar oil companies from directly marketing fuel to consumers. I believe that that is a job which could well be undertaken by the lessees and freeholders of the market that are presently there, and that to allow the oil companies to expand their operations in the way in which they have done in Sydney—and I believe they may extend interstate shortly, including Adelaide—would be a considerable threat to the employment base and small business base of the State.

I think that if that move is taken the Government should consider legislation to debar oil companies from the direct marketing of fuel and to require it to be marketed through an intermediary who would at least give the consumers fair and honest treatment and encourage employment in the State.

I congratulate the new Ombudsman, Ms Mary Beasley, on her appointment. Of course, we have recently had the opportunity to peruse the annual report of both the new and the old Ombudsman (Bob Bakewell), who has since departed the scene. I found it unfortunate that the Ombudsman chose to dwell at some length on the decision of this Parliament to appoint a Police Complaints Authority. I believe that that is a perfectly proper decision of this Parliament and I do not believe it is within the purview of the Ombudsman to be critical of the Parliament over the appointment of an additional authority to monitor public complaints.

If the Parliament chooses to establish a separate office to monitor those complaints, then I believe that is the prerogative of Parliament and certainly it is not appropriate, in my view, for the Ombudsman to take it on herself to criticise this Parliament for that decision.

Mr S.G. Evans: It happens in other countries, too.

Mr M. J. EVANS: It happens in other countries, too, and the Ombudsman has her role delineated by the Ombudsman Act. I believe that she should contain herself to that role and not seek to empire build in a way which would certainly be interpreted from her report. However, I have no criticism of her activities. In fact, I have only praise for the way in which she conducts her work. I believe that less attention to the decisions of the Parliament in respect of other people and a little more attention to her own work would certainly be of benefit to all concerned.

I commend her for the way in which the statistics at the back of the report are laid out. There is a useful table of authorities, departments and councils subject to the authority of the Ombudsman printed at the back of the book, but a useless table which goes to great lengths and lists every individual authority and department, and the number of complaints against them. I would find it far more helpful to have an analysis of complaints by type and success, rather than by authority. Who is interested in the fact that there was one complaint not substantiated against the City of Unley, for example—just to pick one at random? That tells us almost nothing. A breakdown of complaints by type and an historical comparison year-by-year would be of more assistance to honourable members and those reading the report.

However, I would support the Ombudsman's request for a separate budget for her office, and I would go further than that and suggest that in fact this Parliament should have a

separate appropriation, to be dealt with separately by the Parliament, so that the members of this House and the other place can have a greater degree of control over the funding which is appropriated for the use of the Parliament and those parliamentary officers, as in the case of the Ombudsman and the Police Complaints Authority, so that we would have more direct control over that. I do not believe that to date any harm has come from the control exercised by the Executive over these budgets. Certainly this Parliament and the Ombudsman have adequate resources. For the future I believe that the Treasurer should consider a division of the budget so that the Parliament has a greater degree of freedom.

Very briefly, I shall comment on a number of other matters. First, I refer to a recent proposal in the press to add a large tower or spire to the centrepiece of Parliament House. It is an absurd proposition that public funds should be wasted in that way. I realise that the Government in no way endorses the proposal, and I hope that that remains the case. The private architect who put forward the proposal I believe is living in the past. I do not believe that such a structure (to complete the original proposal) would in any way contribute to the architectural merit of the building. I for one am very satisfied with the building as it is.

I also want to comment on the postcard published recently by the Department of Tourism, inviting South Australians to send a postcard to their interstate friends and relatives to encourage them to come to South Australia. Although the publicity campaign is well timed and is very appropriate, I find the card itself to be a little short of pathetic. I am very disappointed that the Department of Tourism, having invested so much money and effort in a very professional television campaign, should then produce such a poor example of a postcard. Although the Minister of Tourism herself has commented that it is perhaps sexist, I am not sure whether or not I take that point. However, certainly, in my view it lacks professionalism and is not worthy of the people who produced it. That is an undertaking that should certainly go back to the drawing board. Although the concept is good, I think the end result is hopeless.

In conclusion, I would like to comment on the decision of the Federal Government to limit tax deductions for local government elections to \$1 000. Although, on the face of it, that proposal may appear attractive, I believe that it will be quite counterproductive. It is granting a concession to those who least need it. In order to benefit from such tax deductability one must be on a high taxation scale, and if one is on a high taxation scale one can well afford the \$1 000 required to contest a local government election. A pensioner, an unemployed person or a low income earner wishing to stand for council would gain almost no benefit, and in some cases no benefit at all, from the tax deductability of local government election costs, because those people pay little or no tax and are on a low marginal tax rate. Therefore, low income earners are certainly disadvantaged by this so-called incentive to enable people to run for local government office.

I personally believe that a direct subsidy of a very small amount to enable anyone who chooses to produce an appropriate leaflet for distribution in a council area, if the Government so wishes, would be a much more positive and direct way of encouraging people to run for local government office. While on the surface tax deductability may appear to be a useful benefit in this area, I believe in fact it is quite a negative and counterproductive effort which has come about by the lobbying of a small group of people and which does not reflect local government thinking as a whole. With those remarks, I support the motion before the Chair.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): First, I indicate my support for the motion. I express sympathy to the families of the late Mr Hunkin and the late Mr Clark, former members of this House. To Allan Rodda, who will soon retire, and to other honourable members who are heading for retirement, I want to say, in particular to Allan, thanks for 10 years of gentlemanly, humorous and friendly support which I and members of my electorate have appreciated very much. Allan represents an electorate adjacent to the Mount Gambier District. To Archbishop Gleeson I express my best wishes for a long and happy retirement, and my congratulations on his outstanding contribution to Catholic education. I also extend my congratulations to Archbishop Faulkner on his accession to the archbishopric.

I refer now to the federal budget, which was brought down, in part, last night. In my 30 years in Australia it was an unprecedented event to receive only half a budget. We were told how the Government intends to spend the revenue of Australia over the next 12 months but we were not given very much indication of whence the income would come. I suggest that, after the peaches and cream of last night, it is highly probable that sometime in September, and possibly even later, we will receive the castor oil and the arrowroot when we find out precisely how the federal Government intends to raise sufficient income to reduce the federal deficit by some \$1.8 billion. If that is achieved it will be a really remarkable feat. But obviously it bodes rather ill for the taxpayers of Australia in that the federal Government, with very little money of its own, will have to depend on the taxpayers for the diminution of that substantial deficit.

There is no doubt that when the September statement from the federal Treasurer does arrive, it is highly likely that it will contain a number of less palatable ingredients. For example, we are very suspicious that capital gains will be introduced in that September budget; and that tax rates will be left at the same levels with very little chance of reduction. Already there is the chance that 750 000 South Australian taxpayers will be paying even more in the next 12 months simply as a result of incremental creep. As salaries and wages rise, so does the amount that the federal Government creams off by way of income tax.

I believe that the rejection of federal Treasurer Keating's options A, B and C at the recent tax summit must have left him and his department rather flat-footed. The total rejection meant that his department was not able to cope adequately with the preparation of a brand new budget, starting virtually from scratch, with the result that either the Treasurer must now bring in the second half of the budget in September or he might simply wish to leave the hard options (for South Australia and Western Australia, as well as the other States) until much later in the year, because the tax slug which will hit hard will have an adverse effect on South Australia's and Western Australia's Labor Governments' chances of being returned. It is highly likely that the Treasurer is deferring the announcement of these harder options until later in the year.

Premier Bannon in South Australia has no real benefits to boast of from last night. Despite his fairly modest acceptance of the federal statement, and in fact from our own observations, he would have received a number of king hits which will substantially increase the amount of money which he must raise in the forthcoming State budget. For example, the Premier gained from the federal Premiers Conference some \$34 million.

He also gained an additional \$5 million to help with the possible debacle of the Grand Prix expenses, but at the same time he has given away \$41 million in alleged tax remissions. These do not seem to have been accepted very well by the general community, which has viewed those tax remissions with some cynicism, partly as being a return of

funds which were extracted from it far in excess of what the Government was entitled to raise during the past 12 months.

