

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 6 August 1986

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.P. Trainer)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITIONS: PROSTITUTION

Petitions signed by 1 146 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose any measures to decriminalise prostitution and uphold present laws against the exploitation of women by prostitution were presented by Messrs Becker, Duigan, M.J. Evans, S.G. Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Hamilton, Hemmings, Oswald, and Slater.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: ELECTRONIC GAMING DEVICES

Petitions signed by 485 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to permit the use of electronic gaming devices were presented by Messrs Allison, Goldsworthy, and M.J. Evans.

Petitions received.

PETITION: ADULT BOOKSHOPS

A petition signed by 85 residents of South Australia praying that the House introduce legislation to ban 'adult bookshops' in predominantly residential areas was presented by Mr Klunder.

Petition received.

PETITION: CARE PROVIDERS

A petition signed by 489 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to increase amounts paid to care providers and leave the ceiling on the number of children cared for to the discretion of family day care coordinators was presented by Mr S.G. Evans.

Petition received.

PETITION: DAYLIGHT SAVING

A petition signed by 1 132 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to repeal the Daylight Saving Act was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

QUESTION TIME

The **SPEAKER**: Before calling on the Leader of the Opposition to ask his question, I point out that any questions that would have been directed to the Minister of Mines and Energy should be directed to the Deputy Premier.

FRINGE BENEFITS TAX

Mr OLSEN: With our car making and retailing industries now at crisis point, will the Premier join his Western Australian counterpart in leading a delegation to Canberra to

insist on an immediate review of the fringe benefits tax? The impact of the fringe benefits tax is now being felt on the factory floor, as shown by Mitsubishi's decision to put its work force on a four day week. The layoffs by car dealers also highlight the devastating nature of this tax, which has forced registrations to their lowest level in South Australia since 1970. Western Australia is less affected by this tax in many respects but its Premier (Mr Burke) is to lead a delegation to Canberra later this month representing farming, mining, engineering, manufacturing, retail and service industries to seek changes to the legislation. This initiative would have far more prospect of success if South Australia would participate as well. I therefore ask the Premier whether he will re-think his support for the fringe benefits tax given at last year's tax summit, condemn the Federal Government for the way it is affecting South Australia more than any other State, and join Mr Burke in his move for an immediate review.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In explaining his question, the Leader of the Opposition said nothing that I have not already said publicly, loudly and directly on a number of occasions. In fact, I remind the House that it was as a result of my intervention in large part that at least some modification (admittedly not sufficient) was made to the fringe benefits tax on motor vehicles and, if members opposite are sceptical about that statement, they should consult with members of the Automobile Chamber of Commerce in Canberra, whose national group I addressed. In fact, I played a leading role in working hard to ensure that some modification was made to the fringe benefits tax.

Having said that, I concede that those modifications did not go far enough. The very effects that I predicted would occur and in fact told the Federal Treasurer would occur are showing up. I said at that time that, unless the Federal Government stood ready to review urgently the impact of that tax and to make modifications as necessary, it would have a massive effect on employment and the future of the car industry, and that that would have an out of proportion impact on South Australia itself. My position has remained very firmly that. It has been very publicly put. In fact, I could quote letters from various elements of the industry, both nationally and in South Australia, thanking me for the efforts I have made on their behalf, and I will continue to do so.

As to the question of whether I will, like Mr Brian Burke, Premier of Western Australia, lead a delegation to Canberra, I suggest that at this stage it is an exercise in futility and I am not terribly interested in such exercises. I am not quite sure what Premier Burke seeks to achieve and I will certainly consult with him about exactly what he has in mind. But, there is no question that the federal budget at the moment is virtually locked into place and to believe that post budget we shall achieve some change in the Federal Government's attitude after all the evidence and all the submissions that have so far been made is absolute nonsense. I will not unreasonably raise hopes and spend time, effort and energy on a useless pursuit at this stage.

What I believe should be done is this: there should be continued, constant and detailed monitoring of the situation. An attempt should be made to dissect the effect of the tax from various other factors causing the downturn in the motor vehicle industry. Let us not forget that 1985 was an unprecedented record year for motor vehicle sales. The year 1986 has seen a massive downturn. It is obvious, therefore, that whilst some of the effect of that can be ascribed to the fringe benefits tax there are a whole lot of other market, cost, dollar devaluation and interest rate factors at work deflating the car industry. Labor policies have nothing to

do with what is happening to our commodity prices and the value of the dollar. I make that point and that has had an impact.

I will not be involved in any half-baked, unresearched, undocumented approach to Canberra because the answer will be quite simply, 'Go away.' Approaches along that line in the past have simply hardened the resolve of the Federal Government, made it quite dismissive of the claims, and I have had this experience with Keating myself. In fact, one goes backwards and not forwards. When the time is right, when we can make some gains, then I stand ready to make further representations.

JUBILEE POINT PROJECT

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Minister for Environment and Planning inform the House what progress has been made in relation to the Jubilee Point project? During the parliamentary recess I received several pieces of correspondence from residents in the Henley and Grange council area expressing concern about the proposed Jubilee Point project. The Henley and Grange council circularised the council area expressing concern about the possible effect of sand erosion on the local beaches. Many doubts have been expressed about the environmental impact statement. I have received very large submissions from the Grange Peace Group and from an environmentalist resident in the Henley and Grange area, all expressing concern about the proposed Jubilee Point project. Many people are waiting with some anxiety for a decision on this matter.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Jubilee Point project application is being dealt with under section 50 of the Planning Act which involves the preparation of an environmental impact statement and proper assessment by my department before a decision is made as to whether the project can proceed. It is a novel project, involving as it does the reclamation of a small portion of the gulf and, as such, must be able to pass the very stringent test as to whether it would have, either in the short or long term, any deleterious impact on coastal processes. The proponents have therefore spent some time in their environmental impact statement trying to come to grips with that matter.

The environmental impact statement has been open for public comment and has been on public exhibition for some time. I believe that time has now elapsed. From memory, 102 submissions were made and it may be that some of the people who contacted the honourable member, in fact, number among those petitioners. Those petitions have all been sent, along with certain reports from Government departments, to the applicants for their further response. Once that further response has been received, the whole matter will be assessed by my Assessments Branch, within the Development Management Division, with a view to a submission being made to Cabinet.

I assure the honourable member and those who have approached him that, while the Government is not prejudging the outcome, it is concerned that all of the proper and very stringent processes which apply within the Planning Act shall be applied and we are, in effect, about midway through that process.

FRINGE BENEFITS TAX

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Can the Premier say what is the total cost to all State Government departments, authorities, and instrumentalities, of paying fringe benefits

tax this financial year? What action, if any, is the Government going to take to minimise the cost?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have already said that our current estimate is of the order of \$6 million or so as a full year cost in 1986-87 of fringe benefits tax if there are no changes to current arrangements. As to what changes, modifications or other action we will take, I intend to make an announcement probably in the budget context on that.

SCHOOL CLOSURES

Mr KLUNDER: Will the Minister of Education indicate what the situation is regarding school closures? The matter of school closures was made a public issue by the Opposition, in the person of Mr Lucas from another place, as reported in the *Advertiser* yesterday. I have had a telephone call from a concerned parent, who has indicated to me that, rather than face the uncertainty regarding local public schools, he will, at very considerable expense, send his children to a private school, thus reducing the numbers of students in public schools. Will the Minister clarify the matter?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his most important question. I was very surprised to read yesterday in the early edition of the *News* a story headed 'Schools to go in cutbacks—Libs' and to there read statements attributing to me and senior officers of the Education Department plans, on a massive scale, to close schools in this State. I can assure members—and indeed the public, as I did yesterday—that there is absolutely no truth in that at all and that at no stage in the current round of budget discussions has there been any discussion regarding the closure of schools.

I was surprised that that newspaper saw fit to publish such a substantial allegation without checking with my office or me to verify it. I checked in my department and certainly no senior officers had any such plans under way that I did not know about, and I was able to give those assurances on their behalf as well. That story was dropped from the later editions of that newspaper and the Opposition spokesman on education then came up with another story saying that if that was not the case, then he had heard the Director-General of Education, at a meeting my wife and I had attended last week, saying that there would be some school closures. The Director-General has explained to me, and publicly, that he was referring to a particular school situation, and that he did not rule out that there could be some school closures in the normal course of events of the Education Department's activities each year.

As I have said in response to questions asked of me about this matter, the department does consider in its normal round of discussions each year the viability of various schools. There is at present in this State one school with five students, three of them from the one family. That family may well leave that community and that could well affect the viability of the school. Indeed, with respect to a number of schools, we must maintain the curriculum offering to children so that we can fulfil our responsibility to provide a proper and adequate education for the children of the State.

That is a different issue indeed from wholesale closures of schools to achieve budget savings and the like. I simply reiterate the assurance I have given the people of this State that, wherever there is a possibility of a school closure, that matter will be discussed with the community, as the department has always done in the past. These matters do not come about overnight. They are discussed at length with communities and worked through in a responsible way. I

join with the member for Todd and reiterate my concern that such attacks on our public education system do great harm to its standing in the community and to the confidence that people and parents have in our school system. We have in this State an excellent system of education, and we are very proud of the system built up by successive Labor Administrations. I am very confident indeed that the budget to be brought down will ensure that there is a maintenance of those very high standards.

ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: My question was to the Minister of Mines and Energy, but if either the Deputy Premier or Premier feels able to answer it—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I hope that we get an answer; I will put it as plainly as that. Will electricity tariffs rise this year, and by how much? No doubt in the budget discussions, the Labor Party will be counting the taxes it has imposed on the Electricity Trust? All the taxes on the sale of electricity have been imposed by Labor Governments. In this context, by how much does the Premier or Deputy Premier believe that ETSA tariffs will rise this year?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The last increase occurred, I think, in 1984. In November 1985, a decrease of 2 per cent occurred, and in real terms that was a very significant saving to electricity consumers in this State. So much for the nonsense that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition states. As to this year, naturally there is an annual review of ETSA tariffs. ETSA will, at the appropriate time, hold further discussions with and approach the Government, but I would refer the Deputy Leader to my statement that, in future, it is hoped that we can hold electricity tariffs at or below the rate of CPI.

RIVERLAND UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr DUIGAN: Did the Minister of Employment and Further Education see in the *Sunday Mail* on 18 May this year an article which quoted the Leader of the Opposition as saying that fruit was being left to rot on trees in the Riverland because growers could not get pickers, despite high unemployment levels in the region or, as the article quoted the Leader, 'Jobless won't work'? Could the Minister comment on this slur on young people who are genuinely seeking work?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am certainly prepared to comment. I have seen the article that appeared in the paper that day. I was indeed surprised to know of the depths to which the Leader of the Opposition will go yet again to gain cheap political capital, and I thought that this kind of slinging out at the unemployed of this State does not do any service to the people who are suffering unemployment in South Australia. In fact, the situation was much more serious than just the matter of whether or not the Leader of the Opposition chooses to make cheap political capital out of these sorts of things.

It actually caused hardship to some of the people concerned, because the *Sunday Mail* is read by many people in South Australia. Some of those people are unemployed, and some of them are desperate in their unemployment and are eager to try to find work wherever they can. They read the article and thought, 'There is a job for us, something

that we can do.' At their own cost these people travelled to the Riverland and went into the CES office up there to seek the very jobs that the Leader of the Opposition claims are empty for want of being filled by the unemployed who do not seem to want to work. When they arrived in the Riverland these people found that no jobs were available for fruitpicking in the Riverland. They found out, as others already knew, that the growers were between crops and that there was no fruit to pick. Those people then—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:—had to find their own way back to Adelaide and, in the case of three of them, were so destitute of personal resources, having spent their resources to get up there, that they had to seek emergency funding in the Riverland. They were given this funding by an agency, enabling them to return to Adelaide. To back this up, I refer to a letter addressed to the Leader of the Opposition from the St James Community Centre Committee, Waikerie Intercare Centre, dated 22 May, following the press release from the Leader of the Opposition. The letter reads as follows:

In the *Sunday Mail* of 18 May 1986—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It is clear that members opposite do not want to know about this and that their Leader, who they thought would have researched a matter as serious as this, obviously did not do so. The letter comes from people based in the Riverland who had to provide money to bail out these people in the Riverland to help them get back to Adelaide. The letter states:

In the *Sunday Mail* of 18 May 1986 you were quoted as stating that 'fruit is being left to rot on trees in the Riverland because growers cannot get pickers, despite high unemployment . . .' Your statement brought three young unemployed men, anxious to find work, on a journey to the Riverland this week.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Leader of the Opposition is obviously trying to drown me out so that I cannot read out this letter. The letter continues:

They had pooled their available money for petrol and travelled to Berri. They contacted the CES Job Centres in Berri, Renmark and Waikerie and discovered what we had known for some time—there were no jobs for pickers or unskilled workers in the Riverland as growers are between crops. Destitute, out of money, out of petrol, they approached our agency for sufficient money to purchase petrol to enable them to return to Adelaide.

The possibility that other people, who perhaps had more cash, had followed the same road must be taken into consideration. Whilst we were more than willing to help, such help would have been unnecessary had you checked the veracity of your statements with our local job centres.

The letter is signed by an officer on behalf of the St James Intercare Office based at Waikerie. I believe that for the Leader of the Opposition to take that kind of approach to achieve cheap capital at personal cost to the unemployed, who take the trouble to try to find jobs, brings him nothing but discredit.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: If the Leader was genuinely concerned about issues such as this, he would have taken the trouble to do a bit of research beforehand.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call to order members on both sides, and that includes the member for Chaffey and the member for Briggs. Members on both sides should be aware that the proper time for making debating points is during debate on Bills, debate on resolutions, in the Address in

Reply debate, grievance debates, and other occasions specifically set aside for that purpose. Comments and debate should not be introduced in the explanations given to questions, as in the concluding remark of the member for Adelaide in the question that he just put before the House.

Mr S.G. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, you make the point that debate should not be included in a question being asked. Mr Speaker, I refer you to Blackmore and the Standing Orders and suggest that debate should not be included in answers by Ministers, either. This has gone on in the House for a long time, and I ask you, Sir, to clarify the situation. When we were debating Standing Orders last year, the Deputy Premier said that an endeavour would be made to exclude the extravagances that occur.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member to order. The member is entitled to take a point of order but is not entitled to make a speech in support of it. Will the member reiterate his point of order?

Mr S.G. EVANS: I apologise, Mr Speaker. I was attempting to ensure that you understood why I had made the point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! I trust that the member is not reflecting on the Chair.

Mr S.G. EVANS: No, Mr Speaker. Standing Order 123 provides:

At the time of giving notices of motion, questions may be put to Ministers of the Crown relating to public affairs; and to other members, relating to any Bill, motion, or other public matter connected with the business of the House, in which such members may be concerned.

Standing Order 125 says:

In answering any such question, a member shall not debate the matter to which the same refers.

Those Standing Orders are quite clear. Blackmore, on page 127, says:

More latitude is given, by courtesy—
and I emphasise 'by courtesy'—

to a Minister than to a private member, in replying; but the Minister should avoid expressions which call forth observations from members, and excite debate.

It is quite clear from that that Ministers should also not debate a reply or use debate in their reply. Mr Speaker, in your explanation a moment ago you only referred to debate in relation to the asking of questions. I submit to you that it also relates to the answering of questions.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member did hear correctly. I specifically referred to members in general, but not to Ministers in particular, because a certain degree of tolerance has always been granted in this respect by the House. I intend to maintain that practice, which was established long before I became the incumbent of the Chair.

TOBACCO TAX

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Premier give an assurance that the State tobacco tax will not be increased in the State budget, as such a move would give even more impetus to the bootlegging of cigarettes in South Australia? The Opposition has received information that a Queensland firm, J & M Enterprises of Nerang, has recently forwarded a price list offering, through its ability to indulge in bootlegging activities, cut price cigarettes to tobacconists in South Australia, avoiding the State tobacco tax of 25 per cent. By coincidence, J & M is offering cigarettes at about 25 per cent less than the prevailing wholesale prices in South Australia.

The Opposition has contacted a number of tobacconists, who have confirmed the activities of J & M and indicated

that a number of other groups remain active in bootlegging. While the Opposition warned, in 1983, when the Government doubled the tobacco tax, that bootlegging would occur, and while some action subsequently has been taken to prevent it, industry sources estimate that tobacco products to the value of \$2 million a year are still being brought into South Australia illegally. This means that the State Government is losing about \$500 000 a year in tax. These bootleggers run highly sophisticated operations with factories and canteens as their major targets. There is now major concern among South Australian wholesalers and retailers that the Government intends to increase the tobacco tax to 35 per cent in the forthcoming budget, which would further encourage bootlegging and cost the Government even more in lost revenue.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will not speculate or foreshadow matters relating to the budget. However, I thank the honourable member for the information that he has put before the House in respect of this approach. I am not sure whether the Taxation Commissioner is aware of it, but I will certainly refer the question and explanation to him. The honourable member, in his explanation, also referred to other such instances that I think he said were known to the Opposition. I would certainly appreciate notification of that.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Thank you. The Leader has undertaken to do that, and I appreciate it. There is no question that bootlegging is serious from two points of view. First, it is a fact that people are illegally avoiding their revenue obligations in South Australia; and, secondly, one of the purposes of the tobacco tax is for health reasons. Obviously, if the price of cigarettes is lowered, it will become more attractive, particularly to juvenile purchasers of cigarettes or tobacco. That is also a very bad thing. For both those reasons, I would appreciate any information that honourable members may have so that we can stamp this out.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT

Mr ROBERTSON: Does the Minister of Transport wish to comment on the following interpretation of recent amendments to the Road Traffic Act by one of the three city councils in my district? I shall quote from the council's minutes.

The SPEAKER: Order! The way in which the honourable member's question was phrased is out of order and I suggest that he resume his seat and reconstruct his question so that it is in accordance with Standing Orders.

CREDIT CARD TAX

Mr S.J. BAKER: Will the Premier say whether Treasury officers have advised him on the introduction of a new tax on credit card transactions in the forthcoming State budget and, if they have, will he accept such advice? Speculation about this tax has arisen because of the reduction in revenue from stamp duty on cheque forms over the past four years that has been caused by the move to paperless financial—credit card—transactions. However, as the introduction of this new tax would mean yet another broken election promise, will the Premier put an end today to such speculation?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think that the speculation referred to may have arisen because (speaking from memory, without checking) the Tasmanian and Queensland Governments have both levied such a tax. I understand that

both Governments are also going into the financial institutions duty field which was so rabidly denounced by members opposite despite its clear equity in terms of its progressive nature. Perhaps that is the source of the rumours that the honourable member wishes to peddle. I cannot comment further than that.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT

Mr ROBERTSON: In accordance with your direction, Mr Speaker, I now address my rephrased question to the Minister of Transport. Is the Minister aware of certain comments by a council in my district on the recent amendments to the Road Traffic Act? The following is a quotation from council minutes:

The Town Clerk reported that . . . the Road Traffic Act has been revised with matters of the responsibility now transferred to the Road Safety Division of the Department of Transport . . . The [council] administration's view is that little appears to have changed in that at this stage very little delegation has been given direct to councils. In fact, it appears likely that approvals for various installations may take longer than before, because at least the Road Traffic Board was a 'one stop shop'. Various approvals are now required from a number of different organisations.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I was not aware of the statement made by the chief executive officer of a council in the honourable member's district. I will check with him after Question Time to identify the council so that I can get one of my officers to speak to the person concerned. I am surprised that any chief executive officer could so badly mislead his or her council, because I have written to every council in South Australia and a seminar has been arranged for council officers so that they may be fully aware of the benefits that have flowed to councils from the abolition of the Road Traffic Board.

In fact, the abolition of the board is completely opposite to that to which the chief executive officer has referred. The previous Road Traffic Board, when it received an application from council, would refer that application to the Road Safety Division, the Highways Department or the appropriate authority for advice. Then, the board, when it met once a month, would consider the matter and, if the board needed to reinvestigate it, it would do so. There was a considerable time delay, whereas now it is a 'one stop shop'. As Minister, I have delegated certain authority to councils, the Highways Department, the Police Commissioner and the Road Safety Division, so that they can deal with requests from councils immediately and so shorten the time, decrease the bureaucracy, and have a more effective system. I will have one of my officers contact the councils involved so that they can be better informed on how they benefit from the Road Traffic Board's abolition.

TRANSPHERE (SOUTH PACIFIC) PTY LTD

Mr GROOM: Will the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place, investigate purported debt notices being issued by an interstate company known as Transphere (South Pacific) Pty Ltd of Sydney and issue a warning to the public if found appropriate? A number of delicatessen owners in South Australia have received a visit from either agents or employees of this company—or, indeed, from the principals—in which a booklet called *Financial Independence* was left with the delicatessen owner on the basis that if it were not sold at the shop the person would call back and take back the

books. In other words, there was very little obligation, if any, on the shopkeeper. In the instant case, the delicatessen owner sold none of the booklets in his shop and, needless to say, no representative of the company called to collect any of the books that remained unsold.

The next sequence in the chain was that a notice of demand was sent to the delicatessen owner to pay up or to return the books. In the instant case the delicatessen owner actually returned the books by virtue of the postal services. Notwithstanding that, the delicatessen owner received in the post a document entitled 'Notice of Referral to Courts of Petty Sessions'. The effect of the document was as if it were a summons issued out of a court. The amount claimed in the instant case was \$135. On reading the fine print, one comes to understand that it is not actually a summons but set out as if it were a summons issued by the court. At the bottom of the document is a further notice headed 'Crimes Act—obtaining credit by fraud', quoting sections 178(c) and 179 of the Crimes Act, and informing people that they commit a criminal offence and are liable for imprisonment if they have incurred any debt or liability by false pretence.

The Minister would be well aware of the thin line a company treads when demanding money by virtue of an allegation or a suggestion of a criminal offence. Not content with a document that purports to resemble a summons, the company issues a bankruptcy notice at the same time, headed 'Notice of intention to issue a bankruptcy notice', and members would be aware that the bankruptcy limit is \$1 500 and not \$135. In the instant case the delicatessen owner made further protests, and his account, so to speak, was cleared. However, a number of delicatessen owners have received such documentation in the post and consequently, because of the seriousness of the nature of the documentation in purporting to resemble a summons and the issue of a bankruptcy notice, which causes grave concern, I ask the Minister to investigate the matter and issue an appropriate warning.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question and bringing the matter to the attention of the House. I will most certainly pass on the information to the Attorney-General. I am not sure whether the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs has authority to act on behalf of people other than consumers, as a small business operator would. There may well be other laws that can provide the protection which the honourable member seeks for his constituent.

HOUSING TRUST RENTS

Mr BECKER: Is the Minister of Housing and Construction considering increases in Housing Trust rents following a report by a consultant that the trust is facing financial crisis? If so, will the Minister make the report public, and will he tell the House the extent of increases being considered and when a decision will be made?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I was rather surprised yesterday in the House that the member for Hanson did not come up with his question, but when I read the *News* I found that yesterday was death threat day, so the plight of Housing Trust tenants is left for another day.

First, the member for Hanson asks whether I will make the report public. When the Government instituted the triennial review on the Housing Trust rent structure and the operation of the Housing Trust he poured scorn on that move by the Government. He said it was an election gim-

mick, and that we were freezing rents because we were facing a hostile electorate. I am glad that at last he realises that it was a genuine attempt by the Government to look at the rent structure for the Housing Trust, to look at where we can improve efficiency measures and whether we can improve our standing with the trust tenants. He will recall that, when we set up the review, he did not really understand it and he did his usual trick and poured scorn on it.

I congratulate the *Sunday Mail* for giving a concise report on the problems facing the South Australian Housing Trust. The journalist in question did not have to get the review; he had only to look at the messages that were coming through from Loan Council and the different Housing Trust reports that we have had over the last five years to make it perfectly clear that the cost of rent reductions has been rising quite alarmingly. Of course, since the Loan Council decisions the problem has been made more pertinent. In fact, if we do not take measures to arrest some of the financial problems facing the Housing Trust, there is a very good chance that in six or seven years the Housing Trust will have a deficit in the region of that of the STA. That means that all the money we are getting from the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement will not be spent on building new homes to ease the waiting list, but will be used purely and simply to pay for rent reductions and other areas where this Government is—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: It is interesting that in 1984, when I introduced the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement into this House for debate—and there were about eight speakers on the other side—I signalled the problems that we are facing regarding rent reductions within the South Australian Housing Trust and within the private sector. As a Government, we have picked up a fairly generous response for those in the private sector. Only one member opposite picked that up, and I congratulate the member for Coles, who devoted almost the whole of her speech to the problem of rent reductions and signalled that although the situation in 1984 was bad, if things continued in the same way, we would be in a worse situation.

Members will also recall that, when the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement was negotiated in Canberra, this Government fought hard to get Commonwealth assistance regarding rent reductions. The Federal Government agreed in principle that it was its responsibility because it was an income problem, but failed to give any money. All the Federal Government did was allow me to use Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement money to offset our rent reductions.

The situation is that the cost of money to the trust is increasing. We were successful in getting 100 per cent nominated funds from the Federal Government, but we lost out because the figure was reduced from \$131 million to \$101 million; so I am down \$30 million on cheap money—4½ per cent money—to be able to administer the program.

If we cannot get 4½ per cent money we have to get it at market rates. So, we are looking seriously at that report and trying to signal to the community at large that, if we are going to consider the 38 000 people who are seeking accommodation on the Housing Trust waiting list, and if we want to maintain that program, we have to look seriously at the question of rent reduction as well as relativity between different tenants and the types of housing they occupy.

We have to look at the boundaries of the inner and outer metropolitan areas, and at a whole range of questions. So, if the member for Hanson is asking whether I will be putting up Housing Trust rents, as he is supposed to be the spokesman for housing on the other side, he should recognise that

we are in a bad financial situation which is not the fault of this Government nor of the Housing Trust, but because we as a Government and the Housing Trust generally have always recognised its responsibility to those disadvantaged tenants in the public sector. We will continue to look after those people, but we have to look at the percentage of rent in relation to the income that they get.

That is the only answer I will give the member for Hanson. If he wants me to spell it out, I suggest that he wait until I have looked at the report and put forward recommendations to Cabinet. Perhaps then we can discuss it. Whether or not I will make the report available I have yet to make up my mind. It was prepared by Touche Ross, a responsible consultant, and perhaps it might be worthwhile if we make that report available to members of the public, who can reach their own conclusions on whether or not this Government is doing the right thing. I make perfectly clear to the House and to the public that I do not intend, as long as I am a Minister in this Government, to run down the Housing Trust so that we end up with a deficit in the region of \$60 million or \$70 million.

DEAD TREES

Ms GAYLER: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning institute an immediate investigation into a proposal for commercial harvesting of dead river red gums and other trees from the Murray River flood plain? A constituent of mine, who is an official of the South Australian Field and Game Association, has presented to me documents demonstrating that a private Renmark earthmover proposes commercial harvesting within the Murray River flood plain using a bulldozer to pull over dead trees such as river red gums, explosives to split large specimens, and sawing, chipping and reprocessing of small timber. The proposal rests on the basis that dead trees are an unused resource that could boost firewood supplies, particularly for the Adelaide and Melbourne domestic firewood markets. The proponent of the development, according to his documents, envisages an enormous industry and employment benefits, but it has been put to me that the proposal will have serious environmental effects on the habitat and on water quality within the Murray River.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am aware that a person has made an approach to various Government department agencies in the Riverland with a view to an industry along the lines envisaged by the honourable member. The first thing I want to say is that dead timber does have an environmental function. A dead tree may well be a nesting site for various forms of birds and, in addition, the effort to remove dead timber from an area may bring with it a large degree of ecological disturbance, which, particularly if the area is fragile, may be something that we are unable to countenance.

However, I am not prepared at this stage to reject this whole matter completely out of hand. The gentleman concerned has been very responsible in the way in which he has gone about his approaches to the various agencies, and I think it is better at this stage to allow those agencies to do the work that has to be undertaken and then for the Government to make a decision once all the facts are known. So, I am not prepared to reject the proposition out of hand, but I would stress that because dead timber is involved, it does not automatically follow that approval would be given, for the reasons that I have outlined. I thank the honourable member for drawing the matter to the attention of the House.

RANDOM BREATH TESTING

Mr INGERSON: Recalling the statements that the Premier made at the Government's road safety forum in March 1984 that the Government was serious about road safety, that it would take action and that South Australians wanted something done to reduce death and injury on our roads, and recognising that the road toll is currently 10 higher than last year, will the Premier give an unequivocal commitment to implement the key recommendations, made more than 15 months ago, of the Upper House select committee which reviewed random breath testing, or will the Government continue to buckle to union pressure on this matter?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member is aware that he is not allowed to introduce comment into his explanation.

Mr INGERSON: It is the second part of my question. The key recommendations of the Upper House select committee, which reported in April last year, were for the police to be given adequate resources to ensure proper implementation of random breath testing. The correctness of those recommendations, made unanimously by the all Party committee, was confirmed in the report which was tabled in this House yesterday and which stated that random breath testing was potentially the most effective counter measure to the involvement of alcohol in accidents. However, the Government has so far refused to act on these recommendations because of union pressure, led by the Liquor Trades Union, against random breath testing. In view of yesterday's report, and the rising road toll, I ask the Premier for a clear commitment that those recommendations will be implemented immediately.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member displays as much ignorance about road safety as he does about sport. I guess a prerequisite for the member might be to actually try to study the facts and retailor them instead of peddling absolute nonsense and misleading people, which he is developing a habit of doing. His credibility was reasonably high 12 months or so ago when he was shadowing the shadow Minister. Since he officially came out of a half shadow and is now a full shadow he is severely under threat.

Regarding the road safety issue and the recommendations of the random breath testing select committee, I do not know where the member obtains this nonsense about pressure. It is certainly true that many people in the community (and perhaps the Liquor Trades Union is among them) claim that random breath testing will result in massive job losses in the liquor industry. I do not know whether in fact that has been borne out.

I should have thought that, with the amendments and reforms that we have made to the licensing legislation in this State, that was far less likely to occur. Also, a very virulent media campaign was waged against random breath testing at different times. That is not a concern of the Government; our concern is to ensure that the right measures are taken to promote road safety and to see whether or not random breath testing can contribute to that. The evidence in the report issued by the Minister yesterday is that so far random breath testing has not had a significant effect, and there is considerable assessment and speculation about that. For a start, it is very difficult indeed to establish the appropriate level of random breath testing.

The practice between the various States ranges from New South Wales through to Tasmania, which I think has the highest percentage of drivers apprehended or drivers tested; Victoria has a ratio which is less than ours; and Queensland has no random breath testing at all. The relative accident rates in those States and a number of other things are to be questioned. I would have thought that, if union pressure

was the key, the Queensland Government must have had a sudden change of heart in its refusal to have anything to do with it. So much for that assertion.

In relation to what the Government is doing, we have said all along that we are systematically testing random breath testing and its effectiveness. As the Minister has already pointed out, the report refers to 1985—before we have had a chance to gauge the effect of the upgraded amendments that we made last year. They will be revealed during the course of the year. In terms of the extra resources that may be needed, they have still not been adequately defined. We are in fact going through that exercise at the moment, and we stand ready to support, with extra resources as appropriate, the development of random breath testing. However, I make the point that one must have a balance between the effectiveness of the resources that one uses and the alternative use to which those resources could be put.

I know that honourable members are very keen on proposing expenditure in each and every area which happens to suit them, which they happen to read about or on which someone has asked them to comment. We have built up a list of some hundreds of millions of dollars just in the past week. That is not bad going on the part of the Opposition. However, I make the point that resources are not infinite and that they must be balanced in terms of priorities between the various areas. Within those limits of effectiveness, we are certainly prepared to provide extra resources to random breath testing if it can be proved more effective.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN SPORTING FACILITIES

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport outline to the House what stage the Department of Recreation and Sport has reached in developing major sporting facilities in South Australia?

Mr Olsen: Read the *News*.

Ms LENEHAN: That is exactly what I have done. I am asking my question in response to an article in today's *News* entitled, 'Mayes must "come clean"—Ingerson', which expressed the views of the member for Bragg. I ask the question because certain allegations and assertions are made in the article, which states:

The State Government was "bungling" the future of South Australian sport, the shadow recreation and sport spokesman, Mr Graham Ingerson, said today . . . Mr Ingerson said the sports facility program in South Australia had developed into a fiasco and considerable funding had been wasted on a series of feasibility studies.

It has been put to me that such irresponsible claims—

Mr Ingerson: By whom?

Ms LENEHAN: By a constituent who telephoned me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Bragg to order. The member for Mawson will conclude her question.

Ms LENEHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. It has been put to me that such irresponsible claims are prejudicing the allocation of recreation and sport facilities in this State.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for her concern. Obviously she is more aware of what is happening in the sports area than is the shadow Minister. Given his track record over the past year I was interested to see the honourable member emerge in the daily newspaper and not in this House. One would expect him to ask these questions in the House, but we have not heard from him—not one question. He was prepared to go to the media, when he should have asked a question in this House, which is the correct forum in which these matters should be raised. Not only did he go to the media, but also he did not get

his story right—as usual. As with other events, we have found that to be the style of the shadow Minister.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I will, if the honourable member will just be quiet. The track record of the member for Mitcham is just as eminent as that of the member for Bragg in directing his questions and collecting his information in a comprehensive way. We should look at what is on the scoreboard in relation to sport in this State. The Opposition was very generous last year with its criticism of and knocking in regard to the aquatic centre. We hear nothing from them now, except that it wants to swim around and enjoy the facility. The comments that I have received—and I know that the shadow Minister would have heard the same comments from interstate and overseas guests who attended the national swimming titles held at the centre—were very positive. Australia's international team members said that it was the best facility in Australia. Where is the Opposition now? Opposition members have disappeared down their burrow, as usual. The shadow Minister said that I should come clean. I am happy to do so and to put on the record exactly what the situation is. Last week in Parliament I indicated that the hockey stadium site was close to finalisation.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: We deal with people in a sensitive manner. We consult them. That is contrary to what the Opposition did when it was in government.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sure that there would be greater opportunity for members to ask questions if the House was a little less unruly.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Mount Gambier pipes up with a comment but, from my experience of his handling of consultation and negotiation, I believe that he should disappear down to Mount Gambier because his scorecard is appalling. We could hardly use him as an example of a person who was responsible for consultation. Concerning the issues raised by the member for Mawson and in reference to the article in the *News*, with all deference to Ms Ralston. I must point out that she did not contact me or my department to ascertain our response.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: She has not even got her sums right. For instance, on the velodrome we have spent \$99 000 on a feasibility study of a project the total cost of which would be about \$10 million. On the athletics track, we have spent about \$24 000 studying the feasibility of a project the total cost of which would be almost \$4 million. On the hockey field, we have spent \$99 000 to study the feasibility of a project that would cost about \$3.8 million. So, it can be seen that there has been extravagant waste on the cost of the study of the feasibility of an international sporting facility for this State! Concerning the hockey field, my department has had discussions with the Department of Aviation and had contact with officers of that department. As a result, it has received approval in principle from the Department of Aviation.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The honourable member has not done his homework properly. He has not followed the matter through with the department. Seven months later, after I was appointed, I inquired to double check the position with the Department of Aviation. It was then that we received a letter from the department, indicating that it was objecting to the lighting—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: You obviously do not know and you have proved your ignorance again and again. I

should have thought that you had learnt from 5AA that you should pull your head in and find a—

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable Minister that he should address his remarks to the Chair, although I certainly should not like him to address his last remark to the Chair.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I certainly would not. However I shall address the Chair and refer to the shadow Minister as the member for Bragg. I make the point that it is clear that the shadow spokesperson has again not done his homework in this area. In relation to the hockey facilities, we have had sensitive discussions with residents of the area. I believe that we will effect a major achievement in establishing the facility. I appreciate the patience of the hockey fraternity in this State, and I believe that they understand the difficulties. They are not knocking the project, as is the shadow Minister. They have a forum in the media in which to knock, whereas the shadow Minister has a forum in the Parliament, although he does not use it.