The Premier has also, in remitting that \$41 million, cancelled out the benefits that he received from the federal Government and, in addition, we find that there is a deficit of \$20 million in the E&WS Department relating to water purification and other schemes. There is also a deficit of some \$19 million as a result of the Premier's reduction in E&WS Department rate increases over the next 12 months. That amounts to approximately \$40 million which he has to find one way or another. There is a reduction by the federal Government of \$8 million in TAFE capital funding. That remaining \$8 million is the lowest TAFE grant for many years. In addition, there is a further TAFE reduction on recurrent lines of approximately \$6 million.

I remind the State Minister of Education that the federal TAFE Commission has been threatening to reduce our TAFE allocations for the past two or three years on the premise that South Australia, when compared with other States in Australia, has not been committing sufficient funds into that area. The earlier claims allowed to South Australia by the federal TAFE Commission in the early 1970s pre-empted all other States. There is no doubt that they spent more than they had. It is no longer an acceptable excuse by the federal Government and, while the State Minister of Education had warnings about these reductions from the TAFE Commission, they went unheeded. As a result we now find that we, of all States in Australia, have received extremely severe cuts in that area.

Furthermore, the Premier has to look at another critical area, and that is the vast reduction—\$4 million—in preschool education for 3½ year olds and upwards, which has already been made much of in the State. Another reduction which has gone a little more quietly is the substantial one of \$3 million or more in the early childhood area, child care. We have been waiting for the federal Government to clarify the situation for South Australia and other States because, while announcing earlier this year that it was going to remove that \$7 million from South Australia in the total preschool area, it has at the same time been claiming that it will increase by 20 000 places across Australia the number of vacancies in child care, 1 000 of those places being in South Australia.

Late last year and earlier this year we had repetitive statements almost *ad nauseam* from the federal and State Ministers of Social Security and Community Welfare saying that they were going to increase by 15 over the next 12 months the number of child care centres in South Australia. Those 15 child care centres are being funded virtually by the reduction of \$7 million from the normal preschool education program in South Australia: \$7 million was taken away and then a \$2 million program was reinstated, but there is more—

Mrs Appleby: You really have no idea.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The member for Brighton says, 'You have no idea', but she has also omitted to notice that South Australia has committed itself to an additional \$2 million in order to train staff for the federal child care centres. We have committed State funds at a time when the federal Government has removed them from the whole of Australia. There is a reduction of \$13 million, so that the federal Government can use money which it has gained from South Australia to fund initiatives of its own.

I ask the honourable members who are clucking away on the other side whether they can guarantee that, within the next few years, South Australia will not have those additional child care centres handed back and will have to carry the total load. If they think that is unlikely, let them bear in mind that the \$3.7 million of federal funds which have

been pegged for the past six or seven years have not been increased over those seven years and have now been removed completely so that the State carries the total burden of all kindergarten and child care initiatives for which it has been responsible so far in conjunction with the federal Government. It is a sleight of hand trick: money from the States and money back to the federal Government. If the honourable ladies disagree, let them and their Minister come forward with the statistics which should have been presented to this House in March, April and May of this year, instead of the Minister's strutting around and taking kudos for extra endeavour. That is all poppycock. The parents in South Australia are the ones who realise that.

Let us have a look at what the ACTU said, the organisation on the Government's side of politics:

The State Government will have to make good the shortfall in federal funds of \$4 million for kindergartens in South Australia. At the same time they will have to make good the \$3 million for the field of child care.

What are the likely effects to South Australia according to the ACTU? They are:

Increased fees to be paid by parents for child care.

Reduction in the quality of care provided.

Limited access to child care places for low income earners, making it more difficult for women seeking work to place their children.

Industrial problems among child care workers, with the strong possibility of a loss of jobs.

A substantial increase in unregulated child care services—

And we know what problems they have caused recently in South Australia in relation to child abuse—

A further burden on the State Government which will be expected to make good the deficit.

A reduction rather than an expansion of child care services with greater stress on existing staff.

That is from the Government side of politics, the trade unionists, who are sufficiently perceptive to realise that, in relation to child care services, we are in Ned Kelly's country.

The odd fact about this whole thing is that the federal Government is committed to an increase in child care and yet it has undertaken to reduce the money that we are about to receive.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: When I want the chooks and the hens I will scatter the seed; I will rattle the bucket.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson): Order! I call honourable members to order.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Meanwhile, South Australia is still committed to the maintenance of all those child care centres and kindergartens which have already, over the past two or three years, been complaining of maintenance problems in relation to buildings.

The impoverished people in South Australia have not been dealt with very handsomely by the federal budget. An increase of \$5 for those under 18 years of age on unemployment benefits brings their allowance up to \$50. How a young person under 18 years, living alone, looking around for work, and with no public transport in country areas can survive on \$50 begs the question: how are they managing to do it? The 18 to 20 year-olds have also had an increase in pensions. There is then the 20 years and over group. There are three different structures for people with virtually the same needs—the single unemployed.

In addition, pensioners generally have had an increase of \$3. We find today in the House that the promised South Australian Housing Trust rent freeze which the Premier promised in his earlier statement of remissions, and about which pensioners have been complaining for many years, is in fact a Clayton's freeze; it is the one you have when you are not having one. Only one third of Housing Trust tenants will benefit. The other 66 per cent who are on some form of Housing Trust Government subsidy will continue

to have their rents indexed upwards in accordance with increases in pensions: in other words, it is all stations exactly the same as they were before.

The people in my district who are on a pension and who thought that here at last was a worthwhile Government concession will be disappointed, because their Housing Trust rental assessment for an increase will occur before the Government pension is increased, and that has been the situation for some time.

Last evening's federal budget was something of a gambler's budget: it was optimistic in aiming to create 10 000 jobs for young people over the next 12 months and 70 000 over the next three years. I describe it as gambling and optimistic, because the federal Treasurer pleaded with industry and commerce, which is still to recover, to make more places available for young people, at the same time asking the unions to accept the fact that young people who would be paid \$90 a week to train and work would not really be competing with those people already employed but would be additional to the workforce.

I ask members to consider how realistic this has been in the past. A previous federal Government introduced a Special Youth Employment Training Program (SYETP) with concessions for employers and reductions in certain expenses that they might normally have incurred. However, what happened? Young people were taken into the scheme and, after the period of concern expired, most of them were dismissed, and new youngsters were taken on. No new jobs were created. Employers simply took advantage of the scheme to obtain cheap labour, much to the chagrin of the youngsters who were employed but later displaced.

Many unionists fear that those young people will come along and take away work that is being done by older people, who will be displaced. I believe that the federal Government is optimistic about the total number of places that will be available. The real test of this budget and future budgets lies in the fact that there is no true indication that unemployment will be substantially reduced and that a vast number of additional jobs will be created. The real bottom line lies in the fact that we look like having in two years time the best trained unemployed in the world. The real test is the creation of more jobs to get the private sector steaming along, and the private sector has seen no real joy by way of job creation and real incentives in this budget.

Further, from the point of view of the people that I represent in a rural based district, there is no real relief for people in the South-East. True, the budget provides for a diesel fuel rebate, but that will take away from the federal Government only \$45 million, whereas \$116 million has been taken from country people by the recent cancellation of the country fuel freight subsidy. So, \$45 million is being given back whereas \$116 million is being taken from the country taxpayer. That is no help to rural people.

The assets test has already had a fearful impact on country people compared to its impact on many city dwellers, because a major anomaly has not been removed. Whether in the city or in the country, the family home is not considered when assets are being calculated. However, in the city, one's home may be valued at \$250 000 and one may be on a full pension, whereas in the country a modest family home, valued at \$40 000, may be surrounded by a few broad acres which, because of the assessed value of the property, means that the owner is not eligible for a pension. So, country people have every justification in feeling disgruntled because of what the federal Government has done to them over the past six months.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: They've been kicked in the head.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Yes, well and truly. Although the Treasurer last evening proudly said, 'I'm not introducing any more sales and excise taxes or increasing income tax,'

he did not mention that taxes on commodities that are important to the working classes (such as beer, cigarettes, and fuel that is used to and from work or by the unemployed to travel to and from places in search of work) are still indexed upwards and will bring in not millions but billions of dollars in additional revenue over the next 12 months. The federal Government has its hand well and truly in the pockets of the working class taxpayers. The increase in pensions is negligible compared to the distance that pensioners already lie from the poverty line: they are well below it.

In addition, semi-luxury commodities and the essential commodity of petrol are being taxed extremely heavily: in many cases they are recreational taxes. If the federal Treasurer is optimistic about what he can do to help youth over the next 12 months, let me point out that the unions have already come out in protest, saying that wage demands will continue. The federal Treasurer has a hard row to hoe in trying to convince the public that there should be a true wage base. He must also convince both the employers and the unions that more young people should be employed.

One of the most ridiculous things that I have ever seen in the past 12 months occurred in the South-East, when a builder there employed two 18-year-old youths who had been receiving \$60 a week in unemployment benefits. The builder offered them work at \$140 a week. He was quickly told that he would have to pay those youths the full adult wage of \$340 a week because that complied with the wage structure in the building industry. He told the youngsters that they had insufficient experience to qualify as fully paid builders labourers and that, if he were required to pay them the adult rate, he would have to dismiss them. However, they turned up for work on Monday mornng asking what was wrong with the system and why they could not be taken on. They were perfectly happy with the wage that had been offered. The builder simply had to tell them that that was the award, that was the legislation and that he was sorry. He told them to go round to the Department of Labour and Industry, officers of which had told him that he must pay the youths the full adult rate.

The Government employees themselves who had to issue that instruction were acutely embarrassed because of the situation. Obviously, there needs to be restructuring of junior wages through to adult rates. If it is good enough for the federal Government to pay \$50 a week to a youth under 18 years on the unemployment list, to pay an additional sum to a youth aged between 18 and 20 years, and more to the 20-year-old and over, surely it should be good enough for employers to be considered for a similar wage structure, so that young people can be employed and then given every incentive to better themselves by working and studying to increase their capabilities and their earning power. Surely, that is common sense.

Such a structure used to exist in Australia not many years ago, but wage and other negotiations have thrown things completely out of kilter and the young people, between 25 per cent and 30 per cent of whom are still unemployed, are the major sufferers as a result of what we adults and the courts have done to them. They are the ones who should have a say as to the sort of wage structure that they might be prepared to accept. That is not a threat to hammer young people into the ground, but simply an acceptance that underskilled people are generally prepared to accept a lower wage while in training.

I wonder about a statement made on 9 March 1983 by the Minister of Community Welfare in response to my request for an inquiry into the Community Welfare Department. On that occasion, the Minister said that such an inquiry was not really necessary. He continued:

What I am doing to ease this flow of complaints is to pass responsibility over to the Ombudsman who will, as of right, be entitled to inquire into the community welfare complaints.

At the time I thought that was a little unusual because, as of right, the Ombudsman usually has been able to investigate the whole range of Government departments, including Community Welfare.

By implication in the House on that day members and the public took it that the Minister was appointing within the department of the Ombudsman a community welfare ombudsman (that is, a person specifically there to deal with complaints) or that the Ombudsman was at least being given additional staff. However, what happened? Instead, over the last 12 months, we have not even had a deputy Ombudsman. There has been a steady stream of employees in and out of the Ombudsman's department making continuity of examination difficult. The Ombudsman herself, in her report, states that currently the problem of the community welfare workload and the deficiency of staff are under review by the Public Service Board.

The Minister of Community Welfare, by not ensuring that the department of the Ombudsman is adequately staffed, has been derelict in his duty concerning the problems we have heard aired in the House. One problem has taken two years to be resolved in regard to the licensing of child care givers, whilst another problem was reported on in the Ombudsman's annual report to the effect that an offender guilty of rape and homosexuality was again given care of young men at some sort of fostering or boarding house that he was running. That matter took some two years to resolve. Out of 40 cases that the Ombudsman was given to deal with in the last 12 months, 15 are still outstanding or under investigation.

When the department has been under severe criticism, and when I continue to receive a large number of complaints, many of which I deal directly with the Minister in trying to resolve, I think the community generally has been short changed by the Minister in not ensuring that the Ombudsman's office was properly staffed to deal with such complaints. I sincerely hope that that matter will be resolved in the near future.

A matter of some crucial importance to my dairy farmers in the South-East is that of adequate augmentation or equalisation payments for milk produced there. For a decade the South-East dairy farmers have been seeking equalisation so that they would obtain the same benefits and returns for milk produced as those received in the Adelaide Hills and in the northern dairies in South Australia. That has not happened. In 1980-81 the Tonkin Government negotiated an increase in augmentation payments from a 7½ to a 10 per cent ceiling, but over the last 12 months the situation in the dairy industry has become absolutely crucial with many dairymen facing bankruptcy and, indeed, a number already having left the industry due to diminished returns—well below the survival rate. I have discussed these issues with representatives of the South-East Dairymens Association, the South Australian Dairymens Association, and the factories involved in the South-East such as the Mount Gambier Cooperative, and Kraft.

In the course of those discussions it has been obvious to me that the general run of the mill dairyman has not been kept properly informed by the negotiators as to what was going on. He has had great fears that nothing was taking place to assist him in his dilemma. We now have a situation where the South Australian Minister of Agriculture in another place and I are in relative agreement in that we are both very hopeful that tomorrow in Mount Gambier the SADA and the SEDA representatives will confer with factory executives and come forward with a scheme to give South-East dairymen a much more substantial return—much closer to

full equalisation, if not full equalisation (I recognise, as does the Minister, that problems exist in effecting that)—and that the actions of those people negotiating tomorrow will result in there not being an open war between the South-East dairymen, those in the metropolitan area, and those in the north.

The South-East dairymen have been threatening to bring their milk into Adelaide, to cart it either in cartons or in bulk, and possibly set up a processing plant in Adelaide, and then compete on the metropolitan market. Such an action would be costly to all parties concerned. It would only lead to dissent and bad temper throughout the industry. I sincerely hope that reasonableness will prevail tomorrow and that the returns to South-East dairymen for their milk will equate much closer to that received by the metropolitan and Northern dairymen for their market milk, that is, milk passing to the householder in the form of milk in cartons for household consumption.

In the South-East over 90 per cent of milk goes into manufacture, such as cheese making, which has shown a very low return. The opening price per kilogram butter fat this season is \$2.45 as against \$2.60 for last year. That compares with a quoted price for the metropolitan area of \$3 as an opening price. A substantial difference exists in profitability between Adelaide and the South-East. I have volunteered to the South-East dairymen and the industry that I would be quite prepared to accelerate proceedings by introducing private members legislation, if that would prove effective. However, my offer was not taken up by the South-East group because negotiations between the industrial components are still under way. I agree that the best result would be to achieve satisfaction and settlement tomorrow. A less satisfactory result would be for legislation to be introduced by the Minister or me some time later.

I have brought a number of other issues to the attention of State Ministers over the last few weeks. The first to which I will refer is the assistance needed, cried out for, by the Mount Gambier YMCA, which has, through my office and direct to the Minister, asked for additional financial assistance so that it will not have to close its doors to some 41 youngsters in need of child care on the first day of next term—term 3 of 1985. The Minister has so far not indicated that he is prepared to assist the YMCA kindergarten and child care centre, and I sincerely hope that he can resolve the issue. It is looking only for some \$6 000 to \$7 000 for this year—\$16 000 in a full year—to help it keep open its doors. I simply remind the Minister that, if the YMCA kindergarten does close, those children will be forced out to other kindergartens that are already full and complaining of understaffing.

Again, in the latter regard, the Mulga Street kindergarten or child/parent centre, the Mount Gambier North Junior Primary School and the Lutheran Child Care Centre in Mount Gambier have all approached the Minister direct and through petitions, as have other centres in my electorate, requesting that the deficiency in kindergarten and child care funding resulting from the federal budget (a total of \$7 million) will be made up now by the State Government. We have had no indication from the Minister that that will happen.

The situation facing preschoolers in South Australia will be absolutely grim if State and federal Governments do not accept their full responsibility for a service which has blossomed in South Australia over the past 75 years since the Kindergarten Union entered the field.

It would be very sad to see a diminution of services at this time, especially when both State and federal Labor Governments have openly and repeatedly committed themselves to improved child care services. I have already listed a number of concerns expressed by the ACTU in South

Australia and I do not propose to go through them again, although I do have additional information from various organisations regarding how they are individually affected.