I could refer to other positive factors. During my ministry, we have opened negotiations and discussions and we have achieved agreement between the parties on the use of the Olympic Sports Field, which is something into which the shadow Minister poked his nose with little help and little success towards resolving the situation. That is another score on the board for our efforts in this area. I wish to correct some comments contained in Margaret Ralston's article and in the shadow Minister's remarks concerning the South Australian Sports Institute. The article states that the institute is to have a shoestring budget of \$500 000. However, even that is wrong, because \$670 000 has been devoted to the Sports Institute. By calling on the Premier to reduce taxes while on the other hand requesting that additional funds be spent, the Opposition is adopting a carping attitude in its criticism of the Government. Whence are the funds to come? I am not embarrassed to have to say that this Government has a score on the board and that the Opposition is seen in its true light as knockers.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: CHANGE OF NAME

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I wish to advise the House that I have changed my name. From now on, I will be known as Jennifer Cashmore, which is my original family name. The circumstances which led to this decision are sad and all too common. Through no wish of mine, my marriage has ended. There is, therefore, no reason why I should continue to be known by my husband's name.

I had a happy childhood and girlhood as Jennifer Cashmore and, for the greater part of the past 27 years, a happy marriage as Jennifer Adamson. As I am soon to be divorced, I believe it is now time to look positively to the future as Jennifer Cashmore. Whatever I achieve from now on, I will achieve in my own name.

I would like to acknowledge my husband's support for my political career and his willingness to accept the often onerous demands which are made on the spouses and families of members of Parliament.

It is perhaps a matter of interest that a Jubilee history of women in South Australia, to be published later this year, is titled *In Her Own Name*. The title, symbolic of women's

changing status over the past 150 years, is taken from the 1883-84 Married Women's Property Act, which enabled married women, for the first time, to own and control property in their own name. Previously such rights were vested in their husbands. Coincidentally, the author of *In Her Own Name* is my eldest sister, Dr Helen Jones.

It will perhaps also be of interest to future historians to know that the resumption of what has been known as a woman's maiden name by women who are, or are about to be, divorced is now relatively common, as is the practice, for a number of women, of retaining their family name rather than taking their husband's name on marriage.

There has never been any legal requirement for a woman to change her name on marriage, and the custom that has influenced this tradition is now giving way to the wish of many women to retain what they perceive as their own identity through retaining their own name.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended so that tomorrow the adjourned debate on the question 'That the Address in Reply as read be adopted' take precedence of all other business, including questions, between 11 a.m. and 1 p.m.

Members will be aware that Standing Order 44 provides that no business other than that of a formal character may be undertaken before the Address in Reply is completed. Although in the last session we changed the arrangements so that private members' business would proceed to the end of the session, however long that might be, we did not in fact touch Standing Order 44 at that point. The effect of Standing Order 44, read in conjunction with other Standing Orders, is that if this motion were not to be passed by the House Question Time would take place at 11 a.m. tomorrow rather than, as I am sure is anticipated by members, at its normal time. As I believe it is the desire of members that the normal time for Question Time proceed, I would urge this motion upon members and would also point out that it will not be necessary in subsequent weeks for the suspension of Standing Orders to be sought because, of course, as seems predictable from the way the present debate is going we will proceed to private members' business tomorrow week.

Motion carried.

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

That Standing Orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable Government Bills to be introduced before the Address in Reply is adopted.

This is normal procedure at this time.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I believe it to be the prerogative of members of the House under Standing Orders, when such a motion is put, for the mover to speak for 10 minutes and any other member to speak for a like time. Since this matter was not drawn to my attention before it appeared on the Notice Paper, because of the way in which the Deputy Premier behaved during the last occasion on which Parliament was in session by not permitting the Address in Reply to be concluded by the end of that session, and also because the Deputy Premier cannot be taken at his word, he having said that next Thursday he expects the Address in Reply to be concluded, I for one as a member of this place raise my voice in protest at the proposal that he puts before the Chamber without notice at this time.

I have my rights and responsibilities here as a representative of an approximately equal number of good citizens in this State as have the other 46 members. I do not believe

that as a backbencher those rights are being respected by the Executive in general and the Deputy Premier in particular. It is the cavalier fashion in which the Deputy Premier has dealt with those rights and our respective responsibilities in the past that brings me to my feet to protest at this time at the action he proposes to take. I do not think that other members have as yet allowed it to really sink in that on this occasion, if we pass this measure today, we would be setting a precedent with the new function of Standing Orders as they have been amended and it would indeed be possible for the Government to introduce Bills and extend the Address in Reply debate for several weeks, thus denying private members the opportunity to utilise Thursday mornings as promised to them.

I accept that whilst the Address in Reply is before the Chamber it is not appropriate for other business, either private members' or otherwise, in my opinion to take precedence. I insist that that ought to be the way in which we proceed from this point for no other reason than that, by the device of suspending Standing Orders in this way and leaving them suspended, we could introduce Government business and every Thursday continue to prevent private members' time from being used for any purpose whatsoever other than by way of the debate on the Address in Reply and thereby spread it out over six or eight weeks.

Even if we can take the Deputy Premier at his word this time, there is no certainty that we could take him or subsequent Leaders of the House at their word, because we are going to set a precedent. I do not think we should set that precedent, because it will enable subsequent Leaders, if not this one, to deny us as backbenchers the opportunity to use the time that was explicitly and specifically set aside for us, that is, to bring grievances and other motions before the attention of our colleagues in the course of debate in those precious two hours, which is all we have now each week, from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. I urge members to vote against this motion.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I will be charitable and assume that the honourable member has really misunderstood the nature of the motion. In fact, I guess I take some responsibility for not having spoken in support of the motion as put before the House. The proposition is not that Government business should be debated during this time but merely that Bills be introduced. So far as I am aware, that will apply only to those measures notice of which has already been given, although it is possible that there could be one or two further notices of motion tomorrow. I would imagine that in most cases, unless the honourable member or any of his colleagues insist, the second readings will be incorporated in the record without being read, and that will occur as part of a normal process. It in fact will leave the normal private members' business, as envisaged in the last session and as provided for in Standing Orders and approved in the last session, completely untouched.

A division on the motion was called for.

While the division bells were ringing:

Mr LEWIS: Mr Speaker, in the course of conversation it has been explained to me that the effective word, to which I have had my attention drawn, is 'introduced'. That being so, and realising that debate cannot proceed on those measures, I seek leave to withdraw my call for a division opposing the motion.

Leave granted.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 5 August. Page 91.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I rise to support the motion and in so doing wish to pass on my condolences to the families of Albert Hawke and Charles Harrison. I also take this opportunity to thank my supporters in the electorate of Bragg for the amount of work they did during the election campaign. I also thank the significant number of voters who supported the Liberal Party and who enabled me to return to this place to put down what I believe to be some fairly important matters.

I would like to rearrange my speech and bring forward my general comments in relation to recreation and sport. I bring these comments forward because it is interesting to note that in the Governor's speech the only mention of sport is in the area of the Grand Prix, which was a magnificent sporting event supported by both the Opposition and, obviously, by the Government. Once we take the Grand Prix out, we come to what I call the fiasco of sporting facilities development in this State and the fiasco of sporting events that have been run by this Government.

Only in the last two or three days in this House we have seen evidence of Government involvement in sport. We have seen the management of the World Three Day Event taken over by the Government and the disaster that has followed. The evidence of the Government backing off from its involvement in this event has been obvious to all in this House. Prior to that, we had the fiasco of the aquatic centre, a fiasco that was one of finance and not one of facilities. Not once was it ever criticised by people on this side of the House in terms of whether it would be a reasonable facility. We commented on many construction problems and the design of the pool; we commented—and I commented in particular—on the construction and depth of the pool and the diving tower. These were all criticisms of the construction and financing of the pool. From my comments in the House, there was no question of any criticism of whether we should have an aquatic centre or where it should be. The decision of having the aquatic centre, as far as our Government was concerned, was prior to my coming into this House.

The other fiasco that occurred last year—again Government instrumented—was the Olympic Sports Field, where the Government and the managers of the sports field and the managers of the athletics, could not sit down and get together. It is interesting to note that today the Minister says, 'At last, with my moving in, we have been able to get this thing fixed.' If that is the case, that is great for sport. If the Minister at last has been able to call off some of the henchmen of the department and get some reasonable discussions between the sports people and the administrators of the sport, then that must be good for South Australia and the sport concerned.

However, there are a couple of comments that we need to make about Olympic Sports Field. We know that the Government, through the department, has been required to purchase the track surface. It will be interesting, during the Estimates Committees, to get out of the department what is the actual interest bill being paid on the account as it relates to the track itself. Many figures have been bandied around and I do not intend doing that because that has never been the way I operate. There has been a very significant figure for the purchase of the carpet, which is lying idle, and interest is being paid on that bill. The Government needs to come clean on that.

The next fiasco we have is the \$4 million exercise purchased at the last Estimates Committee to involve the hockey development, the weight-lifting development and the small bore rifle development at Glenelg. It has been said here today that the Minister had had discussions with the Department of Aviation and had found out that it is all right. That is not the case. The Minister may have had the discussions with the Department of Aviation. I do not believe he did, but the Department of Aviation has always held the view that anything affecting the flight path would not be agreed to by it, and that has not changed since the original decision regarding the development of the West Beach Trust took place many years ago.

It is interesting to look at the plans for the hockey development. The Minister was very scant in his answer in discussing hockey, but let us look at hockey and the development that has occurred in trying to find a home base for it. Firstly, there were discussions with regard to some playing fields at St Marys. That was about the second or third issue, but it was the first serious decision by the Government to become involved and discuss those playing fields. For those in the House who are not aware, some very excellent plans were drawn up for that development, but they have been discarded. What is the cost of those plans? Discussions were introduced with the West Beach Trust but they very quickly fell through only to be replaced by the East Glenelg project. While we are talking about the West Beach Trust, I have been advised that the plans that are currently floating around in relation to SAMCOR look horribly like the plans that were put forward some years ago by the West Beach Trust, with a few streets and a few areas renamed.

After East Glenelg we went to the west parklands, and we had published in the media a magnificent complex; again, money spent on drawing up plans. What happened to that? That was knocked back by the Adelaide City Council because it did not believe that there ought to be a new sporting development in the parklands. After that, we had two sites at Woodville. The first site at Woodville was in a pughole and would have been an excellent site, but that was scrapped. The next site was on an oval in Woodville, but that has been scrapped. Now we have a redrawn plan from the West Beach Trust days for a plan out in the SAMCOR area—again, in a parkland area and an area that has been deemed by the Government to be a green belt area—where we are going to put sporting facilities involving some \$55 million. I have been involved in this Parliament in recreation and sport for only a short period of time, but we have not seen any development in recreation and sport that comes anywhere near \$55 million. Anyone who believes that we are going to get a \$55 million development in the next 10 years is pipedreaming.

We have had seven sites for hockey in less than 18 months. The Government has run out every plan for hockey to the public, and yet it says it has credibility and wonders why I have said today that it is about time it came clean in its total attitude to recreation and sport. The only thing the Government is interested in is the Grand Prix and the hype it produces in relation to this State. It is great, but let us get down to basics to the people involved and all those who have been led and misled by this Government in relation to the development of facilities in this State. Let us go to cycling. We have had two developments in cycling. We had—

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: I will talk about the Sports Institute in a moment. Some two years ago there was a prospect floated for a \$6 million development at Tea Tree Gully for a

velodrome for cycling. It never had a chance of getting off the ground. It is still floating around in the cycling area that the Government is going to develop a velodrome here at a cost of approximately \$1 million. How can we believe that when no other single project has taken place?

Let us talk now about the Institute of Sport and the good that the Institute has done. Interestingly enough, of course, it was set up by the Liberal Party and the Minister was Michael Wilson; since then it has been starved of funds.

An honourable member: Where is he now?

Mr INGERSON: Unfortunately, he had a mishap in this place. The institute had a budget of \$600 000, it is pumping out the best athletes per capita in this country, and it needs to be congratulated for doing that. But it cannot keep on doing it on its measly budget. When the Minister talks of a \$600 000 budget, in fact the institute received only \$500 000, so if we want to talk about getting facts straight, we should get them straight in this place.

Why is it that recently in the press the Director of the institute was prepared to come forward and say that there was a cash crisis that was of great concern. The Labor Party is quite happy to pump up this great institute when its sportspeople win the gold medals, quite happy to stand alongside the cycle stars, quite happy to stand alongside Glynis Nunn and say it is a great institute, but when it comes to budget time, the Sports Institute has no priority rating at all. So much for the real attitude of this Government to the Sports Institute.

If we are to have a top grade sporting talent in this State, we need to have the Sports Institute as the No. 1 centrepiece, and we need to start reorganising our priorities in the department so that the Sports Institute gets more money and we have fewer bureaucrats running around duplicating the services that are being adequately carried out by volunteers in the community. Many sporting associations have had bureaucrats write to them asking them to put in three year plans, only to find those plans rejected. They have put them in again and they have been rejected, and all of this is a waste of time by the department calling on volunteers to do this sort of exercise. I believe that it is about time we got back to a very lean and hungry department and—

Mr Rann interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: I did not say that. I want to reallocate the priorities and place more people and more money in the Sports Institute and reduce the size of the department, which is only duplicating resources that are already out in the community. Let us talk about the department's duplication. We had announced the other day a \$500 000 junior sports program. Within 24 hours of that we had Aussie Sports announced by the Education Department—two identical programs aiming at the same group of children from the same Government, two different departments going down the same line in junior sport. It is about time that the Department of Recreation and Sport and the Department of Education got their acts together and we had the one department, whoever ought to be doing it, carrying out the development in junior sport in this State.

We have had mentioned in the press the possible relocation of cricket to South Australia, and that is an excellent prospect. It is one thing that this side of the House would support very vigorously. When that relocation occurs, along with it is the requirement for some very hard-headed decisions by Government in terms of funding that exercise. On current costs, shifting cricket and establishing it here in South Australia will cost about \$6 million. If that project is to be set up, considerable funding must be placed by this State Government both at recurrent and capital levels. That must occur. All we have had so far is a hype from the

Premier, who says that it is great that it will occur, but we have had no commitment from this Government on how it will be financed, whether it is Federal or State, or whatever.

I would like to talk now about the entertainment centre, this big, magnificent hype that we have for sport and entertainment in this State. What has happened to that? That is only the last of the fiascos. We have been fed all of these other things out, but where is the entertainment centre? It is too hard now. Suddenly, perhaps it will cost too much. Perhaps we should not have brought it out two or three weeks before the election, because there was no intention whatsoever of building that entertainment centre within the life of this Parliament. Perhaps we might get a bit of publicity, though! What about all the sporting bodies? What about the Adelaide, 36ers, who thought that they might get a decent stadium? What about the netballers who thought that they might get a decent stadium? What about all the other sports that might have been able to set up there? No mention now, of course. It is all, 'Look, we are sorry about that. It is one of those things we picked up and thought we could run with. We now need restraint.' That is another one of these magnificent fiascos thrown out, all for the hype of this Government, not for the benefit of the sporting community whatever.

Let us run off a few comments about the Minister of Recreation and Sport and communications. In the last 12 months, there has been little or no communication with his advisory committee on sport. The SA Netball Association has attempted to see the Minister on three occasions and appointments have been refused every time. We hear the need to get this communication and to get out there and be with the people. That is the greatest lot of nonsense I have ever heard. It is about time that the Minister opened his doors to the sporting community so that he might hear a few of these problems and understand what is going on.

I would now like to make some comments in relation to the Governor's speech. The speech stated:

My Government recognises the difficulty in the Commonwealth managing the national economy.

What an amazing statement from this Government and this Premier! This is the most incredible statement that has been made by this Government. Let us look at the excessive spending that it has supported at the federal level and at the taxation reform systems that it has introduced, the fringe benefits and the real effect it is having in South Australia. We heard today that Mitsubishi is reverting to a four-day week. The new car industry in South Australia is down by about 30 per cent, and the second-hand car industry by about 40 per cent, all because of one single decision made by the Federal Government and supported wholeheartedly by this Government. The fringe benefits tax has caused a total change in attitude and concern in the community. We have seen the total effect of that tax in the motor industry, and we have also seen its effect in the restaurant industry. Of the 13 restaurants in my electorate, nine have put off half their staff. The other four restaurants are able to continue on the same staff numbers as before. So much for an employment factor and the effect this fringe benefits tax on community employment. Then we have the capital gains tax. If ever there is a tax against incentive, it has to be the capital gains tax. Who does it affect?

Mr Tyler: The rich.

Mr INGERSON: Come on—the rich? We love that. It affects the rich. There are 650 000 small businesses in this country, and more than two-thirds of those businessmen do not earn wages. Members opposite talk about the rich. Why do people go into small business? Because there is an incen-

tive at the end that there will be some goodwill and they will make some capital gain out of the hard work that they put in. Members opposite talk about small business and capital. In all small business, the owner is an employee. Members opposite have not even woken up to that. When the Government gets into small business, it gets into employees as well. Every small business that I know in this country is owned and worked by the man or woman who puts up the capital, and that is what has happened here. It is a great system, where we say that we recognise the difficulties.

Who has created these difficulties—the Hawke Government, supported by the Bannon socialist Government. That is who supported this and caused the change in the economy that we see at the moment. People are scared because of the nonsense taxes that have been introduced and are affecting the small business sector. What about negative gearing? We hear all about negative gearing and that it is used by only the rich. The Minister of Housing and Construction would know that the people mostly involved in borrowing money to invest in small single units are not the rich: they are the workers and small business people who are also employees. A few rich people are involved; no-one would argue about that. The majority of people involved in negative gearing are now placed in a very difficult situation.

Let us look at running a business in relation to negative gearing. I do not know one small businessman in this State who has not negatively geared his business; in other words, borrowed money to work on. That is what negative gearing is all about. Members opposite do not seem to understand the fundamentals because they have never been in business; they have never had to employ anyone; they have never had to do any hard work, and they have never had to take the risk of losing their capital. That is what it is all about. This Government, through the Premier, has supported the introduction of all these taxes.