I feel that a Family Court Registrar is needed in the South-East of South Australia. The federal Government has indicated that funding might be available for decentralisation of this service. I have asked the State Attorney-General to examine the possibility of appointing a Family Court Registrar in Mount Gambier. Men and women dealing with family problems such as divorce, access to children and other such matters associated with family break-up would be better served if they had someone available locally rather than having to come to a metropolitan area for assistance.

It would probably alleviate the necessity, too, for rather expensive legal aid being provided on an individual basis. I believe that there might be a net saving were a registrar appointed in a subregistry in Mount Gambier. I hope that the Attorney-General can assist people, especially those on lower incomes who do not have ready access to legal advice, by making such an appointment.

I have recently approached the State Minister of Education regarding assistance for the Allendale Area School gymnasium project. Parents at that school raised \$30 000 in very quick time, having been told that, if they did so, they would be able to construct a gymnasium and recreational hall with the assistance of the School Loans Advisory Committee of the Education Department. Subsequent to raising that money there was an indication given that they might have to raise substantially greater funds or that, alternatively, the hall would not be large enough to cater for the full range of sporting and recreational facilities required in that area in winter.

I ask the Minister to give every consideration, and quickly, to amending the recommendations of the SLAC so that Allendale Area School can go ahead and build an adequate gymnasium in the near future. This area school is the southernmost school of mainland South Australia. It lies full in the track of the westerly wind system: its winters are long, bleak and wet. As a result, children have to spend a great deal of their recreational time indoors during school hours and after school.

There is no recreational hall in that area south of Mount Gambier suitable for a whole range of activities. The provision of such a hall, with State Government assistance, would be of great benefit. In view of the fact that there are a great number of halls similarly constructed and large enough to provide basketball courts in the rest of rural South Australia, I do not think that this is an undue demand that parents on this school council are making of the State Government.

I wrote to invite the Minister of Housing and Construction to visit Mount Gambier's Housing Trust area, East Gambier. Some 30 years ago, when homes in Mount Gambier East were being constructed, they were not always of the best construction. I was fortunate enough to work with an agency of the South Australian Housing Trust—a private company—in the very first job I had when I came to Australia in 1955. I saw how houses were constructed. I handled a great many complaints about features of the houses being inadequate—skirtings, mouldings, ill fitting doors, inadequate cupboards and a whole range of problems such as those.

Of course, the houses were never reconstructed. They are now 30 years old and are of the early basic unimaginative design of the Housing Trust of those early times. Many now need repair and for many years have suffered problems with dampness, draughts and the like. The number of problems reported to me over the past 12 months has increased, despite the fact that the Housing Trust management in the South-East has been doing a really remarkable job, partic-

ularly over the past five years since regionalisation gave it the right to allocate repair and maintenance funds as it saw fit.

I have absolutely no complaint about the marvellous way in which Housing Trust regional officers have been administering that office's funds. However, I ask the Minister, in view of the fact that he has been claiming a great deal of credit for raising tens of millions of dollars for the construction of new houses in South Australia, and in view of the fact that his electorate benefited by the recently announced construction of something like 30 or 40 houses—\$1 million worth of emergency housing—to come down to Mount Gambier and decide whether some of that large sum of money will be taken out and put aside for the urgent task of accelerating the rate of repairing and maintaining trust homes, particularly the older ones, in the South-East.

Not only the inside but also the outside of these houses could stand some attention. Drives are muddy. About 200 of those will have been concreted by the end of the financial year, and that will be an improvement. Tenants might be encouraged, if the insides and outsides of their houses were looked after, to spend a little of their own time and money to ensure that gardens look spick and span. It is a two-way traffic. I ask the Minister to join me on a tour of inspection calling on those houses whose tenants have complained to me.

I am a little worried about the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau and its attitude to the South-East. It has failed to publish any mention of the South-East in the tourist report released this year. In the page entitled 'Who's Who in Tourism in South Australia' the South-East region is completely omitted despite the fact that we have been pressing for many months for the appointment of a regional tourist officer. That officer was appointed this month. The South-East regional tourist officer (Sheena McGuire) has been holding the fort for the Government for the past eight or nine months. If one couples these problems with the fact that the former Premier of South Australia (Don Dunstan), in his role as chief administrator of the Victorian Government Tourist Bureau, has seen fit to remove the western region tourist office from Hamilton near the South Australian-Victorian border back to Geelong in a strange form of recentralisation, then it would seem that somebody has it in for the South-East.

I believe that the Victorian funds may have been diminished because they have a reduced reference to the South-East of South Australia in their tourist publications. During the past few years we have developed a delightful relationship between the Western Districts of Victoria and the South-East of South Australia, each mentioning the other in joint or individual publications, to the extent that they have complemented one another well in keeping people in the districts for a few more days. I ask the Government to redress that situation and to make sure that proper funding and attention is given to staffing of the Government's office there.

In addition, no mention was made of important South-Eastern events occurring between now and December 1986 in the Tourist Bureau's regular publication entitled *Coming Events in South Australia*. Mount Gambier has the largest country show anywhere in rural Australia—the only three day show outside Australia's metropolitan centres. This event will take place in October this year and again in October of next year. The Governor-General, Sir Ninian Steven, will attend the October 1985 show. Mount Gambier also has an annual New Year's Day carnival, which will literally open the South-East's 1986 sesquicentenary celebrations on 1 January next year. Neither of these events was publicised: nor was anything mentioned about what is happening south of Bordertown in the next 18 months. I have asked local

people to advise the Tourist Bureau and to take advantage of free publicity. I hope that the Tourist Bureau will fossick around and ensure that more South-East and Lower South-East events are mentioned in its next edition.

Another problem experienced by people in rural areas is that they find it very hard to gain access to dental treatment when they live in Mount Gambier and the treatment is provided in Adelaide at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The Government's dental scheme has largely assisted in keeping people in the South-East attending their own doctors. I express a strong vote of thanks to Dr Peter Telford, of the Royal Adelaide Hospital dental section, for the assistance he has personally given to over 100 applicants for assistance who have passed through my office in the past 12 months or so.

Mr S.G. Evans: And he lives in a good electorate.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Well, he is a splendid gentleman and I have always found him extremely cooperative. One problem lies in the fact that orthodontic treatment—the more expensive treatment, far in excess of providing false teeth—has been harder to come by. The impoverished people in my electorate have been faced with bills of \$1 500 for a child and more than \$3 000 for a lady who required extensive bridge work and reconstruction of her upper jaw. Neither of these people is in a position to purchase orthodontic treatment.

I have requested that the Government consider extending the visiting orthodontist scheme to Mount Gambier so that people in the South-East have access to a Government employed specialist instead of having to rely on the goodwill of the school dentist, Dr Weaver, to whom I give thanks on behalf of my electors. He has been another gentlemanly person who has assisted far beyond the measured mile in looking after the poorer people in my electorate. If the visiting orthodontist scheme came to the South-East doing work through the hospital, this would not impinge on the incomes of specialists already in the area because the people using the scheme would be people who could not afford to go to a resident specialist in the South-East. An extension of that scheme would be very welcome.

There are a large number of other issues I would like to address, but time does not permit. I understand that there is some agreement that we close early, instead of having to proceed until later this evening. I have a number of other issues that have been put before State Ministers on behalf of electors in the South-East. Generally, Ministers have been very speedy in acknowledging letters to them. However, they have been fairly tardy in coming forward with remedies, solutions and further advice as to what they intend to do.

I ask all Ministers to whom I have addressed correspondence to ensure that they deal with those matters more speedily. I ask that promises made three years ago during the 1982 election campaign be kept, promises such as the one to upgrade the Mount Gambier Hospital to a teaching hospital: there is nothing done, it is three years later and another election is coming along. The Mount Gambier Hospital redevelopment plan has been finalised and I sincerely hope that that redevelopment and the Finger Point sewerage scheme (which is a firm commitment of the next Liberal Government) will be placed back on the public works program in the forthcoming budget so that we do not have the problem of ransacking the public works budget and having to reinstate a number of programs to which we are firmly committed. If the Government keeps its promises that will not be necessary, and we will be able to cruise ahead when we return to Government.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport): I move:

That the sittings of the House be extended beyond 6 p.m.
Motion carried.