Another interesting point is that business taxes, during the life of the Hawke Government, have increased by 50 per cent since 1983. It is quite amazing to hear from members opposite that that is because of the trade problems overseas. What about the internal problem? It is about time that members opposite recognised that the business sector—the small business employers, who are consequently employees themselves—is in trouble as a result of the Government's actions. We had the floating of the dollar, which is an excellent concept. That move clearly set out what the world thinks we are all about. At the moment the Keating statement about Australia's being a banana republic is echoing all around the world. Members opposite who have been overseas recently will know that we are the laughing stock of the world. People overseas cannot believe that this great Australian country—this lucky country—has now reached its present level. Who is responsible? It is the Hawke socialist Government totally and backed consistently and often by the Bannon Government.

Not once have we heard the Premier come out and say that he will get rid of these taxes. The Premier has come out many times and said, 'I am not too sure whether the fringe benefits measure is any good.' Whenever disaster point is reached, not once have we heard the Premier say, 'Look, I do not think that the fringe benefits tax is any good for South Australia. Let us get rid of it.' Again today the Premier said, 'When things get really bad (or words to that effect), we will have a look at it and we will watch it.' It is interesting that during the time of the Hawke and Bannon Governments we have seen the floating dollar drop from 90 cents (American) to a very low 57.9 cents (American). I happened to be overseas when this was occurring

and heard many jokes about this. We were being called a banana republic by people overseas who could not understand how a Government could continue to let this occur.

The other issue is interest rates. The interest rates in this country are at the highest level they have ever been, and they are likely to go higher. We should look at the people with whom we have to compete. Today in business lending the Australian average rate is 16.7 per cent. In comparison, we have competitors such as the United States at 8 per cent, the United Kingdom at 10 per cent, West Germany at 6.5 per cent and Japan at 6.4 per cent. The only other group in the OECD that is of any importance to us is New Zealand, and its rate is just a little lower at 16.5 per cent, compared with Australia's rate of 16.7 per cent. It is interesting to note that New Zealand has a Government with a basically similar philosophy to ours and that it is getting into exactly the same trouble.

Another important area is our inflation rate. Our rate is 8.4 per cent compared to the United States with 1.6 per cent, Japan with 1.1 per cent, West Germany with minus 0.2 per cent, France with 2.7 per cent, the United Kingdom with 2.8 per cent and Canada with 4.7 per cent. When we look at—

An honourable member: What happened under Howard?

Mr INGERSON: Under Howard we did not have a dollar worth 57.9 cents (American). The only other major country in the OECD with an inflation rate higher than ours is New Zealand at 13 per cent which, again, has a socialist Government of the same ilk as that in Australia. It is interesting to look at the United States, because yesterday we heard a couple of play ups about that country, and a couple of stories were told about it. I was very interested in two things: first, RSI, which I have promised to discuss later because I did a bit of work in the United States to follow up some of the member for Briggs's statements; and, secondly, the wages and the attitudes of people in the United States.

It was very interesting to ask people in the United States about the 17.5 per cent leave loading, long service leave, sick leave, holiday pay and penalty rates. It was very interesting that they do not have the first two and that there is no accumulation of sick pay. If anyone wants to do an exercise on the effect of costs on small business, they should look at the accumulation effect of sick pay on small business. Long service leave in the United States is non-existent. If one talks to people in the United States about penalty rates, they say, 'After an eight-hour day we get 50 per cent and we work seven days a week.' They start work whenever the employer wants them to start. They do not have all the fixed and rigid rules which were great in the development of this country but which are no good today because we have to change. There must be more flexibility in the system. That does not mean that we have to reduce wages; it means that we must pay as we go. That means that many of the hang-ons that we have—

Mr Rann interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: What did you say to them? That is what you have to do: you must have a system where business knows at the end of each week what its true costs will be. We need to recognise that some of the things in the United States need to be transferred to this country.

Mr Tyler: Why?

Mr INGERSON: I just told the honourable member. One thing is the removal of penalty rates, and there are many others. In conclusion, I refer to the final problem of extreme unionist control in this country. One of the most important things that we need to do is look at extremism, not at the role of unions, because there is no question about the role of unions. However, the unions should stay within awards.

If agreement is reached by the Arbitration Commission—the umpire—both sides agree. Unfortunately, under the present system we have a nonsense in this country at the moment whereby, if everything goes well, the unions will take it but, if they believe that it is no good, they say, 'Up the arbitration system, up the community and we will do what we like.' That is just not good enough. At last we have seen in this country some decent operations like Mudginberri and the Dollar Sweets situation in Melbourne, and there will be many more similar situations, where extreme union action is brought under control.

Mr DUGAN (Adelaide): I add my congratulations to the Governor for his speech when opening the second session of the 46th Parliament and, in so doing, I will address some of the sentiments in the opening paragraphs of his speech.

Before doing so I would like, as other members have, to pay tribute to previous members of this House who have died during the recess. In the six months or so in which I have been a member of this House I have come to know in a far more realistic and positive way the enormous amount of work and the large obligations that are placed on members of Parliament. While I did not know Mr Hawke or Mr Harrison, I am able, as a result of my experience, to have some appreciation of the enormous amount of work that they put in over a long period of time for the people of South Australia and their own constituencies. I join other members in expressing my condolences to their families.

The sentiments expressed in the Governor's speech, to which I would like to address myself, concern the need for restraint and imaginative solutions to the continuing problems that are besetting Government. In particular, I will refer to some of the strategic issues that are involved in the planning of metropolitan Adelaide. I start by looking at some of the population dynamics of metropolitan Adelaide and some of the planning issues that they raise. They are issues not just for the Government but also for local government and people involved in community services, as well as a whole range of other people—urban planners, academics and members of Parliament—who are concerned about the future direction that our city is taking. I use the term 'metropolitan Adelaide' in its broadest sense to cover that city which is now some 70 kilometres long and is close to being one of the largest cities in the world in terms of land space.

In that respect I refer members to comparisons that were provided by Peter Ward in his regular series of articles appearing in the *Adelaide Review* which are concerned with urban planning and design. In the March edition he said that at the end of the present population projection periods—the end of this century—the overall metropolitan population of Adelaide, quite apart from being 1.2 million to 1.3 million people, will be spread over something like 2 000 square kilometres. He makes the comparison with the city of Paris, which puts 10 million people in an area two-thirds that size, London, which puts 7 million people in an area about two-thirds that size, and Athens and Rome, which put 3 million people into about 450 square kilometres. The issue of the rate at which we are consuming land for urban purposes is something to which members of Parliament, Government planners and people in local government must address themselves.

The recent population projections that have been provided for use by planners and others are contained in some work carried out by the Department of Environment and Planning in its projection of populations and dwellings up to the year 2001. Those population projections demonstrate

that the population of the central sector of the larger metropolitan Adelaide (or the Adelaide statistical division) will decline by about 38 000 or 6.9 per cent over the period to the end of the century. However, over the same period the outer sector is expected to undergo substantial population growth, somewhere in the order of 222 000 people, or a 55 per cent increase in about 15 years.

Within that central sector the inner suburbs are expected to lose about 5.3 per cent of their population and the middle suburbs about 6.5 per cent over the same period. As a result of those changes, the outer metropolitan local government areas will have 49 per cent to 50 per cent of the population at the turn of the century compared to their 35 per cent at the moment. The middle ring of local government authorities will have its proportion of the total population of Adelaide drop from 51 per cent at present to 40 per cent. The inner area will see its proportion of the population of total Adelaide drop from 13 per cent to about 10.5 per cent. Those population figures are a cause for concern, but they raise a whole range of issues not the least of which is enrolments in schools—something that has been addressed in this House recently on a number of occasions.

Paradoxically, there has been another change in the other direction, namely, an increase in the inner and middle level local government authorities in relation to the number of housing and dwelling units while this population decline has been going on. Using that as a starting point, I will raise the question of where that growth of 222 000 or so will go. I also ask the corollary of what, if anything, can be done about the declining population in the inner suburbs—in other words, about a better utilisation of the infrastructure of the community in physical facilities that have been established by generations over the past 150 years.

Other issues will also specifically affect local government as a result of these population changes—issues like boundaries, efficient operating size, and the effect that those will have on revenue bases and their ability to meet revenue requirements. I will address that matter later. I will also refer to more general matters, for example, the social mix of the population throughout all of metropolitan Adelaide, and the need to ensure that we get a variety of people living in a variety of housing types throughout the metropolitan area.

Perhaps the best place to start this discussion is to note quite simply that there is nothing terribly new about all this. These issues have been faced from time to time by both Parties and by Governments in a variety of States. These issues are important and contemporary again now because, first, the city of Adelaide plan is being reviewed and quite an extensive public debate is going on about what has been happening to the city of Adelaide over the past 10 or so years and what ought to happen to it over the next 20 or so years; in this way, policies can be put in place to effect the objectives about the way in which the city should develop, what it should look like, who should live there, the job opportunities that should be made available and how people should be able to enjoy it.

The second reason why the debate has again become important and contemporary is that the Department of Environment and Planning has recently issued a document that examines the opportunities for the long-term development of metropolitan Adelaide. This consultant report by Kinhill Stearns sets out the population dynamics that are operating at the moment. It was released for public comment in February 1986 and identifies a number of areas where the increased population can be located. It looks also at the better utilisation of our existing resources. So, that

report is one other reason why this current debate is extremely contemporary.

The third reason is perhaps that there has been a recent census which will give more definite figures on the way in which metropolitan Adelaide is developing, where it is developing and the types of people who are moving into particular areas. We have been operating on projections, and these projections have been reasonably accurate over the past five or so years. However, the latest census will give us more definite figures.

As I said earlier, this really is nothing new. In reply to a question asked by the member for Coles on 23 November 1977, the former Minister of Planning (Hon. Hugh Hudson) said:

...the decline in population of Adelaide and in the inner suburban areas of Adelaide has been a phenomenon of our metropolitan development for more than 30 years. It has been partly a consequence of the industrial and commercial development of the central areas which have forced out residential users and which have converted previous residential buildings to other uses, either through a straightout renovation of the interior of old homes, or, alternatively, through their demolition.

He went on to give some examples of where that had taken place and the action being taken by the then Labor Government to affect the population decline in the inner metropolitan area. He gave some examples of the activities of the Housing Trust, especially in North Adelaide and in the south-eastern corner of the central city area, to redress that population decline. That public sector initiative, which was a Housing Trust initiative, began the turnaround of population and the turnaround in the residential attractiveness of the central city area, which has continued since.

In his answer to the question from the member for Coles, Hugh Hudson went on to address one of the other issues concerning the extraordinary growth in the outer metropolitan area. He said:

The methods that have been applied for financing the cheaper houses that are bought by low income people, particularly those with young families, invariably have a tremendous bias in favour of the purchase of new houses. New houses are available only on the fringes and this has been the situation in Adelaide ever since the Second World War. The young people with young families can get finance only for purchasing a new house, because they are the cheapest houses available and for which they can get finance. Those houses are on the fringes, so progressively young families have been forced to go to the fringes—

The sentiments expressed by the then Minister of Planning almost 10 years ago have a familiar ring about them. There was then, and there is now, a reduction in the number of persons in each family and it was that factor, as well as the economic circumstances of the availability of housing finance, that have in fact resulted in this anomaly of a decreasing number of people and an increasing number of houses in the inner areas.

I refer to the report that has been produced by the Department of Environment and Planning entitled 'Long term development options for metropolitan Adelaide'. This report notes that Adelaide, like many other Australian cities, is a voracious consumer of land and that, unless we are to get a city that will be about 100km long by the turn of the century, it is necessary to try to contain the population growth in areas that will be reasonably easy to service with government schools and other education facilities, community services, roads, and so on. I suppose the point at which this report starts is simply to note that it will be necessary over the next 25 or so years to house another 230 000 people. That is only a minimal growth rate each year of about .75 per cent.

The question then arises where on earth those people are going to live. At present, on the projections provided in

this report it will be necessary, if the current density of dwellings is maintained, to find at least another 7 000 hectares of land to house these people over the next 25 years. That presents a difficult problem indeed because there are some constraints that operate on the development options and there are some population dynamics that must be taken into account, the most serious of which is that there will be an increase in that time in the number of elderly people—those over 65 years of age in our community—who will need a special form of housing.

The proportion of elderly people in our community will rise from 11 per cent to 14.5 per cent (an increase of 70 000) over that planning period. That is something with which no previous Government in this State has had to cope. However, the following constraints should also be borne in mind. There is no doubt that the city of Adelaide will maintain its dominance as the commercial and business centre of the whole of the metropolitan area, albeit supported by certain nominated regional centres, namely, Modbury, Elizabeth, Port Adelaide, Noarlunga and Marion. The importance of these regional centres is now being realised more fully than it was when these centres were nominated as regional centres in the late 1970s by the then Labor Government in order partly to decentralise the employment opportunities that were available throughout the metropolitan area, to build up alternative community centres for the population in those suburbs and to try to focus attention on the needs of smaller communities than was possible by concentrating all our physical, community and social resources in the centre of Adelaide.

Nonetheless, the dominance of the central city will remain and that is a constraint. Over that planning period, the areas already allocated for urban development will have been developed; namely, Golden Grove in the north and Morphett Vale East and Seaford in the south. However, that will not be enough development to house the number of people with which we must deal.

Another constraint is the fact that it will not be possible to undertake any massive redevelopment in the sense of large high rise residential buildings in the central sector, because that debate was fought in the late 1960s and indeed the community of Adelaide rejected that as a development option. A preference has been expressed for a continuation of relatively low housing densities in the whole of the greater Adelaide metropolitan area. It is unlikely that the Adelaide Airport will move, that there will be any major decentralisation exercise of the sort contemplated by Monarto, or that there will be any development on the hills face zone or in the watershed areas of the Hills or substantial development in the Mount Barker and Mount Lofty area.

That means that the constraints applying to urban development for the future of Adelaide are severe. However, the report suggests that there are, nonetheless, some alternatives, which are not exclusive alternatives. The first of these is for urban consolidation. The second is the continuation of the linear development that we have had since the Second World War. This would mean the continuation of development in the north in the Sandy Creek, Roseworthy and Virginia areas and, in the south, into the Willunga Basin. The decentralisation option of Mount Barker is one that has little support but, nonetheless, it is included in the report as an option.

Probably, the most realistic and likely outcome is the combination of consolidation within the existing metropolitan area from, say, Gepps Cross in the north to Flagstaff Hill in the south, in order to build up the opportunities that exist there and to use the existing facilities, with some extension of the linear development and some extension of

decentralisation. Really, the choice confronting the community is whether, in the longer term, the development options for Adelaide should be based on consolidation on the one hand or, on the other, the continuation of Adelaide with an identity as a low density State capital stretching 100km from north to south.

Either way we have to find space for about 100 000 of the 220 000 people that it is projected we will have to find accommodation for in Adelaide over the next 25 to 30 years. Whilst there has been a declining number of people in the inner areas there has been an increase in the number of houses. There are a number of reasons for that. I have alluded to one, namely, the increasing proportion of people over 65 years who live in single accommodation. Another is that the average size of families has decreased. Yet another fact is that many people have several families throughout their lifetimes as a result of divorce and remarriage, which means that the demand for different types of housing and the number of houses has increased.

Similarly, many people, the young in particular, are wishing to lead independent lives and need a particular form of accommodation that has not previously been available to them. A number of men and women in their twenties and thirties are pursuing their independent careers prior to having families, and they are involved in a number of different domestic arrangements. In short, it means that there is a demand for a greater variety of housing choices to fit in with the different stages of a person's life cycle. It is that which is leading the private and public market to provide a greater variety of dwelling types. It does mean that there are less people in those dwellings.

I wish now to refer to urban consolidation. It is probably better to define urban consolidation by what it does and what it tries to achieve. Urban consolidation is the modern term for what used to be called urban renewal or urban development. It is designed to make better and more effi-

cient use of the existing investment in the urban infrastructure, the services and facilities already established by government. It is designed to assist and promote a wider choice and range of housing types (both in the type of housing available and the location) and to maximise the accessibility of the total population to the widest possible range of employment, entertainment, recreational opportunities and community facilities.

It is important to say that urban consolidation, despite the fears often put around, is not a desire or attempt by government, urban planners, designers or academics to comprehensively demolish and redevelop old existing parts of the urban area and replace them with new high rise developments. It is not that at all. It is not even focusing on the inner suburbs. It is simply a matter of focusing attention on the need for more flexibility, greater imagination and tolerance and for planning policies adapted to the changing population dynamics to which I have already referred. It is very much a bipartisan issue because the consequences that flow from not addressing some of these questions—by having an inefficient utilisation of services by limiting variety of choice and having an inflexible attitude towards new and creative forms of development and new technologies—means that opportunities are lost through the development control system. People will not be able to meet their housing and employment needs. Indeed, government budgets will be stretched to the limit to try to provide an extra range of community facilities in developing suburbs when there is already an under-utilisation of those same type of facilities in the inner areas.

I seek leave to table a document which is purely statistical in nature and which identifies some selected local government areas. It identifies population changes in those areas over the past 10 years or so, and also looks at the increasing number of dwellings in those same council areas.

Leave granted.

	Dwelling Stock				Population			
	1971	1981	Change		1971	1981	Change	
			No	%			No	%
Enfield	21 893	24 133	2 240	10.2	75 574	64 731	-10 843	-14.3
Henley and Grange	5 552	6 407	855	15.4	15 802	14 864	-938	-5.9
Hindmarsh	3 357	3 009	-348	-10.4	10 074	7 431	-2 643	-26.2
Port Adelaide	12 301	13 535	1 234	10.0	37 984	34 681	-3 303	-8.7
Thebarton	3 778	3 498	-280	-7.4	11 665	9 101	-2 564	-22.0
West Torrens	16 794	18 587	1 793	10.7	48 780	44 049	-4 731	-9.7
Woodville	22 627	28 292	5 662	25.0	70 591	75 778	5 187	7.3
Adelaide	4 885	4 842	-43	-0.9	9 508	7 749	-1 759	-18.5
Burnside	13 786	15 360	1 574	11.3	36 721	35 561	-1 160	-3.2
Campbelltown	10 978	14 471	3 493	31.8	37 511	42 432	4 921	13.1
Kensington and Norwood	4 135	4 082	-53	-1.3	9 977	7 865	-2 112	-21.2
Payneham	6 008	6 832	824	13.7	17 216	15 938	-1 278	-7.4
Prospect	7 533	7 928	395	5.2	20 430	18 158	-2 272	-11.1
St. Peters	3 530	3 401	-129	-3.7	9 849	7 912	-1 937	-19.7
Unley	14 502	15 119	617	4.3	37 086	33 195	-3 891	-10.5
Walkerville	2 540	2 794	254	10.0	6 729	6 453	-276	-4.1
Brighton	7 501	8 064	563	7.5	21 476	18 279	-3 197	-14.9
Glenelg	6 676	7 072	396	5.9	14 494	12 568	-1 926	-13.3
Mitcham	18 708	22 124	3 416	18.3	56 036	57 814	1 778	3.2

Mr DUIGAN: This table shows that, of the 19 councils listed, all but two have lost population in the past 10 or 15 years. However, 14 of them have increased their housing stock in that same period of time. That means there is already a process of urban consolidation taking place. There is already a larger and larger number of different housing types being erected with council permission and within the guidelines of the authorised development plans.

It is simply, therefore, a matter of addressing these issues and not being frightened off by the notion of greater densities, because we are, in fact, getting greater housing densities anyway. What is not coming along with it is increasing

population densities, which raises the question of whether or not the houses that we have are actually being fully utilised.

In the short time remaining to me I shall refer to the issue of local government boundaries and the consequence on local government and its revenue raising of these continuing falls of population in these inner and middle suburbs.

Quite simply, it could mean that the payment of council revenues, which is based on a tax on property, will have to be met by fewer and fewer people. Council revenue is primarily based on its tax on property, supplemented by the revenue that it gets from the Commonwealth through

the revenue sharing grants. As the population falls, so does the total *per capita* grant councils get from the Commonwealth. Therefore, the capacity that councils in the inner areas have to provide community services also falls. As the value of property in those inner areas increases, so the revenue that is needed by the council to maintain the services has to be provided by fewer and fewer people. I only raise the issue as one to which councils will need to be sensitive in their own long-term financial projections and the way in which they can efficiently provide services throughout their areas.

It raises a number of questions about the way in which they can provide these services cooperatively with other councils and, indeed, the optimum efficient size for councils operating in this sort of environment over the next 10 to 15 years. Councils must remain economically viable and must have the population on which to depend for their revenue. They must be able to continue to provide the community services for which they are accepting an increasing responsibility.

Mr Gunn: What about the ability to pay? You just cannot keep putting on taxes.

Mr DUIGAN: Exactly! The final issue, in this last minute that I have available to me, is the nature of the urban form. It is changing and it may mean that we must look at the planning system and the way in which we assess applications that are made for housing development projects. There may be criteria which could be used to assess the purpose for which projects were being erected. We could allow for objectives which would provide greater flexibility to councils to accept a greater variety of housing applications in their areas and so attract people back to the inner suburbs and use the community facilities that have already been established.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Tyler): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I support the Address in Reply and offer my condolences to the families of the two departed members. More specifically, I want to dwell for a moment on Charlie Harrison, who was a contemporary, who entered this place in May 1970 and was a person with whom I have had a great deal of contact, more recently than his Parliamentary service because he was a member of the South Australian Parliamentary Bowling Club.

Charles was particularly interested in that fine sport. In fact, only three or four weeks before his death a number of us had the opportunity of meeting him on his home ground at Rosewater and I can fully remember the conversation: 'How are you, Charles?' He replied: 'Oh! It has been a bit rough but she'll be right.' That typified Charles's attitude to life; he had difficulties with the sudden loss of his wife, his subsequent ill health and his inability to do all of those things in retirement that he might have wanted to do. In recent years he spent quite a degree of time in Queensland with a member of his family and therefore our opportunity of meeting him was diminished. It is a tribute to the sort of person that Charlie was that on the occasion of his funeral, both at the parlour on Port Road and subsequently in the Cheltenham Cemetery, a large number of members—his colleagues from the other side, from both the Federal and State sphere—were present. I was pleased to be able to offer my last thoughts on that occasion at that venue.

The late Mr Hawke, member for Burra Burra, was actually a resident of Kapunda, an area I had the privilege of representing until the last redistribution. The name Hawke, which was very prominent in the Kapunda area, has recently

gone from the scene in the sense that the Hawke and Co. Engineering Works, which was responsible for placing most of the large weighbridges around the State, and elsewhere in Australia, fell on hard times and wound down its operation and is now no more. Unfortunately, that is the situation in many of the country towns. Whether you go east, north, south or west, many country towns that used to provide part of the community income from some small business are now reduced to just the farming community and perhaps a church. Very few of them have a post office or a store now. In many cases the schools have been closed down and I only trust that the activities of the present Government in relation to schools do not see the demise of more of those small country schools, which do at least have a very important part to play in binding together a community which otherwise has no heart or no purpose. Once you start to move people away from their own centre and off in various directions, you lose the community spirit.

I pause here to relate a very sound piece of philosophy the former Minister of Education, Mr Hugh Hudson, had. There was an occasion when large numbers of small schools were being closed down, and someone in the near vicinity will remember that Daveyston was one of them. The question was put to the then Minister: what is the future of these small schools when the community itself wants them to persist? His quick answer was, 'If you can show me that the community still wants its school and will continue to support it, I, personally, will move heaven and earth to make sure that that school is maintained.' That attitude was carried through for many years, and after some rationalisation in the early 70s there have been relatively few of the smaller schools close down. I sympathise with the comment which was made by the Minister of Education this afternoon that, when you get down to five pupils and three of them belong to one family and it is likely that that family is going to leave the community, obviously you have to question whether you can continue. A number of schools were destined to close down—and I simply mention Rose-dale, a small school in my electorate, which got down to 22 students. It was planned to close the school down and amalgamate it with Sandy Creek.

The then Minister of Education (Hon. Mr Hudson) asked whether the community wanted such a school. I related to the then Minister that, of a possible total of 34 parents, 33 were present at a school meeting, and the other one was not present because she was suckling a week old baby; so that indicated their support for the school. The Minister told me to go back and tell members of the school community that they would retain their school, and today it has a population of nearly 50 students.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: The parents got the message.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: There has been an influx of new parents. I have raised this matter because it is so important. His Excellency the Governor's speech is couched in quite unusual terms, in the sense that it seeks to deliver a message to the Commonwealth. It is like standing off and hitting the Commonwealth with a powder puff because, as we have seen this afternoon in the House, the Premier is quite unprepared to join with his colleague from Western Australia and at least stand up for South Australia and talk to the Prime Minister and to the Treasurer and consistently to put before them the effects of their legislation on the South Australian community.

This afternoon, the Minister of Housing and Construction indicated the terrible situation in which he has found himself when, at a time involving a tremendous need for housing, the Commonwealth suddenly has taken away from him \$30 million worth of funds. There are other reasons for his

being in difficulties and I have no doubt that they will be analysed at a later stage when we come to look at the self-generation of funds by the Housing Trust over recent times. There is a problem with the Commonwealth transferring to the State the odium of, and the responsibility for, tax raising. In turn, the State is seeking to shift the odium of tax raising fairly and squarely on to local government. Local government has said for a long time that it wants more responsibility, but it wants to be given the funding that goes with that responsibility. I will develop some comments on that a little later on. Paragraph 3 of the Governor's speech reads:

Our nation is facing a major test of its ability to adapt to difficult economic times . . . recent changes made at the national level have made the task of economic and financial management within South Australia extremely difficult.

When given the opportunity to take that message to Canberra, what does the Premier do? He ducks, and point blank refuses to stand up and be counted on behalf of his own State. In paragraph 4 the Governor refers to:

My Government's policies will continue to be directed towards the establishment of a sound base within our regional economy to ensure that, as far as is possible, South Australia is sheltered from the worst effects of any adverse national or international factors.

South Australia cannot stand alone. We have lost our position as No. 4 State in the Commonwealth in relation to development and population. In recent years South Australia has slipped behind Western Australia, and the State cannot insulate itself from the activities of the national capital, particularly when the national capital has been winding down in so many areas the percentage of funds made available to South Australia. The Minister of Housing and Construction has said that that has been the case with housing and, if we asked the Minister of Transport, we would find a similar situation. The percentage of funds that South Australia has enjoyed over a long period has been diminishing—more than 1 per cent in some instances in recent years—to the point where South Australia, with its long distances between areas of population, is having grave difficulty in getting national support for its roads.

When we do not get national support in that way, I ask the question again: how will we insulate ourselves from the national capital? We are quite unable to insulate ourselves from it, and we ought to be in the national capital saying that on a consistent basis. If that is part of the reason why the Premier's minder has been given a new position, and he will have these relationships with the Commonwealth and other States and will persistently demand South Australia's rights, there may be some reason for acknowledging and accepting that appointment. However, if the appointment is just a sinecure, the Premier will be damned on two points: first, he appointed somebody under the 'old boy' system; and, secondly, that he and that person are not out there fighting for South Australia. The challenge is there for the officer to perform and for the Premier to be seen to be more actively pursuing South Australia's needs. Paragraph 5 of His Excellency's speech states:

The uncertain nature of our immediate economic future will compound the difficulties already brought about by reductions in funds from the Commonwealth.

What are those uncertain factors? When questioned, the Premier refuses to answer. He suggests that he cannot answer because he is framing a budget; he does not really know what will be in the Commonwealth budget, and therefore when he knows that, and in due course—or, as one of his predecessors used to say, in due season—he will let everybody else know. I can accept that there are unknown areas at the moment, but I do not accept that the Premier cannot—nor that he should not—advise this Parliament and

the people in more definite terms of the problems in South Australia at present.

We know that we are heavily dependent upon the motor car industry. We know what has happened to the motor car industry as a result of one of those Federal interventions. Does the Premier fear a great downturn in the motor car industry and, from the motor car industry, the steel industry which supplies the motor car industry? What are the factors that ought to be disclosed here and now so that we can all be putting our shoulder to the wheel in the interests of South Australia? Either the Premier knows or he does not know, and it is past time that he shared that information with the House.

In addition, the speech says, 'The public sector must ensure that it is responsive, efficient and accountable.' I certainly hope that, as a result of a number of reports presented to the House by select committees, the Public Accounts Committee and the Public Works Standing Committee, over a period, accountability will be more to the fore than it has been in the past. As a matter of interest, what did it cost the State launch the new paddle steamer at Goolwa? I simply want to know the cost in terms of the number of personnel who went on the junket involved in that launching.

The Hon. R.K. Abbott: I wasn't invited.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I can assure the Minister that a number of his people were there, as were a number of others. It is good that the State benefits from this enterprise. It is good that there is a light on the horizon for increased tourism, that there is an opportunity for increased employment, but I question, and this is the point that I come back to, the number of public servants who had the day off, the number of motor vehicles bearing Government registration that were down in the Goolwa area for that particular occasion. How many people were in each car? How many cars could have been taken as against how many cars were taken?

How many people had a genuine right to be there, or a genuine need to be there? It is probably the need factor that I mention rather than the right factor. This is where accountability can come into the whole picture. Accountability can also come into the position that I and others have been arguing about in this place for very many years—the wanton spending of funds coming up to 30 June each year. It used to be quite a fun thing in relation to 'What will the Education Department or individual schools be given to spend this year?' and 'What will they buy to hide in the cupboard because they do not really want it?' What they really wanted was the money available so that they could use it, along with a bit from next year, to buy equipment which was really of value to the school rather than getting half a dozen microscopes, a projector, or one or two other things they might already have but they went out and got them because that was the money they had to spend.

Mr Klunder: You are recycling something six years old.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I let the honourable member know that it is more than six years, but it is still happening, and that is what I question in relation to the statement in the document about accountability—where is accountability?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: As long as one buys them at the right price, and the honourable member will know what I mean. Where is the accountability in Government that still persists with a system that allows for the sudden expenditure of funds before 30 June rather than making money available on a continuing basis so that people can buy something that is effective and worthwhile to the school?

I do not only home in on the schools as there are other areas where this argument is equally relevant. They are problems that still exist. I say to the Government that it has the full support of the Opposition in getting the house in order if only it will get on and get the house in order—not blow out the size of the Public Service, as it has done in the past 3½ years, to proportions which are not in the best interests of the State. That subject will be developed at another time.

I want now to congratulate the member for Adelaide on his recent contribution. I had the opportunity of speaking after the member for Price on the last Address in Reply debate and congratulated him on his contribution. I want to congratulate the member for Adelaide on his contribution in relation to consolidation of the metropolitan area; he talked of planning by consolidation, looked at the overall needs of the Adelaide scene and referred to the importance of developing the area, say, between Gepps Cross and down towards Christies Beach so that there is a better utilisation of existing facilities. That is certainly where the Government can contain spending; that is preferable to some ideas that may be termed grandiose ideas of starting to look way beyond the metropolitan area. It happens that two of those five areas are in my electorate. I do not criticise the fact that some action was taken to have a good look at where we might be going farther down the track.

I do question going out to the public and saying, 'We have placed a freeze on these five areas for three months and then we will make a decision and give you some more information.' What happened at the end of three months? 'We have extended it for another three months.' I stand corrected in relation to just how many months have gone since that first announcement, but I suspect that it is very close to more than six. Are we any closer to having an answer to those frozen areas?

We owe it to the councils, communities and people who live in close proximity and who might be conducting agricultural pursuits and wanting to know where they will go in the future—whether they hang in there or take an opportunity to sell and go where they will be able to utilise land in the future. These decisions are being held up by failure to consult with the public. I extend the argument and talk about the concept of the second generation parklands, which is excellent. It has had my support throughout. In fact, for many years I have said there needs to be a clear definition of the parkland area—the green belt area—that will exist between Munno Para (or the extension of Smithfield) and Gawler.

Over a period of time, again with the help of the Hon. Hugh Hudson, who by this stage was involved in State development and planning, we received a clear indication that Elizabeth was no longer to move towards Gawler and that any future urban development would move from Gawler towards Elizabeth, and that there would be a green belt in the middle. How will this fit into the hills face zone, because this concept gives a parkland type setting. It is also important that people in the hills face zone have a better understanding of how they will be rated in the future. A large number of them in the not so distant past were rated on the basis of being adjacent to development land and their land was valued and rated at development prices, when they were not allowed to build a shed, let alone put up an extra fence.

Changes relative to notional values that have come through in more recent times have given more knowledge about the situation and a better advantage to people living in the hills face zone. However, there are still questions to be asked. Another question that is currently being asked about the

hills face zone—and this surfaced again this morning at the Central Metropolitan Local Government Association meeting—relates to the fact of the Government trying to leave the hills face zone control and management to local government. It is saying to local government, 'You go ahead and do all the things that are necessary in relation to the hills face at your expense, but we cannot identify any funds to enable you to undertake that control.'

Is it any wonder that local government is jacking up and saying to the Government, 'What you are saying is not against our will or desire but we want to know how we will fund the costs associated with this new control.' Local government is asking many questions and not getting any answers. Members will have received letters about waste management and country fire services. I do not wish to debate the merits of either of these now, because I believe there are points to be made and a value in what has been undertaken. However, there was inadequate consultation, with the result that local government authorities were informed that they would have to provide more funds, when it was almost too late for them to properly build it into their budgets for 1986-87.

Mr Klunder: Is that a criticism of the Country Fire Services legislation?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Not at all. It is a criticism of the Government because it made the final decisions and the announcements. In many cases the Government sits on the decisions of the boards, the members of which have a much better understanding of what is happening out in the sticks and is more aware of the feelings and attitudes of people. The Government made the announcements at a time when it was inopportune in relation to cost structures.

Let us look at the current review of the financial aspects of local government. We thought that we had the tiger by the tail when we were looking at the first rewrite of the Local Government Act. However, it was not as big as the tiger that we have at the moment, looking at the financial aspects and all the ramifications, particularly when the Minister and some of her advisers go around telling local government that in the future they should not think too much about minimum rates, that the application of minimum rates is costing the Government too much and that therefore the councils will have to rethink their position in relation to a minimum rate or a service rate and will have to pick up what they do not get from the Government by way of subsidy given by the Government through the pensioner scheme by charging the people in the field. The end result of charging people in the field is that everyone in the field will be charged, and I suggest that some major arguments will occur in relation to that. However, this matter will probably be discussed in about November or maybe even early next year.

What about the libraries conducted by councils? Many of them now conduct libraries in concert with the Libraries Board of South Australia, and they provide a very worthwhile service to the community, but will that be the next area under question? Will the local governing bodies be required to find more funds in relation to those libraries and, if so, when will the communities be told about this? I point out to members opposite and to the Minister responsible for this area that at present councils and council officers and local government organisations are considering the very real question of Government motivation in shifting responsibility and odium for collecting funds to local government, without consultation and without entering into a phased in or staged form of change situation, which perhaps should be undertaken if it is considered valuable for both

levels of government, that is, State and local, to perhaps change the thrust of who provides the various services.

Mr Acting Speaker, time is short but I want to very quickly make one or two comments about the police services in this State. I believe that we are fortunate in this State to have a Police Force of which we can be proud. I believe that a decision made by the Government recently to allow for the introduction of a 38-hour week, which is now virtually universal, and the application of one or two other industrial type factors they announced will overcome some of the difficulties that the Police Force has experienced, with uncertainty amongst the ranks. I noticed as recently as the weekend that the report on police services, which was to have been made available by the end of July, has been given an extra two weeks because the inquiry group had not yet completed the report.

I would not mind if they had another month, because I want to see produced a report which really does address the problems and one which the Government and the Parliament can address to effectively provide adequate support for the Police Force. We have already had the announcement of a quite major upgrading of communications. That is certainly warranted, particularly in the event of a disaster situation—and who knows when a disaster situation will arise? One must be critical, and as recently as yesterday I was critical of the failure of the Government to alter its priorities in an overall sense to provide for a more adequate helicopter service to cater for emergency situations in this State, and more than that, to provide for the safety, health and welfare of the people who work in emergency situations.