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): I rise to close this debate and in so doing support the motion before the House. Before turning my attention to some of the matters I would like to raise in my Address in Reply speech, I acknowledge the contribution of the member for Adelaide who was the former Deputy Premier, Minister of Labour, Minister of Emergency Services, Chief Secretary and Minister of Youth Affairs. What a tremendous number of portfolios and what a tremendous contribution the member for Adelaide made to this Parliament.

I also acknowledge the contributions made over the years by members who will be retiring at the end of this session. The member for Price, whose contribution has been particularly significant, has been supportive to members on this side of the Chamber, and I wish him well in his retirement. The member for Victoria has always appeared to members on this side, myself in particular, to be a thorough gentleman and I wish him all the best in his retirement. Last, but by no means least, the member for Whyalla, none other than yourself, Mr Deputy Speaker. I acknowledge the support that you have given, particularly to new members, and would also place on the public record the fact that so many of us appreciate your sense of humour, your patience and tolerance in carrying out your job so successfully. I wish you well in your new career as one of the landed gentry.

I wish to cover several areas in this address tonight. First, paragraph 18 of the Governor's speech states:

My Government is also concerned to ensure that the needs of women in the community are recognised both in terms of employment and in the allocation of Government resources.

I will highlight how the Government has responded in ensuring that the needs of women in terms of employment and in the allocation of Government resources are being met. It is particularly significant that women's advisers and equal opportunity officers have been appointed in the following areas: Premier and Cabinet, health, community welfare, education, technical and further education, labour, recreation and sport, and the Public Service Board. These women are central to the development and coordination of policy in those areas for women in the community and the work force.

In the area of education a commitment to equal opportunity for girls has resulted in the recently created position of Superintendent of Studies, Education for Girls, and will assist in promoting equal opportunities for girls in school curricula throughout the State. Also, the State and Commonwealth have contributed funds to initiatives such as the Girls in Transition project and the Womens Studies Resource Centre. Each of the areas of the Education Department now has an advisory staff allocation to provide school support for the implementation of equal opportunity policy and girls education.

Within the TAFE area, courses such as New Opportunities for Women, or what is commonly referred to as the NOW program, and other prevocational trade courses for girls, have been successfully introduced into a number of colleges. There is now a much wider availability of TAFE women's study courses throughout South Australia, and this again is a direct result of Government policy. The promotion of a greater participation by women in training and employment in non-traditional areas has been a high priority of the Government. Several Government areas have come together to ensure that there is greater participation.

The Women's Advisory Unit of the Department of Labour, in conjunction with publicity and promotion programs in high schools, together with increased funding for TAFE courses, have been instrumental in broadening the partici-

pation of young women and indeed their self-confidence in many of these non-traditional areas.

In the employment field, initiatives for women have been many. Through the State and Commonwealth Governments' policy directives, 50 per cent of CEP jobs were targeted specifically to women. In the 1984-85 financial year, a total of 844 positions were created for women in South Australia. The Department of Labour has also sponsored a sub-program for young women to redress the significant under-representation of young women in CEP placements. CEP funds have been utilised to provide 12 months employment for a total of 73 young women, working in a variety of community organisations.

Another project sponsored under the Community Employment Program is a research project, undertaken by the South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission, on the occupational health and safety conditions of migrant women cleaners in public hospitals. The Working Women's Centre has received increased funding. The centre plays a very important, and indeed vital, role in providing information, advice and support on issues concerning women in the paid work force.

Other areas that relate directly to women are health, housing and children's services. Very significant advances have been made in the area of women's health and related support services. For example, funding for the sexual assault referral clinic at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital has increased dramatically over the past five years, and the funding allocation for the 12 months ended 30 June 1985 amounted to \$135 500. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it a statistical table showing the funding increase.

Leave granted.

12 months ending	Total
	\$
30.6.81	22 200
30.6.82	66 700
30.6.83	86 100
30.6.84	104 200
30.6.85	135 500

Ms LENEHAN: The Adelaide Rape Crisis Centre has also had its annual funding allowance almost trebled in a budget allocation of \$158 000 for the 1984-85 financial year. I seek leave to have a table showing a statistical analysis of the funding inserted in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

	Budget
	allocation
	\$
1982-83	87 000
1983-84	127 000
1984-85	158 000

Ms LENEHAN: Women's community health centres have also received unprecedented support from the Bannon Government. Three new women's health centres have been opened during the present Government's term of office. They are the Elizabeth Women's Community Health Centre; the Southern Women's Community Health Centre, which is in the area I represent, and I know from first-hand experience what a tremendous job it is doing providing for the health of women in the southern community; and the Dale Street Women's Community Health Centre at Port Adelaide.

Another area of vital support for women in crisis involves the provision of women's shelters, those non-profit, non-government organisations, for which a total of \$1.704 million has been allocated in 1984-85 financial year. This comprised \$619 000 from the Commonwealth Government and \$1.085 million from the State Government—an extremely considerable financial contribution from the State Government. I point out that all State Governments do not provide

this level of support for women's shelters. One has only to consider the sort of financial support that is provided by the Queensland Government to realise that indeed we in this State are fortunate to have a Government which responds so sensitively to the needs of women in crisis.

The Government's housing program has greatly benefited women. The Housing Trust's programs aim to meet community public housing needs through the provision of rental housing, rent and mortgage relief, home purchase assistance, emergency housing, and other services. Housing Trust policies promote the provision of housing to those in greatest need. One hopes that all members totally support that policy. Women from any group in the community may find themselves in need. Aboriginal women, migrants, single parents, women in crisis, and disabled women are often in the greatest need. In 1983-84, almost 40 per cent of trust rental housing was allocated to lone women, with or without children.

The work done by the Emergency Housing Office should be recognised. Indeed, it provides direct financial assistance to people on low incomes who are experiencing some crisis related to accommodation. Many people who are desperately in need of the support and services provided by the Emergency Housing Office come to my electorate office in the southern area. I take this opportunity to congratulate the EHO on the fine job that it does in providing for these people. It is also worth noting that lone women, with or without children, make up about 40 per cent of the clients of the EHO.

I refer now to the rent relief program, because, once again, while it helps all members of the community, it specifically helps women. Lone women, with or without children, make up about 50 per cent of the recipients of the rent relief program allocations. The mortgage relief program is another initiative of the present Government, and lone women, with or without children, make up about 30 per cent of recipients of allocations made under the mortgage relief program operating in South Australia.

I now turn to matters involving the Children's Services Office. I believe that the establishment of that office is one of the most significant and outstanding initiatives of the Bannon Government. This statutory authority will coordinate, integrate, and plan a range of children's services in this State. Services will be provided by this office which have important implications for women, as the primary care givers and labour force participants. The services provided under the umbrella of the Children's Services Office include: preschool education, child care centres, family day care vacation care, out of school hours care, licensing of child care centres and commercial child care agencies, support of play groups, and a review of the needs of disadvantaged children.

Tonight I want to discuss two areas of responsibility of the Children's Services Office. I refer to child care and family day care. Despite the recent debate in the community, and in this Parliament, about child care funding (and I noted the comments of the previous speaker, the member for Mount Gambier), I believe that any fair-minded person in the community, and indeed in this Parliament, must recognise and acknowledge the large injection of funds for the construction of new centres in South Australia.

Of a total of 15 centres planned for South Australia, five will be located in the southern area of Adelaide. These centres will be situated at Diagonal Road, Marion; Happy Valley (and I am pleased to see here members of the Happy Valley council, some of whom fought very hard and long for the provision of child care facilities in the community); Hallett Cove; The Hub, Aberfoyle Park, which is also in the Happy Valley council area; and Wheatsheaf Road, Morphett Vale, which is in the electorate that I represent.

In relation to child-care, I note from reading the policy of the Liberal Party that it has come lately to recognise that child-care is and has been for many years a fundamental issue in respect of equality of opportunity for people in this community to participate in education, in work and in a whole range of other social—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: Mr Deputy Speaker,—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the honourable member for Mallee wishes to have a dizzy spell, it would be better if he left the Chamber.