It is ludicrous that in South Australia we have a helicopter with a winch that does not always work and will only hold one person. Can members imagine anything worse than a person in need dangling on the end of a rope because the winch is not strong enough to hold that person plus an assistant?

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

Mr GROOM (Hartley): In this half hour of Address in Reply time available to me, I will refer to the national drug offensive, because this is the first major nationally coordinated campaign in Australia in an attempt to resolve some aspects of the drug problem. The increase in the number of drug related offences in the community is graphically illustrated by the annual report of the Commissioner of Police which was distributed recently to all members. In 1984-85, there were 4 234 charges for possession of cannabis as compared with 3 701 in 1983-84. However, the 1976-77 annual report of the Commissioner of Police indicates that there were 1 281 charges for possession of cannabis in that year. Therefore, in the past nine years there has been a dramatic increase in the number of cannabis offences in the community.

According to the Commissioner's report, in 1983-84 there were 119 offences for possession of cannabis resin (and these must be coupled with other offences relating to cannabis). In 1984-85 the number dropped slightly to 94 offences. Heroin offences in 1983-84 totalled 54, but in 1984-85 that number increased to 130, in comparison with the 1976-77 figure (which includes offences relating to morphine) of 70. There have been dramatic increases in the number of heroin and cannabis related offences.

However, a more dramatic increase has occurred in relation to amphetamines, including such drugs as benzedrine, which can be taken orally or intravenously. The number of offences relating to amphetamines has increased from 33 in 1983-84 to 110 in 1984-85. In 1983-84 six offences for

possession of cocaine were recorded, and in 1984-85 there were five: this compares with three offences in 1976-77. The number of offences relating to possession of cocaine does not appear to have changed much since 1976-77, and one of the reasons the police have put forward in my discussions with various officers is that it is very difficult to detect cocaine offences because the drug is generally used by the 'upwardly mobile groups'. I note that this year in New York City alone about 10 000 people have been arrested for trafficking and using cocaine, which is freely available.

In 1983-84 there were 307 offences recorded for selling or supply of cannabis, and that number increased to 338 in 1984-85 but in 1976-77 only 10 offences were recorded for the supply of all kinds of drugs. There was a slight drop in the number of offences relating to cannabis resin—from 17 in 1983-84 to 15 in 1984-85. Offences relating to the selling or supply of heroin remain at much the same levels—26 offences in both 1983-84 and 1984-85. Figures in relation to amphetamines showed a dramatic increase: from 13 offences in 1983-84 to 31 offences in 1984-85. Two offences for the selling or supply of cocaine were recorded in 1983-84 as compared to four in 1984-85. There is also another category—make or cultivate—and in relation to cannabis 503 offences were recorded in 1983-84 as compared with 471 in 1984-85. Those figures compare with 74 detected offences in 1976-77. These statistics alone indicate that there has been a substantial increase in drug usage in South Australia.

I should say, and the annual report points out, that some of the offences are multiple offences, since people are charged with more than one offence. One may not only be charged with possession but also with selling and cultivating cannabis or possessing implements for use of cannabis. The Police Commissioner's annual report at page 108 graphically demonstrates the way in which drug offences have increased since 1975-76. These statistics are tabulated on the basis of a rate per 100 000 of population. In 1975-76, the rate of total drug offences was below 100 per 100 000 of population. For 1984-85 the number of drug offences per 100 000 of population was over 500. That is quite a dramatic increase in the number of drug offences in South Australia over the past decade.

In relation to the reported or known offences, table 8.21 on page 109 shows the number of drug offences recorded by police in the rate of 100 000 of population from 1975-76 to 1984-85. The drug offences reported or becoming known in 1975 were 1 013, whereas in 1984-85 the number of drug offences reported or becoming known was 8 175. Even in the past 12 months, the number of drug offences recorded by police as reported or becoming known has shown a 19.7 per cent increase over the 1983-84 figure.

Once one is hooked on drugs it is quite clear that one needs money to obtain them. I have gone out and spoken not only to police but also to teachers, youth groups, young people and lawyers involved in the field to acquaint myself with the nature of the problem in South Australia and also the extent to which it would affect my electorate. The police officers to whom I have spoken have estimated that 60 per cent of all breaking and enterings are drug related. That means that people who do not have the money to buy drugs but are hooked on them and need them will break into houses, chemist shops or elsewhere to get either money or drugs.

In relation to breaking and entering offences, in 1975-76 the rate per 100 000 of population was between 1 000 and 1 200 whereas in 1984-85 the rate of breaking and entering offences increased to over 2 000. Coupled with an increase in breakings and enterings, there has been an increase in

false pretences, bankcard fraud and credit card fraud as well as armed hold-ups because these people need money to meet their drug habit. The Police Commissioner's report shows that for robbery in 1975-76 the rate per 100 000 of population was just over 20, whilst the figure for 1984-85 is now closer to 30. For false pretences and fraud, the figure for 1975-76 per 100 000 of population was under 200, whilst it is now roughly 325.

In talking to young people and the police it appears that the most vulnerable group is the 20 to 30 years bracket. They are the biggest market for drugs. First, they are vulnerable, particularly when associated with unemployment. Quite a far greater proportion of males than females appears to be vulnerable. That is not to diminish the fact that it is an equal problem for males and females. Most of the people to whom I have spoken have been unemployed and in their own experience or that of people they know drugs are used as a means of reducing boredom and increasing excitement.

The point that the 20 to 30 year old age group is the most vulnerable is also supported by the Australian Royal Commission of Inquiry into Drugs, the report of which was published in 1979-80 following various studies. The inquiry found, for example, that of drug offenders some 70 per cent were between 18 and 25—and these were Commonwealth Police statistics—with only 5 per cent in the over 30 age group. According to a 1978 study in Adelaide, 33 per cent of all 17 year olds had tried marijuana.

Most young people tell me that drugs are easy to come by, and I have been equally informed of this by the police, by various youth groups and by lawyers practising in the field. Young people have told me that cannabis is quite freely available. Despite the fact that the number of statistics relating to cocaine offences are somewhat low, I have been told by young people that cocaine is very freely available.

As I have mentioned, in New York this year 10 000 people have been arrested on charges relating to this drug. I heard a radio report stating that one can simply go for a drive on a Sunday and shop around to get the best price on cocaine. Predominantly, it is more of an upper class drug, but if overseas trends are followed here the use of cocaine will increasingly become prevalent and more offences will be detected in the community.

Heroin is available without too much difficulty, and certainly amphetamines, which are a problem for young people, are also freely available. I have been told by the police and by young people that drugs can be purchased in car parks, hotels, on street corners and in discos, anywhere people congregate. They can be purchased privately, of course, in one's own home, if that is where one is making the deal, or at parties, and these are the common mediums through which drug transactions take place.

The ultimate sources of supply are the eastern States and Western Australia. Police have told me that the reason for this is that the usual way in which drugs are brought into the country is through customs, so that in Melbourne, Sydney and Perth, being major ports, drugs are brought in by couriers or by passengers. Drugs are also brought in by light aircraft, light seacraft and postage. The police have told me that there are, in fact, several networks operating but there is not a crime boss in the sense of a Mr Big. The reason why the criminal network is becoming more sophisticated and is developing is because of the huge amounts of money that are involved.

I should say that alcohol and tobacco are problems as well, because young people tend to mix amphetamines or what other drugs they choose with alcohol to increase their potency. Alcohol and tobacco are what I would call legal drugs, whereas the other drugs I was referring to—cocaine,

marijuana, opium and heroin—are illicit drugs. According to the Australian Royal Commission into Drugs, the 1978 street value of heroin was estimated at between \$1 billion and \$1.6 billion, so it is readily apparent why drugs are attractive to the criminal element. The royal commission also stated that in 1977-78 Australians spent \$3.3 billion on alcohol; on tobacco they spent \$1.18 billion, and on drugs that required a prescription \$380 million was spent. The total expenditure, including that on heroin, was between \$5 billion and \$6 billion.

Mr Becker: Where is the money coming from?

Mr GROOM: As I indicated, the money to purchase illegal drugs is coming from breaking and entering, robbery and bankcard fraud. If one looks at the Police Commissioner's annual report, one will see that coincidental with the increase in and the prevalence of drug offences in the community over the past decade there has been a consequential increase in the number of breaking and entering offences, robberies, bankcard frauds, forgeries and larceny, because in the vulnerable group (the 20 to 30 year old youth) many are unemployed. Those people have to turn to crime. It is not a problem in the schoolyards. All the teachers I have spoken to, and indeed the young people, have told me that it is not a problem in the schoolyards, despite what one hears from time to time. The reason for this is that, for example, a taste of heroin costs about \$50, so they simply cannot afford it.

The Australian drugs royal commission showed that only 1 per cent to 2 per cent of all secondary students had used narcotics, but that there is drug taking amongst the 13 to 17 year old group. The statistics show that this involves mainly people who have already left school. As I have said, the teachers to whom I have spoken and the people still in school say that it is not a problem in the schoolyards.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr GROOM: That might be a matter that the honourable member can take up. I have only 13 minutes left, and I will not go down that path. The *Sunday Mail* of 6 April 1986 published a report of a survey of 1 200 teenagers in Glenelg, Kilkenny and Happy Valley. With under-age drinking, in two centres 100 per cent of the teenagers were involved and in the other centre some 90 per cent were involved. The survey tended to substantiate what any member can find out for himself by going and talking to young people, police, doctors and educators, namely, that there has been a switch from the softer drugs of marijuana or cannabis to the harder drugs such as cocaine and heroin.

The survey that the *Sunday Mail* published is not really consistent with the information that I have in relation to the taking of drugs, because they reported that, of the 600 teenagers surveyed at Glenelg, 90 per cent were taking drugs and 99 per cent were taking alcohol under age; at Kilkenny, of the 367 teenagers surveyed, 95 per cent were taking drugs and 100 per cent had indulged in under-age drinking; in Happy Valley, of the teenagers surveyed, 60 per cent were involved in drug abuse and 100 per cent in under-age drinking.

Mr Oswald: That has been discredited in Glenelg.

Mr GROOM: In my view, that survey is not accurate. It is not consistent with the drugs royal commission, and I refer to the royal commission figures. The 1978 study in Adelaide showed that, of the 18-24 year old group, 64 per cent had never used drugs and, in the 25-34 year old group, 82 per cent had never used drugs. The royal commission figures are more reliable because in my view the *Sunday Mail* figures are way out. Nevertheless, that is not to underestimate the drug problem at all, and it is quite proper for the *Sunday Mail* to highlight that there is a drug problem

in the community. I merely question the accuracy of the survey. The *Sunday Mail* illustrated what the drugs royal commission showed, namely, that of the group that was vulnerable some 60 per cent were unemployed and 55 per cent of the males had criminal records.

Generally, most of the statistics that were published in the Australian Royal Commission into Drugs reflect that drugs are a greater problem with males than with females. Briefly, that is the extent of the problem. It is an increasing problem of which all members ought to be aware.

Three solutions are being proffered so that the problem might be contained, and they are, firstly, education and rehabilitation; secondly, the need to increase police personnel and equipment; and, thirdly, to examine the role of the parent in relation to the problem. Parents cannot entirely abdicate their responsibility to the State. I have discovered from most of the statistics that I have examined, from most of the teenagers to whom I have spoken and most of the 20 to 30 year old group with whom I have come into contact that there have been communication breakdowns at a very early stage between them and their parents. Most of the parents have no idea as to what their children do at night time, or indeed what they do on weekends.

Mr Hamilton: Give them \$50 and send them off.

Mr GROOM: The member for Albert Park is quite right. There is a complete breakdown in parental responsibility. Parents must be properly motivated to communicate with their children at a very early age. The Royal Commission into Drugs dealt with this aspect and said:

Australian parents should know that young people who experiment with drugs almost invariably do so because of some failing in the home. It is often because the parents have not maintained close contact with their children that the children look to 'the drug scene' for excitement, relief from boredom, acceptance by a peer group, or even gain attention from their parents.

Quite clearly, the Royal Commission was signalling that the parents have an important role to play. The police are concerned with the level of manpower that they have in the field. They have expressed some concern that the national drug offensive campaign is placing too much emphasis on alcohol and tobacco and not enough emphasis on the illicit drugs. From the point of view of the police, I think that that is a legitimate concern, but I am told that, in South Australia, there are only three teams of eight operatives in the field, which basically comprise the Drug Squad.

I am told that in Victoria there are something like 100 in total, and that there are proposals to increase this number to 190. So there will then be a considerable discrepancy between South Australia and Victoria in that regard. One must take into account local problems, and the Victorian drug problem may be more severe than South Australia's. Of course, Victoria has a much larger population than does South Australia and it has a large seaport. Nevertheless, the police feel that they need greater manpower and that they need access to electronic surveillance equipment such as listening devices and tracking devices.

With regard to telephone tapping, although one will probably find police in favour of telephone tapping, I think that most of the police officers to whom I have spoken do not have any serious concerns about telephone tapping in relation to drugs, because the fact of the matter is that, once you start tapping the phone, people use another medium by which to communicate. It therefore becomes a fairly useless exercise and, for greater efficiency, it is probably better to put actual manpower in the field, because it is very difficult for the police to obtain evidence of drug trafficking.

This year a great start has been made with the national drug offensive campaign because of its emphasis on education and rehabilitation. This campaign is the first nation-

ally coordinated campaign, although a number of State campaigns have been waged. There is no question that it is a step forward, because the announcement was that some \$100 million will be spent over the next three years in Australia. There were 5.4 million booklets distributed to, I think, 80 or 90 per cent of households in Australia. There was some criticism that no-one read the booklet so that it was useless. I doubt that that is a valid criticism because, distributing the booklet to each household must significantly increase the awareness of people in the community as to the drug problem. Governments do not go to this trouble to produce a booklet—

Mr Gunn interjecting:

Mr GROOM: Time will tell, but it is a start. All of the royal commissions into drugs have emphasised education and rehabilitation, so you have to start somewhere. You have to go down the correct path, and the national drug offensive is going down the correct path. Even if people do not read it word for word, they will look at the booklet and it will increase their awareness. If it does nothing more than that, it has been a success.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I will come to that. The national campaign on drugs is emphasising drug education, drug rehabilitation and law enforcement. Within each program, the States are free to develop local programs to meet particular local problems in this area. It is very difficult to separate illicit drugs from legal drugs such as alcohol and tobacco. I have mentioned the police grievance in this area. It is difficult to separate illicit and legal drugs from the point of view of Government responsibility because, of the 20 232 drug related deaths in Australia in 1984, 96 per cent were caused by alcohol or tobacco. In the breakdown of these figures, some 16 300 Australians died from tobacco related illnesses. In terms of deaths in Australia, right across the board— young people as well as aged people—the fact that 96 per cent of drug related deaths were due to alcohol or tobacco emphasises that it is difficult—in fact it would be irresponsible—for a Government campaign to separate illicit drugs from legal drugs.

The South Australian allocation for 1985-86 will total \$2.2 million, because the federal allocation of \$1.1 million to South Australia is being matched dollar for dollar by the State Government. It will be a three year campaign and \$6.84 million combined federal and State moneys will be spent in South Australia. On 15 April it was announced that \$354 000 would be allocated for the primary schools 'learning for life' campaign. That will canvass metropolitan schools and will use two mobile vans and high tech aids.

Mr Becker: Who got them?

Mr GROOM: Never mind; I do not have enough time to go into that. There will be \$24 000 spent on the 'learning to choose' campaign, which is an adaptation of the secondary school program. That will involve specialist training of teachers to address the problem of peer group pressure; and various other educational projects in South Australia have been announced over recent times. In the *News* of 4 June, the Health Minister announced that part of the education project in South Australia will include a nursing staff awareness program, a mobile resources van, a drink-driving education program, and a learning for life campaign; and the treatment and rehabilitation project will cover drug dependence, clinic upgrading, and alcohol sobering-up units to be run by the Archway Rehabilitation Centre at Port Adelaide and The Salvation Army.

In the *Advertiser* of 7 April 1986, shortly after the national drug offensive, an announcement was made in relation to programs under way or in an advanced planning stage,

including the conversion of St Anthony's Hospital at Belair to an outpatient/day patient facility and eventually its closure and relocation of trained staff, the conversion of the existing drug and alcohol facility at Osmond Terrace to a drug only rehabilitation centre, the integration into the suburbs of a number of community based alcohol treatment houses, some of which have already been brought, and the establishment of a drug free therapeutic centre at Ashbourne near Strathalbyn for drug addicts, for which council approval was pending in April.

The fact of the matter is that, for the first time, the Federal and State Labor Governments have combined to mount a nationally coordinated campaign to meet the drug offensive. One cannot underestimate the impact of drugs on the community, particularly with high unemployment. Young people are particularly vulnerable. The whole community needs to respond to the national drug offensive campaign, otherwise the criminal element will become even more sophisticated. Criminals will get a far greater hold on our social and cultural fabric and it will be very difficult in the future to break the criminal network. The statistics I have mentioned over the past decade show that drug related crime is a serious problem. One has only to get out in the street—and any member of Parliament can do it—and talk to the young people in one's area, the educators and the police and honourable members will soon find out the extent of the problem.

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

Mr BECKER (Hanson): It is a pity that Standing Orders were amended to reduce members' time to speak in this debate. This is my first opportunity to speak in an Address in Reply debate since the 7 December 1985 election. I would have liked to hear more from the member for Hartley because, as I recall, he is the only member so far who has raised this issue in this Chamber. I accept his sincerity in relation to this issue, but I would like to have heard further from him because, hopefully, he will eventually support me in my move to have opium poppies banned in the various countries of the Golden Triangle.

I was fortunate enough during the parliamentary recess to go on a parliamentary study tour and visit Singapore, Penang and Hong Kong to look at the heroin trail. I did this because, as shadow Minister of Correctional Services, I was concerned about the large number of young drug addicts, particularly those affected by heroin, who are finding their way into our prison system.

I go along with the member for Hartley (and I know that I do not have many supporters on this side in relation to this matter) that the drug offensive must now be made to work. The Federal and State Governments are going to commit \$100 million, and that is well and good, but it must be made to work. At present it is not working; it is a disappointment. The pamphlet was not well received; it was too large, too much and too involved.

The television campaign, by Hong Kong standards, is weak and pathetic. One has to come out with hard hitting television advertising in relation to this matter. That is the way to go in this State: one must get into prime time and use the reality of drug addiction, show the people what happens and, finally, ask the question: 'Is this your son or daughter or brother or sister?'

That is what they do: they hit home hard. They have had 20 years of experience of keeping statistics and in dealing with drug traffickers. In Hong Kong in particular, as in Malaysia and Singapore, drug addicts are registered. I think that we have to face the facts of life—we have to do this.

The whole tragedy that I discovered in Hong Kong is that there is no guarantee that you can rehabilitate a heroin addict. After 12 months in a rehabilitation centre there is a 34 per cent chance of a person having a relapse, and after five years it is approximately 90 per cent. However, they were making some progress and, if only 5 per cent can be saved, at least it is worth spending the money.

The money being spent in South-East Asia to deal with the drug trafficking problem and rehabilitation is far in excess of the \$100 million this nation will spend in the next three years. To try to save the current generation will cost this country tens of millions of dollars, if not hundreds of millions of dollars. We must accept the fact also that we have lost a generation. As cruel and as tragic as it is, I see many young people from that 14 to 24 year old age group who are drug addicts at the present moment and who form part of a lost generation.

The drug and alcohol staff at Osmond Terrace have done a marvellous job under extremely difficult conditions. They need a lot more support, but that will take a lot of money. The Government will have to re-establish its priorities if it is genuine in this campaign. The small amount allocated to South Australia is chickenfeed compared to what really should be done. We do not have a Government sponsored rehabilitation centre; we do not even have a voluntary agency working in conjunction with the Government to try to do something in this area. I hope the member for Hartley is sincere in this issue. I think he is, and I will support him and do what I can to see that drug awareness programs are continued. I want to see the number of persons in prisons reduced considerably. I think that, if we tackle this drug problem, it will help us to start reducing these costs.

The Address in Reply debate is my first opportunity to speak in this session. I am extremely disappointed that the Standing Orders Committee has taken away a basic principle of every member of this House, that is, an hour's speaking time in the Address in Reply debate. In fact, the time used to be unlimited, and I still think it should be. This debate provides the only chance for individual members to bring to the attention of the House the concerns of our constituencies and our personal reflections of the comments made in His Excellency's speech. I will talk about His Excellency's last two speeches, as I think they overlap. Let us be honest: the speeches are written by the respective Ministers of the Government. The various sections of the speech are fed into a central organisation and it is knocked into shape as the speech to be delivered on the opening of the Parliament by the Queen's representative, His Excellency the Governor.

I wish to thank His Excellency for the time he gives to the State and the way he attends to his duties on behalf of Her Majesty in South Australia. We are fortunate to have in Sir Donald Dunstan an outstanding person who attends to his duties in a most dedicated fashion. His loyalty to the State must be recognised by the current Government, and I hope that his term will be extended.

I was particularly disappointed to hear of the recent passing of Charles Harrison. I liked him, and to me he was a man's man. He was what I always thought a person representing the Labor Party should be—a person who represented the worker, who did so honestly and sincerely, was a hard worker and was dedicated and genuine in his beliefs. This Parliament will have benefited from the contribution made by Charlie Harrison. If I remember rightly, he was once, for a short time, Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. When we lost Charlie Harrison we lost a nice bloke—a good fellow—and I think that is how he would

like to be remembered. He served his country, State, union, fellow workers and constituency in an exemplary manner.

I was particularly interested to compare the two speeches of the Governor on the progress of the Government. The speech delivered earlier this year stated:

My Government has been pleased to note the continued strength of our economy throughout the past year. There was sustained improvement in employment opportunities and a decline in the unemployment rate which was noticeably greater than the national trend. Particularly high levels of activity in the housing and construction industries contributed significantly to these results.

The more recent speech by His Excellency states:

Our nation is facing a major test of its ability to adapt to difficult economic times. During the first half of this year, our economy has experienced a sharp change from the buoyant conditions of the previous two financial years.

The speech indicates that the Government will have to draw on its own reserves if it is to ensure that essential public works continue. In relation to housing, the speech states:

The stimulation of the housing and construction industry has been a major part of my Government's economic policies. It has led to levels of activity in South Australia which have far exceeded those of other States. The general downturn in the industry, and the restrictions on funds available to South Australia from the Commonwealth, have meant that it will be difficult for the Government to maintain its housing and construction program.

That was the first indication that when the Bannon Government went to the people in December 1985 the promises that had been made could not be fulfilled. The attitude was to promise almost anything and to not give a damn whether or not it could be delivered—simply to make the promises and sort out the situation afterwards. It had been clear to the Opposition for 12 to 18 months that the economy of this State was not as well as everyone believed. It was also clear that on a national basis the Hawke Federal Government was not supervising the handling of the economy as efficiently as it should. Then there were trends around the world which also indicated that there would be a slight hiccup in the economy, that the world economy was in such a state that the economy was heading towards a recession.

Certainly, some South-East Asian countries have experienced a recession. Some of them are on the way out. Singapore is presently experiencing difficulties. Workers there had their wages and salaries slashed. There was no outcry whatsoever: they accepted the reduction of wages and salaries because they realised that they would still keep their jobs. I would like to see that tried in this country; there would be an outcry if we were all asked to take a 10 per cent cut in wages and salaries. It would mean hardships for some right across the board. But I want to make it clear to the present Government that, no matter what it does and no matter how it treats the economy, it should not fall for the stupid trap which Don Dunstan fell for many years ago when he said that he would tax the tall poppies. He thought that it was 3 per cent, although it came out at about 1½ per cent. No matter what is done and what is tried they cannot be touched. They can be taxed 90 per cent, but those people are so well established in their financial arrangements that all they do is to pass it down the line.

If the boss is taxed 90 per cent he will not reduce his standard of living but will simply take out more in profits, up his prices or reduce his work force. No matter what happens he has an established standard of living. He has his capital invested in his business, other businesses or whatever, and he will maintain the standard of living to which he is accustomed. So, it is the middle class, for want of a better description—the people in the middle—who suffer every time.

The State Government as well as the Hawke Government have fallen for that stupid trap again of thinking that wealth can be redistributed and resources shared. It cannot be done

and it will never work. There has been a tremendous backlash already in this country following the threat of redistribution of wealth of the nation. The two by-elections in New South Wales last weekend proved this; never in the history of New South Wales politics has there been worse timing of two by-elections. Never in the history of New South Wales was there a worse time for a Premier to retire or a worse time to bring someone from the Legislative Council to the House of Assembly to lead the current Government Party.

In relation to the 18 per cent to 22 per cent swing in New South Wales, what would the situation be if that occurred here in South Australia—and let us not kid ourselves that it could not happen? If that occurred the present Labor Government would lose at least 22 seats, that is, 22 seats under 19½ per cent. If the swing went over 22 per cent the Labor Party would lose even more seats. Such a swing would simply annihilate the Labor Party in this State, let alone what would occur across the nation. That would not be good for politics in any sense. We in the Liberal Party would be delighted, of course, but it would be hard to control so many people.

The best Governments are those with a majority of about three, in which case the Government has a reasonable working majority and is stable. A large majority is not desirable: even the large Government majority that we have at the moment can cause trouble, and there is trouble for the current Government. The Premier is not such a strong leader and I do not think he is really in control of some of the things that go on within his own Party. But, in looking at the results of the 1985 State election, another matter becomes apparent, and this is a point that I wanted to make earlier this year.

That was the worst redistribution of boundaries ever. It was the most unfair and lousy scheme that I have seen in all my years of involvement in politics in this State. There were tremendous differences between districts. The situation was totally misread by the major political Parties. I was always convinced that we were unfairly treated, and I believe that in regard to the situation of the former member for Glenelg, Mr Mathwin. We were not listened to. The distribution could not be predicted. I considered that I would be very lucky if I survived, and I did—and did it well. We had to fight the odds as well as a Labor Party that spent tens of thousands of dollars more than we had ever considered spending. Probably more money was spent in that 1985 election in my district than was spent by my campaign committee in the 16 years I have represented the district. That is how desperate the campaign was. I do not give a damn what people want to spend there: we will always survive, because we have established a hard core. The figures can be seen and understood.

It is interesting to note that the assessment of the 1985 State election undertaken by the Hon. Legh Davis, MLC, proved the point I was making, but no-one would listen. In 1975 the Liberal Party enjoyed a swing of 5.2 per cent; in 1979, 9.9 per cent; and in 1982, there was a swing back to the Labor Party of 8.1 per cent. Therefore, from 1975 to 1979 there was a 15.1 per cent swing, a downturn in 1977, or virtually a holding position, and then in 1982 a swing back to Labor. There was still 7 per cent floating in the swing that had gone to the Liberals and could go back, if one considers figures going back to 1975. In my opinion, the 1985 result reflected the true situation. We could take that situation as the baseline for all the districts. When a redistribution of boundaries is undertaken, it is hard to define the boundaries, but now we see a reasonable reflection of the situation.

It is interesting to note that the current Government holds five seats that are subject to a swing of less than 5 per cent. I will never forget that when I first came into this House one of the more arrogant members of the Labor Party said that there was a new crop of members and launched into a tirade of abuse, saying that never before had he seen a greater collection of donkeys. That situation has not only been repeated but it has been outnumbered. We now have the greatest collection of donkeys that has ever been seen. I am not being unfair, but I remind the member for Bright (who went to great pains when he stood against me to ensure that he did not get the donkey vote) that he got the donkey vote this time, but I have not heard anything from him in that regard. The Government won and consolidated its position on the donkey vote.

Let us consider the districts. The swing against the Liberals in the District of Adelaide on first preferences was 3.8 per cent and on the two-Party basis it was minus 3.4 per cent. The swing to the ALP on first preferences was 4.3 per cent and 3.4 per cent on the two-Party basis. If there is a swing of .7 per cent against Labor, the ALP will lose that seat. If the donkey vote in a new district is worth 2 per cent (and I have always believed that it is worth 2 per cent) then the District of Adelaide will be lost at the next election irrespective of what the current member does. There will be a turnaround. The swing against the Liberals at the last election in the District of Bright was minus .1 per cent on first preferences and minus 2.6 per cent on a two-Party preferred basis, indicating a considerable swing from the Democrats to the ALP.

On the first preferences the swing to the ALP was 3.5 per cent and on the two-Party preferred vote it was 2.6 per cent. For the ALP to lose Bright the swing will be 1.7 per cent. That member, and the member for Adelaide, had the benefit of the donkey vote—2 per cent and he is history. In Fisher the swing against the Liberals on first preference was .9 per cent and on the two-Party vote it was minus 3.1 per cent. To the ALP the first preference was 6.4 per cent—a considerable drift from the Democrats to the ALP—and the two-Party vote was 3.1 per cent. For the ALP to lose, the swing will be 1.2 per cent. The ALP in the seat of Fisher had the second preference vote with the donkey vote going to the Democrats followed by the ALP and the Liberals.

In my own seat the swing against the Liberals on first preferences was minus 2.1 per cent and on the two-Party vote it was minus 3.1 per cent. The swing to the ALP on first preferences was 5.4 per cent and on the two-Party vote it was 3.1 per cent. This indicated that there was a considerable swing from the Democrats to the ALP. In fact, it is the first time that the Democrats lost their deposit in the electorate of Hanson.

Mrs Appleby interjecting:

Mr BECKER: She was the worst candidate the Party has had. No matter how much money was spent trying to prop her up, it helped me all the way. I would not have won if all that money had not been spent. It is the first time the Democrats lost their deposit. It is significant to know that the Democrat candidate was Janine Haines' husband. Ian and Janine Haines were members of the Liberal Movement and campaigned for me in 1973. Whilst I wish Janine all the very best, she certainly was taught some good campaign tactics in 1973. I thought that it was significant that her husband Ian had decided to stand against me for the sake of it. In the process he lost his deposit. I thought that was poetic justice. In the suburb in which they both live, Netley, they had the worst result. I hope that Ian stands every time.

In Hayward the swing against the Liberals on first preference was minus 2.4 per cent and on the two-Party vote it

was minus 2.8 per cent. The swing to the ALP on first preferences was 3.1 per cent and on the two-Party vote was 2.8 per cent. There was a slight drift from the Democrats to the ALP. For the Labor Party to lose Hayward it would need a swing of 2.9 per cent. The member for Hayward was bottom of the list. The ALP got the donkey vote in the electorate of Hanson, where I had second place and the Democrats were bottom. So, the ALP benefited to some extent by the donkey vote in Hanson.

In Henley Beach the swing against the Liberals on first preferences was minus 3.2 per cent; on the two-Party vote, minus 3.3 per cent to the ALP it was 2.6 per cent and on the two-Party preferred vote it was 3.3 per cent—a slight move from the Democrats. Of course, the ALP candidate in Henley Beach was bottom of the list so he did not get the benefit of the donkey vote. He needs 7.4 per cent to lose. Unless Hawkey does the wrong thing, the ALP has got no worries there.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:

Mr BECKER: That is why I am reminding members now. Jack Jennings reminded us for years. Every time I saw him he said, 'You donkey'. So, now I can turn the tables. In the seat of Newland the swing against the Liberals on first preferences was minus 1.6 per cent and on the two-Party preferred vote it was minus 2.5 per cent. To the ALP it was 3.1 per cent and on the two-Party preferred vote it was 2.5 per cent. The ALP received the donkey vote and the swing to lose is 1.6 per cent. Therefore, with 2 per cent comprising the donkey vote, madam you are in trouble. In Todd the swing against the Liberals on first preferences was minus 2.8 per cent; on the two-Party preferred vote it was minus 3.9 per cent; to the ALP it was 2.8 per cent and on the two-Party preferred vote it was 3.9 per cent. The swing to lose is 6 per cent. There the Liberal Party had the donkey vote, the ALP the second position, and Democrats third.

In Unley, the other seat always considered marginal, the swing against the Liberals on first preference was minus 2.5 per cent, on the two-Party preferred vote it was 3 per cent; to the ALP it was 1.3 per cent and on the two-Party preferred vote 3 per cent. The swing to lose the seat of Unley by the Labor Party would be 5.1 per cent. There the ALP was bottom of the list.

I hope that the people of South Australia will follow the New South Wales lead. As I said, if there is a swing of 18 to 22 per cent, we will be delighted. Certainly, I think there is a lesson for everybody: after a redistribution of boundaries you cannot take anything for granted and you must always keep going back, because there is a consolidated vote throughout the metropolitan area and you have to check that you keep going well.

I made a speech after the last State election, and I make it again, to remind the new members of their responsibilities to the constituents, constituency and the taxpayers of South Australia. I also remind backbenchers that many of us have been here quite some time and there is a circle of people in the community who have been to every member of Parliament, be they Labor, Liberal, Independent, Democrat, National or whatever, with the same complaints. They have tried the lot of us.

They all have a history of grievances, of problems that cannot be solved, and they can put over a very good story. Members will be taken in by them and feel that they want to try to do something for them. Very rarely will they find a politician slip up, be they Liberal, Labor, Independent, or National, and it is best for members always to check first with the department or body which is the subject of the grievance, because there is a long history and a long file.

I am glad that the member for Bright is here again, because I want to give him one further reminder. What he did was absolutely despicable in the way he named Adelaide Pest Control under parliamentary privilege, and the damage he has done to that company is very worrying. As shadow Minister for Housing and Construction, I come across a whole range of companies and organisations, and I have not had any complaints against any pest control company in this State.

The charges made by these companies in South Australia, whilst they will vary slightly from company to company, are amongst the lowest in Australia. But I do not know whether or not the damage done can be repaired. Certainly, I would ask the honourable member to consider withdrawing his statement or easing the reflection that he made on the company. The company had six complaints, I think, on Friday: it has had more complaints in the last few days, and two threats this morning. That company is 30 years old, the sixth largest company in Australia, and it is Australian owned and controlled. It is not part of any large conglomerate such as other companies in the field, nor is it owned overseas: it is a South Australian company, proud to be South Australian. It decided five years ago to do something for South Australia, and invest its profits in the community through sport, community organisations and junior athletics. It feels let down. It feels hurt that it was not approached first to get its side of the story, and I believe that the member for Bright should have done that.

I believe that he has reflected on somebody who is well known to the Premier. I would suggest the honourable member double check his facts first. He must be very careful, because if one puts a company under the microscope, as he has in this House, and if that company then goes, there is only one person who can take the blame for it if there is loss of employment or anything else.

I think that it was most unfair to take the word of one person without checking on the other side of the story, then weighing up the pros and cons and making the decision. I feel for that organisation, and I do not think any company should be put under the pressures it is now under to have to go round and explain to people that what was said was not 100 per cent correct. It was a misconception of facts and figures, two different stories rolled into one, and it is most unfortunate that it was given the publicity that it was.

As I said, I think that it should be a lesson to all members to be extremely careful when they decide to ask a Minister representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs to investigate an industry or a company, or name a company, as was done in this case. Here is a company that has been deeply hurt, and it should not have occurred in the way that it did. That is the responsibility that we have as members of Parliament. As I say, plenty of us have been around for a long time.

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

Ms GAYLER (Newland): In supporting the motion I wish to congratulate His Excellency the Governor on his opening address to the Parliament. The charter for legislative reform and responsible economic management laid down for our State is confirmation that the Labor Government is best equipped to continue worthwhile reform, even when times are toughest. Especially when times are tough, the people look to Labor governments to strive for fairness and equity, to see that improvements of recent years, particularly in growth and employment, are not swept aside; to ensure that the burden of restraint is shared and not disproportionately foisted on those least able to cope. Conversely, the com-

munity also looks to us to see that those who would avoid their responsibilities or exploit others through excessive prices for goods, or exorbitant interest charges on debts, especially for the poor, or by avoiding their financial contributions to family and community, are exposed and brought to account. Our Governments, Federal and State, will tackle these challenges with the overall public interest as the paramount concern.