Ms LENEHAN: I am happy to discuss the situation of the Coomandook kindergarten with the member for Mallee at an appropriate time, but certainly not in the middle of my Address in Reply speech. If the member for Mallee is prepared to afford me that courtesy, I will be pleased to tell him what I have done personally to support the community at Coomandook. I noted with great pleasure that the Minister of Education, in reply to my question in the House yesterday, reaffirmed the Government's policy on the provision of child-care facilities at TAFE colleges. In asking my question, I made reference to the excellent quality of child-care which is currently being provided at the Noarlunga Centre in the form of the Noarlunga Children's Centre, which is a joint child-care centre serviced by the Department of TAFE and the Health Commission.

I asked the Minister to outline the Government policy and the Minister gave a guarantee that, within the next four years, a Labor Government would extend this type of child-care facility to all TAFE colleges. I congratulate the Government, and in particular the Minister of Education, on the support which has been forthcoming in respect of the provision of not just child-care but quality child-care staffed by trained professional people who are also paid.

I am sorry that the member for Mount Gambier has left the Chamber, because I want to refer to his about face. It never ceases to amaze me that the member for Mount Gambier, when discussing child-care, criticises most strongly the federal and State Governments. If one looked at one small aspect of his record, one would have to be completely appalled. I remember, as the candidate for Mawson, fighting the member for Mount Gambier, who was the then Minister of Education.

Mr Baker interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: The honourable member was not even on the scene then, so I am sure he does not know what I am talking about. I fought the then Minister of Education for the provision of child-care to the college. The member for Mount Gambier told the then principal (also the now principal) of the college that perhaps he should run off and find a room somewhere where they could put children. What a gross insult to the children and to the people in the southern community. They responded through the ballot-box. I am sure that honourable members are all very much aware of what happened to the former member for Mawson. Indeed, the Liberal Party at the time was not prepared to support child-care and the provision of child-care at the Noarlunga TAFE college. The shadow Minister of the time supported child-care and we now have probably one of the finest child-care centres in the State.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: Perhaps the member for Mallee might like to have a look at the kind of quality child-care we have. As he is such a supporter of children and the family, I am sure that he would want to see that level of child-care extended right across the board to all children in this State. I also support my colleague the member for Henley Beach in his quest to have child-care in his electorate and I hope that he will be successful in the short term.

I would now like to turn to the second area that comes under the umbrella of the Children's Services Office and that is the area of family day care. We have heard in the media and in this Parliament an attack on one particular relative of a child-care giver in this State. We have not heard one word of support in this Parliament for child-care givers, for those women (they are mostly women) who provide—

Mr Mayes: The Minister supported it.

Ms LENEHAN: Apart from this side of the House, as my colleague has reminded me. Yes, the Minister of Community Welfare has fully supported child-care givers in this community. I am totally and quite unequivocally appalled that a child was sexually molested while in some sort of child-care.

Mr Baker interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: That is an outrage and I want it to go on the public record that the member for Mitcham has categorically stated that it was the responsibility of the Minister of Community Welfare; what an untruth—what an insult to a man whose sensitivity and commitment to children's services are unprecedented in this State.

Mr Baker interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: I think that indicates the attitude and double standard of the Opposition. We have not heard anyone from the Opposition stand up and present any hard evidence about where sexual molestation and sexual assault of children comes from. Let me tell the House where it comes from: the largest amount of sexual assault on children takes place in the family by people who know and are related to the child. Have we heard one word? No, we have not. The community has been led to believe that every second family day care giver is sexually assaulting children; that is the impression, but not one word has been spoken about the tremendous job performed by family day care givers in this community.

I would now like to turn my attention to acknowledging the sort of support provided and the tremendous role played by family day care givers. Family day care is an important and valuable style of child-care. It is a flexible system of meeting a range of child-care needs and enables parents who are caring for their own children to earn an income in their own homes.

Family day care provides for the needs of a working parent or parents, but it also provides occasional and respite care. Family day care should not be seen only as work related, because it also provides an opportunity for time out for parents. This family style care, based on small units where care givers are able to establish a close relationship with children, has resulted in quality care being provided for children with behavioural and emotional problems, and I am told by people involved in the family day care area that excellent results have been achieved as a result of this type of care.

The flexibility provided by family day care caters for shiftwork, occasional overnight care and before and after school care. It also enables the matching of parents with care givers, so that parents can choose the most appropriate care giver for their children: in other words, they can interview two or three families and ascertain which family would best suit the individual needs of their child and their family unit.

Coordinators are also available in all family day care programs to offer support, to answer concerns and to generally ensure the smooth running of the programs. Within the southern community areas of Happy Valley, Morphett Vale and Noarlunga, a total of 255 care givers (and I suggest that that is a substantial number) provide care for a total of 643 children, which equates to 332 full-time places. There are 4.1 equivalent full-time coordinators and three com-

munity workers, as well as clerical support staff. I am delighted that the regional office of the Children's Services Office for the southern area will be fully operational within the next six to eight weeks. I extend my congratulations to Ms Louise Denley, who has been appointed as the regional manager.

I also offer my support and congratulations to those 255 care givers who are working tirelessly to provide quality care for children. I put it to this House that those people are not child molesters; they are doing a very valuable and necessary job in this community.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: The honourable member should read the transcript of what has been said in this House. There are many other areas where this Government has supported women and women's issues. For example, the Womens Information Switchboard, which provides an excellent and vital service for women, was an initiative of a Labor Government and has been continually supported by this Government. This Government also supported the retention of the womens studies course at Flinders University. I note that my colleague the member for Mitcham is in the House, and I wonder how supportive he has been of that program. I acknowledge the appointment of Mary Beasley as Ombudsman and congratulate her on her first report to Parliament. I also offer my congratulations to Anne Dunn, who was appointed a Commissioner of the Public Service Board; Cathy Branson, who has been appointed Crown Solicitor; and Sue Varden, who was appointed Director-General of the Department for Community Welfare. All of those appointments have been made in the period of the present Government.

I acknowledge that I totally support paragraph 23 of the Governor's speech, which states:

The Criminal Law Consolidation Act will be amended to reform the law relating to the crime of rape.

The Governor then explained what will happen. I do not intend to debate that issue this evening, because I hope to take part in the debate—

Mr Baker interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: If the member for Mitcham will allow me to continue: I will be speaking in the debate on that legislation when it is before the House. Without going into all the supporting arguments, what we have said on this side of the House and what I have said as someone who has been very involved for many years in trying to reform the rape laws of this State is that we are not going to accept one aspect of reform and sell it to the community as changing the whole nature of convictions in relation to the rape laws of this State. We have consistently held out for a package in relation to rape law reform. There is no point in changing one aspect and not changing the rest. I am delighted that the Attorney-General will be introducing a Bill as a package in relation to rape law reform. I believe that will go a long way towards educating the community and ensuring that rapists end up where they belong.

Before concluding, I refer to an area which has greatly concerned me as a local member, and I refer to the area of youth and drug abuse. The southern community has spent much of its time and energy, through the Noarlunga Community Services Forum, working to identify the problems associated with drug abuse in youth. We have come up with a range of programs and ideas which I have put to the Government. In fact, I wrote to the Minister of Health requesting that he allocate money to fund a youth drug worker. I am told that the Minister has supported my proposal to the federal Government and has requested that it be treated as a priority. I look forward in the near future to a successful conclusion and the appointment of a drug youth worker.

I have also approached the Housing Trust, because I believe it is important that we provide in the southern community what young people refer to as a 'flop house' (although older adults find that offensive and prefer the term youth shelter or drop-in centre). However, the name is irrelevant. We need to provide somewhere for young people on drugs to have accommodation overnight or longer, where they can be provided with proper support and counselling by a properly trained youth worker.

When I recently opened the City South offices at Christies Beach I was delighted to meet so many young people in the local community and see the types of programs that they were undertaking. One program involves concerned youths from the City South office making a video about youth and drug abuse. These young people hope to show the video to other young people in the southern area, through liaison with the secondary schools in the area, youth clubs, church groups, and so on. They have used their initiative to produce a film which they believe will be especially appropriate for young people. I publicly congratulate City South on its initiative in working with the community to overcome what I am sure every member of this Parliament would acknowledge is a growing problem in our community—the problem of youth and drugs. In conclusion, I support the motion.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:
That the House do now adjourn.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I will use the time allocated to me to raise a couple of matters of considerable concern, particularly to the people of the Cleve area. The issue that I refer to first is the condition of the road between Cleve and Kimba, and more particularly the manner in which this issue has been handled. I understand that the Cleve-Kimba road has had its status changed from a rural road under local government to a rural arterial road under the Highways Department. I understand that the official transfer of responsibility for that road was to take place on 1 July. That has not taken place because of a holdup due to red tape, and we now have a situation where the road has become the worse for wear as a result of wet conditions and reconstruction work in the area. No-one has actually accepted responsibility for the road and it has become impassable. As a result, the local school bus must be diverted around the Mangalo silo to the Cleve Area School. That means an additional run of nearly an hour for the students on the school bus. The people involved are a little frustrated to think that no-one is accepting responsibility for the road and that no-one is doing much about it.

I have spoken with the Minister about this matter and he assures me that he is making every endeavour to see that the problem is rectified and that at least some action is taken. Whether that action comes from local government or the Highways Department does not really matter as long as the situation is rectified, responsibility is assumed, and the road is made passable at the earliest opportunity. It seems ludicrous in today's climate that a primary road, in this case a rural arterial road, can be made impassable because of a shower of rain.

I suppose we are all pleased to see the rain in many ways, because it has opened up the possibility that many farmers in this area may get some return, even if it is only light. I ask the Government to treat the matter with some urgency so the problem can be remedied, so that the school bus can travel on its usual route as soon as possible, and so that the

students do not have to spend an extra hour in travel time. I think it is fair to say that, because of the danger, it was right and proper for the school bus driver and the Principal of the Cleve Area School to stop the bus from travelling on that road at that time.

Although I did not actually see the road on the day the bus was stopped from using the road, I know the road well, and I know that it is made from clay soils. The road becomes slippery during wet weather, particularly when there is reconstruction work in progress. It would have been dangerous for a 70 passenger school bus to travel along that road in those conditions. I support the driver and the Principal of the Cleve Area School in rerouting the bus at that time. My only request of the Government now is that every endeavour be made to rectify the situation so that the students do not have to spend longer than necessary on what is already one of the longest runs in the area.

I suppose the other main issue relating to the Cleve area is Sims farm. Since 1981 I have mentioned Sims farm on several occasions, and I was pleased to hear the announcement by the Minister last week that the Government had decided to hold the property. What is not yet known are the terms and conditions of this agreement. We know that the Government will hold the farm under the control of the Department of Agriculture. However, there will be a share farming or leasing agreement with the Cleve Area School, administered by a committee comprising local expertise. I refer to the United Farmers and Stockowners Association, representatives of the Agricultural Bureau and the Department of Agriculture, as well as the Cleve Area School and I believe one other body. Be that as it may, I am sure that that can be made to work and I do not believe that the Government will regret the decision it has made, as it has been applauded by many people who are relieved as they were concerned that the property would be lost, possibly for all time.

The property will be used for agricultural studies, even if only by the Cleve Area School at this time. The value of the property to rural studies is, indeed, immense and is to be applauded and supported wherever possible. I also believe that the rural studies courses as conducted under the TAFE program will also benefit, as those courses are required to do block releases at various times. The present pressures on TAFE staff are such that they cannot handle the demands being placed upon them. As the rural studies course has now been recognised as one of apprenticeship, there is some obligation on the Government's behalf to accept all applicants for rural studies courses and facilities will have to be upgraded. Certainly the number of lecturers required will have to be increased in order to accommodate the large number of applicants.

When I was last talking to the rural studies people at the TAFE college in Port Lincoln, I understood that the courses that have been running over the past six years or so have an intake of 20 students every second year an average of 10 a year. This current year's intake or for enrolment is 55 for one year alone. Obviously anyone with any sort of mathematical deduction would realise that the present facilities are totally inadequate for the demand for those courses. The retention of Sims farm will allow greater use of it and the greater extension of the rural studies course. I can only commend the course to those people running it, particularly TAFE, for the manner in which it has developed the course over time.

Full marks are to go to Leon Holme, presently Principal of the Port Adelaide TAFE college and former Principal of the Port Lincoln college when rural studies was first developed. I was then and still am on the college council and was with Leon through the development of that program.

We should say to Leon that he has benefited the agricultural areas to a large degree.

Another small point I wish to raise: I heard the member for Mawson make mention of youth centres, saying that we are not doing enough for youth, and issues of that kind. We all applaud that type of support for our young people. I have been actively involved in a number of organisations in trying to assist them, not only in recent times but since I could have been classified in the youth category myself. I was disturbed at the attitude of governments, particularly the federal Government, in relation to what is known as the Copyright Act of 1968. Whilst that may be a little removed from the subject of youth, I point out that there has been a program or project in Port Lincoln known as 'Kids Kitchen'. The project has had the absolute support of the Minister of Community Welfare, Hon. Greg Crafter, and many of the local community citizens. It is very worth while and the Minister would agree that it is a pilot to be held up as an example.

The organisers were as disturbed as I was when a couple of weeks ago they received from an organisation a letter that I cannot quote now demanding payment of fees for copyright of music played in the juke box at 'Kids Kitchen'. It sets out a scale of fees, because it is alleged that records and music being played are subject to the Copyright Act.

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

Mr KLUNDER (Newland): In the next few minutes I wish to recapitulate the tax relief package saga and, in particular, the fascinating history of Opposition twists and turns on the matter. I want to start with the following statement made by the Leader of the Opposition in *Hansard* of 3 April 1985:

I am asking for tax relief from 1 July, and for the past 2¼ years have consistently called for tax relief.

This is fascinating stuff, indeed. The Leader would have us believe that he started calling for tax relief on the day that he stopped being a Minister in the Tonkin Government. In other words, he wanted tax relief from the day that he was no longer able to provide it. He virtually stands condemned for that statement as a bit of a hypocrite. The things he has stated since then unfortunately have not given us much hope that he has improved in any way at all. For the sake of sparing the House the various twists and turns on that statement—

Mr Baker: Twists and turns is right!

Mr KLUNDER: The member for Mitcham who is not a patch on a the previous member for Mitcham that I was in the House with, is trying to defend his Leader from his own statement. That really does take the cake. I will neglect the Leader's repeated calls on the same issue over the next few months and will now come to August 1985. On 1 August His Excellency the Governor opened the Parliament, and in his speech he made this reference to tax concessions:

My Government believes that all South Australians should benefit from renewed economic growth. The revenues of the State depend heavily on activity within our regional economy. The improvement during the past two years has considerably strengthened our State's financial base and complemented the very necessary and responsible measures my Government took in 1983 to correct the serious imbalance that had developed in the State's accounts. Consequently, my Government believes that it is now in a position where it can return directly to the community the benefits of recovery. Legislation will be put before you to provide tax concessions in areas of greatest priority.

In the *Advertiser* on the following day the Governor's speech was reported as—

... indicating that the South Australian Government will make significant reductions to some taxes later this month. It is understood the Government is planning to announce a special tax package within the next few weeks. Areas in which cuts could be

made include ETSA tariffs, land tax and payroll tax. The Leader of the Opposition, Mr Olsen, said yesterday that the time for tax relief was long overdue.

From what I have said so far, we know that the Leader wanted tax cuts from the time he was no longer able to provide them, and we must have some sympathy for him because the terrible state in which the previous Government left the State's finances gave it little option of providing tax relief at that time.

He wanted the tax cuts, he knew approximately when they were going to take place, he knew roughly in which areas they were going to take place, and he claimed that they were overdue. Given the amount of notice he had, of both of the time and the kind of tax cuts coming, it was utterly staggering to see how unprepared he was when the tax package was announced.

In the *Advertiser* of 6 August, the day after the package was announced, the Leader called it a 'cynical vote buying exercise' which clearly signalled a State election within weeks. Two comments are necessary at this point: first, something that he wanted for 2¼ years—ever since he was unable to do anything about it—suddenly became a cynical vote buying exercise; secondly, since the Leader has been saying for six months that an election is due within a few weeks, we must admit that we can no longer claim that he is always inconsistent—wrong, yes; but consistently inconsistent, no.

In the *News* that same afternoon he was quoted as saying that the tax relief was phoney. On Thursday 8 August he called it indefensible. It varies. At other times he said that tax cuts did not go far enough, that they mirrored what the Liberals would have done and that they were a con. The *Advertiser*, the *News* and the *Australian* editorial, fortunately, did not share the Leader's gamut of mixed emotions. First, the *Advertiser* of 6 August said:

The Bannon Government's decision to cut taxes and charges by \$41 million is a most welcome indication that the worst of the State's economic problems are being overcome.

Further, it stated:

The Government has acted sensibly in selecting for cuts those taxes which have detracted from job opportunities.

Finally, the article reads:

It is entitled to credit for its contribution to the State's better economic position.

The *News* on that same afternoon stated:

The Premier, Mr Bannon, can now go to the election having kept his promise of substantial reductions in taxes and charges. ... Mr Bannon is entitled to the credit, he has proved himself not only a prudent and diligent Treasurer but a sensitive politician.

The *Australian* on 8 August, after having a couple of days to digest the package, stated:

But recent surveys by the Government and the SA Chamber of Commerce and Industry have shown the State is leading the national economic recovery and of the three manufacturing States seems best insulated against any short-term downturn. These surveys are backed up by Australian Bureau of Statistics figures released yesterday showing South Australia heading the list of forecast new capital spending by the private sector with an expected increase of 43 per cent to \$1 251 million next financial year.

In fact so good is the economic news from South Australia that Mr Bannon has been able to make his tax cuts, including a drop in electricity charges, without having to be concerned about creating his own deficit blowout.

Housing and construction sectors in the State are enjoying boom conditions, total unemployment is down and employment growth up, and there has been a significant increase in new fixed capital expenditure by private enterprises.

As a result revenue from land taxes and stamp duty has markedly increased and despite increases in payroll tax exemption levels the increase in employment has meant no revenue loss in that sector. The net result of this is a State whose finances are healthy and whose economy has not been in a better shape for more than seven years. Mr Bannon must be pleased. He could not have hoped for a better story to sell to the electorate.

I suppose that the *Sunday Mail* of 11 August summed up the Opposition's response quite nicely:

The Opposition wasn't quite sure which way to jump; the reaction being something like: "These cuts are an election con job, and anyway they aren't real tax cuts, and even if they are, we thought of them first."

Two things follow quite clearly from the chain of events I have just outlined. The first is that the Liberal Party was quite clearly surprised, both by the scope and size of the tax cuts package. Instead of welcoming it, the Liberal party went scabbling around looking for ways of denigrating the package. Not only that, but it is quite clear that the Labor cuts pre-empted the Liberal proposals. It is obvious that the Liberal party was hoping that the Bannon package would be smaller in size and would encompass fewer areas than it actually did. If that had happened, the Liberal Party would have been able to grandstand and announce its own package.

In fact, the Leader's comments that the Labor package was a mirror of his own was the only attack of Valderitis that the Leader has had for some years. Indeed, even that attack was not acute, because it is quite clear that the Labor cuts were bigger than the ones he had proposed. I can say that with some confidence because it is the only explanation that fits the fact that the Leader did not make his own package public as soon as the Labor package had become public.

The second item that follows, as the *Australian* expressed it, is that the \$41 million tax cut package resulted largely from increased revenue due to economic growth in which South Australia is leading the nation. That, in turn, means that the Bannon Government is sharing with the community the benefits of that economic recovery, which certainly did not occur during the period in government of the Liberal Party, regardless of the promises that it made in 1979.

Not only that, but the Bannon Government is sharing the fruits of its economic recovery in a way which is calculated to increase further that recovery by reducing those imposts which act as a brake on economic activity. It is a sad commentary that the Liberal Party refused to welcome the tax cuts, but continued with the knocking and whingeing for which it has become so infamous in this State.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): In the short time available to me tonight, I shall address my remarks to the social obligations to which the Labor Party has committed itself in South Australia. In particular, I refer to public transport in and around my electorate. Shortly after coming to office (in December 1980) the then Government was involved in the introduction of new bus services in and around the West Lakes and Semaphore Park area. Those plans were put in train by the previous Labor Government under the very good auspices of the then Minister of Transport, Hon. Geoff Virgo, for which I commend him.

On 22 December 1981 I wrote to the Minister of Transport seeking the upgrading of those services in order to provide bus services not only for the elderly, particularly in the Delfin Island area, but for the people who intended to or had taken up residence in the area. I received a response to that correspondence four months later. Briefly, it stated that the Government of the day was considering those matters. Since the Government has been returned to office, I have again pursued the matter with my colleague, the previous Minister of Transport, Roy Abbott, and with the Hon. Gavin Keneally.

Honourable members will recall that I asked a question in the House last week in relation to the Government's intention with respect to this bus service. Not only has the Government honoured its commitment, but it has advised me that the bus service will commence operation later next

year. I am delighted that the Labor Government has honoured its community services obligations to those people who need public transport to travel in and around their district.

In my electorate there are three large community villages, one of which is Woodbridge. Many of the people who live there have some disability, such as arthritis, and they are sorely in need of a decent bus service in that location. The new bus service will also take people to and from the West Lakes shopping centre. Some people might ask why local residents cannot walk across the bridge to the Bartley Terrace shopping centre. For the agile that is all right, but for the not so agile it is not easy to do that.

The new service will significantly enhance public transport not only for my constituents in the West Lakes and Delfin Island area, but for the many people who wish to visit friends in that location. I commend the Ministers responsible for the provision of the new service—both in this Government and in the Dunstan and Corcoran Governments—on honouring their obligations towards the community. It is worth noting that the Tonkin Government was sorely remiss in not providing such a service. It is said that the districts to be served by this new service are Labor electorates. Nonetheless, this Government and former Governments have certainly put their money where their mouths are.

Another matter that I have pursued under successive Governments, but to no avail, relates to the need for a bus service from the corner of Trimmer Parade and Tapleys Hill Road, Seaton, to Fulham to connect with services to Glenelg.

I find it remarkable that, although people can travel in private vehicles, they cannot catch a bus from Port Adelaide, up Tapleys Hill Road, to Glenelg—just because no connecting service exists for a distance of two kilometres. I appeal to the Minister to look at the previous correspondence that I have forwarded to his office, and I ask that this service be provided in the very near future. I find it strange that an area of only two kilometres cannot be serviced in this day and age. If this area was serviced, it would not only provide the opportunity for people to travel from Port Adelaide to Glenelg and vice versa, but also would mean that constituents in the electorate of Henley Beach would have quicker access to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I know that since Don Ferguson was elected he has pursued the matter of this connector. I hope that the Minister will give favourable consideration to it in the near future.

Another matter that concerns me is the lack of lighting around the West Lakes High School. For some years I have noted with concern that the area is poorly lit, and certainly does not provide for the proper security of the school grounds. In saying that, I do not reflect on the Police Force or the security firms that service this area. However, unless adequate lighting is provided in and around the school it remains an ideal situation for vandals and persons wishing to break into the school.

I am concerned that this lighting is not available. This inhibits night activities at the school, and this will apply particularly during the coming spring and summer months. It is important that proper lighting be provided at the school, and I appeal to the Minister of Education to seriously consider the matter—if not this year then certainly before the start of the next school year. If proper lighting is provided it will keep many unruly elements out of the school.

Another matter that I want to raise in the two minutes left to me is the lack of use of a strip of land on the southern side of West Lakes Boulevard between Tapleys Hill Road and Frederick Road at Seaton. This strip of land was originally set aside for the rail extension from Hendon

to West Lakes. That project was abandoned and, as a consequence, the land is now bare. This land could be used by the local Hendon Primary School for sporting activities, tennis courts, and so on. It is necessary to make proper use of this land, and I hope that the Minister can advise me in the near future of the Government's intention: whether to offer the land to the local football club, the Hendon Primary School, or to any interested sporting organisations or groups

in the area. The land is in a muddy condition during the winter months, and in the summer months it is of concern to local residents because of the dust. This land may be an ideal opportunity for a CEP project.

Motion carried.

At 6.35 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 22 August at 2 p.m.