Labor is also acknowledged as the Party in government best able to deal with vital longer-term planning for the future. We see this on the national scene in the crucial efforts to revitalise our manufacturing and export industries. After years of conservative coalition neglect, Labor has embarked on a concerted program to redress the poverty of our industrial capacity. I am sure that those forward looking efforts will be seen in years to come as the turning point towards a more vibrant and competitive economy. Significantly, on the State scene also, our Labor Government is more than a government for the here and now, the expedient short haul. Longer-term planning for the future is an essential feature of our program for South Australia. An important element—a long-term development strategy for metropolitan Adelaide—is Labor's initiative to which I will turn shortly.

For residents of my electorate of Newland and of the north-eastern suburbs generally, worthwhile advances, particularly in local community services, are being achieved, in spite of the economic restraint which we share. In just six months of the second Bannon Labor Government, a series of important initiatives stand out. In the face of a general downturn in land and housing development, the State Government's Golden Grove joint venture development is running ahead of expectations. First home buyers particularly are queuing for land, some to the point of camping overnight to secure their sites. Affordable finance is being made available, in no small part due to the allotment price range set by the Government at the outset of the development and also to more recent Government insistence on new forms of home loan arrangements from the financial institutions. Government initiatives in Golden Grove to introduce landmark human services planning of a truly coordinated kind are also producing early results.

The new concept of a communities trust fund has financed an information kit for incoming residents. Plans for the joint Government and independent schools complex from the outset incorporate provision for a kindergarten, a child-care centre and child-parent centre. This means that young children's services will no longer be an afterthought, to be tacked on if a space can be found at some time in the future. Pocket parks at neighbourhood level and corner shops will also mean a change from the standard dormitory which has characterised our modern suburbs. I understand that plans are also under way to ensure integrated schooling, and post-school training and employment for disabled residents in Golden Grove and that these will be under the auspices of Bedford Industries. All these innovations point to Government aided or inspired human services planning being a valuable investment for all new development areas. I understand that a certain amount of envy is appearing in other growth areas, no doubt evidence of the successful approach being adopted at Golden Grove.

In the established suburbs of Tea Tree Gully, the fruits of Labor's superb policies on children's services are also delivering tangible results. Our first government supported child-care centre, called 'Lurra', the Aboriginal word for nest, opened for service in May. It is providing full day care, primarily for children of working mums and dads. At the same time, the needs of mums outside the paid work-

force for occasional child care and respite care have not been forgotten. The local community committee which had lobbied long and hard for occasional care was delighted to learn in July that Federal Government funding is now a reality and that the Kelly's Farm occasional care centre can open for children in September.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the Federal Minister for Community Services, Senator Don Grimes, and the Federal member for Makin, Mr Peter Duncan, for supporting the centre through recurrent funds, and also congratulate the Kelly's Farm shopping centre joint developers, Becanter Pty Ltd and Paynter Dixon, who financed the construction and fitting out of the centre as an integral part of the shopping complex. Retail centre developers of the future could do well in emulating the co-operation and community service initiative at Kelly's Farm.

Since Parliament last met in February, the north-east has also seen the new premises of the Tea Tree Gully community health service opened, road traffic improvements on Lower North East Road and an extra 170-car parking provision at the O-Bahn Paradise interchange, along with progress on construction of O-Bahn stage 2 from Paradise to Tea Tree Plaza. State Government funding towards the Tea Tree Gully community information booth, also at the plaza, will shortly give the community a very accessible means of finding out about support services available in the north-east region. Also notable is the joint nature of this enterprise, involving State and local government, a paid coordinator and an especially enthusiastic band of volunteers who will staff the information booth in the heart of our regional centre.

Joint Federal and State Government funding under Labor's new home and community care program will now enable the Tea Tree Gully council to extend vital in-home support services to elderly residents and disabled people so that, increasingly, they can live with dignity and security in their own familiar local communities. Improved youth services will result from the State Government's commitment to finance a Banksia Park youth worker to work with young people and their parents as an outreach service from the Gully Youth Centre.

Finally, major extensions to the Modbury Hospital, which serves 160 000 people in the north-eastern region and beyond, are a high priority for the Labor Government. The \$7 million redevelopment program, due to get under way shortly, includes construction of new outpatient and physiotherapy facilities, and refurbishment of the currently overcrowded accident, emergency and radiology departments. This two-year redevelopment effort will also allow the planned upgrading of orthopaedic and urology services and the establishment of new ear, eye, nose and throat services, resulting in a major boost to the extent and quality of the health and medical services available to the people in the fast growing north-eastern suburbs.

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

Ms GAYLER: In just over six months, acknowledged as a period of economic restraint, it has been possible for the State Labor Government to pursue important initiatives and improvements, to see results on the ground and to have others in the pipeline. I am pleased to report that once again we are a Government committed to reform, responsibility and results.

I turn now, from the immediate needs of my own electorate and the present, to my earlier theme—Labor's role in longer-term planning for metropolitan Adelaide. It is not entirely novel, at least in South Australia, for politicians to

take up city planning and development issues. I note that my colleague, the member for Adelaide, did so earlier today. Our State's history is notable for the involvement and inspiration of political and other figures in visions and grand schemes, in reforms and passionate debate and in disagreement on planning and development and housing plans and Bills. Some of those Bills came to grief or were mutilated in another Chamber of this Parliament, as reformers such as Charles Reade found in the early 1900s.

As current practitioners of city planning, Alan Hutchings and Raymond Bunker point out in their Jubilee book recording the history of town planning in South Australia, entitled *With Conscious Purpose*:

The reformist drives within South Australian society have, from time to time, been counterpointed by reaction.

This time there are signs of common purpose among some of our State politicians of opposing political persuasions and I think that that is an encouraging sign when we confront decisions about future strategies for metropolitan Adelaide.

It is fitting that future strategies for our city are again on the agenda of the State Government, local councils and the wider community. This is so because it is increasingly evident that decisions about how, where and when our city grows or changes reach out and touch the everyday lives of the public.

How is this the case? The courses of action or inaction adopted by both those levels of Government directly affect what we pay to run the city: the pipes-and-wires costs we bear; the roads and buses we fund; the council rates we pay; and the interest charges we accumulate for future generations. Those decisions affect where our youngest, newest families live, and what it costs them to get the basic essential services. They determine how much we must commit to new schools in outer areas, to community welfare offices, to child care centres, kindies and the like.

Choices about where, when and how our city grows determine how many hours people spend in a car or a bus getting to work, or indeed whether many can get work. They bear on how far people are from family and friends and essential personal support in their daily lives. In a nutshell, aside from employment and education, where one lives very significantly affects what one pays to live in our city and the level of services available in the local community.

I am delighted that under the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. Don Hoggood) the investigation of long-term development options for metropolitan Adelaide promised by Labor is now underway. The discussion paper canvassing options sets the scene. We have a linear metropolis 70 kilometres long stretching from Seaford to Smithfield. At June 1984 the Adelaide statistical division had a population of 970 000 residents. By 1997 we expect a population of 1.1 million, rising to 1.2 million by 2011. In 1981 we had 322 000 households with an occupancy rate per dwelling of 2.96 and falling. As the report well demonstrates, existing land stocks, including deferred urban land, vacant allotments and lots under production, will be exhausted at some time between 1996 and 2001.

It is also clear that over the past 30 years Adelaide's population has grown threefold, to just under one million people. That growth has been sustained by urban expansion on the fringes of the city—to the north, north-east and the south. Inexorable fringe growth is entirely possible. The question is whether it is desirable. Is that the kind of city we want? Does it suit our emerging demographic and household patterns? Does it fit our community's budget? Would it allow Adelaide to retain, for much of the population, the quality of life that we value and the surroundings like the

Adelaide Hills and the hills face zone, the Barossa and the Willunga Basin, which we can enjoy?

An honourable member interjecting:

The **SPEAKER:** Order! Interjections are out of order. They are particularly out of order if the honourable member is not in his seat.

Ms GAYLER: It seems to me that there are powerful reasons to build a community commitment to a metropolitan strategy which sets out to maximise urban consolidation within the existing metropolitan region. I include powerful economic, social, environmental and political reasons for so doing, and I link the political with the economic reasons.

Future State budgets will be stretched to capacity in the next decade and perhaps beyond. Accumulating evidence across a wide spectrum of Government infrastructure agencies points to a compelling need to shift capital works expenditure away from the urban fringe extension of services towards maintenance of the existing fabric of the city—on sewer replacements and water supply refurbishing, school upgrading and road and rail improvements. Increasingly the 'human services' needs of existing communities will mean that more child care facilities and improved facilities in local communities for the aged and for young people are needed.

The economic climate and the massive capital funding requirements which flow from an 'ever-outwards' city strategy will put an impossible price on such an approach. State budgets, Governments and local councils will be bound to face those facts. Apart from the economic reasons which, I believe, are persuasive, I have already mentioned that there are also important environmental reasons for preferring a concerted urban consolidation strategy rather than the ever-outwards expansion of our already long city. Time precludes me from detailing these today. I simply say that much of our population benefits in tangible and intangible ways by an improved quality of life. The advantages that we now derive will be even more vital as our population grows.

I also refer to the powerful social reasons for adopting the urban consolidation strategy. It has been well established in recent studies that our demographic and household patterns are changing quite significantly. The recent publication *With Conscious Purpose* states:

We should not, of course, lose sight of the fact that the family unit has changed substantially over the years. Anna Rubbo in a recent article 'Rethinking the suburban sprawl' points out that while the single family house on a suburban lot 'with its implied gender roles for men, women and children' accounts for 78 per cent of all Australian housing stock, the traditional nuclear family accounts for only 27 per cent of families. One in five households contains only one person and, in the future, perhaps as much as 30 per cent of all households 'are likely to be headed by women'. We can surely provide a wider range of options in housing density and type while avoiding the social problems of the slums, both old and new.

In addition, in relation to the aged, and referring to the recent report entitled 'Long-term development options for metropolitan Adelaide', we read:

Larger numbers of older, elderly and very old people, often 'ageing-in-place' and wanting to continue living in their present localities, raises the need for adequate diagnostic and support services. It also indicates a need for a range and choice of accommodation types in which they can live. In terms of distribution of population, advantages can be claimed for less segregation of populations by age and family type. While this is not a new issue, it achieves fresh prominence under present population trends.

These findings concerning the number of single headed households and the increasing number of elderly people, very often also living alone, combined with the increasing need to provide accommodation for young people, point to the conclusion that in the housing market we need a much greater choice and diversity available not only in the type

of housing but also in relation to the size and price so that affordable housing can become a reality for a wider range of the population.

In the Tea Tree Gully council area, which I represent, all these issues are already in evidence. I was pleased to hear the Minister of Housing announce a review of housing for youth and of the problems associated with homeless youth. It is wrong to think that problems relating to youth housing are confined to the inner suburbs. There is plenty of evidence of these problems, even in the relatively affluent council areas like Tea Tree Gully, where youth housing is already an issue. The provision in the community of, predominantly, detached three-bedroom separated housing does not cater well for young people. It would be a tragedy if young people now living in Tea Tree Gully had to leave their local area in order to find housing of the type that they need and within an affordable price range.

Similarly, many single people and single parents are not looking for detached housing (for example, a three-bedroom house on its own allotment) while, in any event, many of them are unable to afford that kind of housing. I think it is incumbent on each local government authority to ensure that local community needs are adequately catered for in providing a range of housing.

I have already referred to the elderly in the community. Part of the reason for the decline in household occupancy is, and will increasingly be, that elderly people who would like to stay in their own neighbourhood have little choice as to alternative housing within the local area that is familiar to them. For this reason also and in regard to this category of people, it seems to me that each council ought to ensure that the full range of housing—types, sizes and price ranges—is available in each area. Again, I refer to the book *With Conscious Purpose* in the chapter written by the Minister for Environment and Planning, Don Hoggood, where he says:

In part, our model and laboratory in these matters is the Tea Tree Gully-Golden Grove development, a comprehensively planned project 20 kilometres north-east of Adelaide that carries forward the traditions of Colonel Light Gardens and West Lakes.

In some respects, Golden Grove is indeed the model and laboratory but, unfortunately, in some respects it is also as yet not that model and laboratory. It is a pity that to date opportunities have not been taken up to provide anything but the standard size detached dwelling on its own allotment. I certainly hope that in the very near future some of the innovations that so many of us are now urging on the community, planners, local councils and developers will be taken up by the Golden Grove joint venturers in what is a vital opportunity.

I return to the general question of the social reasons for adopting an urban consolidation strategy. It is clear that people in the outer suburban growth areas often miss the kinds of services, access to services and breadth of services that communities in the inner city and middle suburbs have come to take for granted. I refer to the study on options for the future, in which it is stated:

New communities on the fringe are often initially and sometimes continually under-provided with essential social services. Such areas tend to have a high proportion of young, nuclear families with low incomes. These families are least able to cope with living in new, isolated and difficult conditions. Arguably, the development process still places an undue emphasis on the provision of engineering services . . .

I point out that there are two councils in the metropolitan area where there is a relatively high occupancy rate per household compared with other areas, and I refer particularly to Happy Valley (which has an occupancy rate of 3.21 people per household) and Tea Tree Gully (with an occupancy rate of 3.18). Clearly, those two council areas are not

suburban ghettos: they are not undesirable places in which to live. I believe that in those areas there is further capacity for urban consolidation. That means that those councils in whose area the occupancy level is low offer quite substantial opportunities, while maintaining the quality of life that we expect in our suburban areas, for pursuing the consolidation strategy. A wide range of measures must be adopted to pursue what I believe is the preferred strategy for metropolitan Adelaide.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's speech opening Parliament on this occasion. I join with other members of the House in expressing my condolences to the families of the late Bert Hawke and Charlie Harrison. I did not know Bert Hawke but have read of his activities and his parliamentary career in this place. Without doubt I know that I can share with this House the respect for his achievements, and I express my condolences to his family.

Charlie Harrison I did know and can only support the kind remarks made about him, because he was a caring man and was a member whom someone else has described as being without spite. I echo those sentiments because for the time that I knew Charlie when he and I were members we shared many a conversation. The comment 'without spite and without malice' certainly applies to Charlie Harrison. To his family I express my sincere condolences. I also express my condolences to the family of John Cherry, whom we all knew John as a messenger in this Chamber. We were indeed sad to learn of his passing.

This is the second Address in Reply debate this calendar year. I would like to know what happened to the last one. The debate ensued in both Houses but in the House of Assembly it only got part way. Under Standing Orders I believe the Address in Reply should take precedence over other matters, with the exception of procedural matters. My understanding is that no normal Government business should transpire whilst the Address in Reply is in progress. However, the Government, in its wisdom or otherwise, decided that it was not the appropriate thing to present the Address in Reply to His Excellency. To that end the Government should be condemned for the manner in which it showed contempt for the Governor and the parliamentary system.

It concerns me that we should allow that matter to go virtually unheeded and with hardly a murmur in this Chamber. Certainly some objection has been expressed from the Opposition benches, but the Government does not seem to have any conscience about it. I hope that we never witness such a spectacle again. An election was slipped in, and the Government, without batting an eyelid, decided to ignore the Governor on that occasion. I would like to know what the new members of Parliament thought about it. We had a motion moved by the Deputy Premier that a committee consisting of Mrs Appleby, Ms Gayler and Messrs Bannon, Hoppood and Rann be appointed to prepare a draft address to His Excellency the Governor in reply to his speech in opening Parliament. Certainly, they prepared a draft address, but what happened to it from there? We do not know. I would like to know, and this Chamber deserves to know, what happened. It is another part of the Westminster system that seems to have slipped by the wayside. I was somewhat concerned that on this occasion the Governor's speech comprised only three pages. Normally it is eight or nine pages, and sometimes more.

This tells me one of two things: either the Government has little or nothing planned for this session or, secondly, it has been very cautious in what it is exposing to the general

community. It does not want the community to know which way it is going. Either it does not know which way it is going or it does know and is becoming very guarded about it. I think there are some issues there which all members of this State will have to watch very carefully, to see what the Government is up to.

I propose to speak about a number of issues particularly concerning my electorate and the areas to the west of the State. Before doing so, I would particularly like to thank those members of my electorate who saw fit to re-elect me at the last election, and I trust that I will be able to give them the support that they deserve, and representation in this Parliament.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: As the honourable member says, it is very late some eight months after the event. Be that as it may, one of the issues presently causing considerable concern to the public on Eyre Peninsula is that of daylight saving. I know that many Government members have just turned off.

Members interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: They have just turned off because they believe that they can carry on in their own merry way. They believe that it is irrelevant whether they inconvenience anyone else in the State. I wish to raise the two zone matter shortly. The general problem with daylight saving has been exacerbated by the Government wishing to extend the period of daylight saving—last year because of the Royal Visit. This year the Government wants to bring forward the commencement of daylight saving because of the Grand Prix, and so it goes on.

As a result of an amendment to the Daylight Saving Act, we know that it is possible for the Government to do that by regulation. I strongly opposed it at that time. However, when one is defeated by two votes to 45, one has to accept defeat. The issue is becoming a little more involved than that, and I do not believe that the Government of the day has really latched on to what the problem is.

If the Government does go ahead with the idea of two time zones, as has just been raised, then there are some inherent problems in where we are going. I say 'problems' quite advisedly. I believe that the Government will have considerable problems with its unions if it proposes to do that. I believe that there are some unions that are on side with the people of the West Coast about the problem of daylight saving.

Let me quote an example of what could happen if South Australia divides into two time zones, in other words, the eastern part of the State going to eastern standard time and the western part to central standard time. If, then, the part that goes to the eastern standard time adopts daylight saving and the part to the west does not, we will have a 1½ hour difference. To me, that is a most untenable situation.

Who wants to come in from the paddock—if he is a farmer—at half past four to see the six o'clock news? They are incredible circumstances, which I do not think any one of us would accept as fair and reasonable, yet that is the proposition the Government is putting up. We know full well that, if the Government of the day or this Parliament changes South Australia to eastern standard time, it is almost obligatory that we have daylight saving with it.

We all know that South Australia's present standard time is based on the time meridian that runs through Horsham, I think, in Victoria. It does not even run through the central part of the State. If we adopt eastern standard time and, on top of that, add the one hour of daylight saving time, the natural time meridian that this State would be adopting as its time meridian for the summer period would be a time

meridian less than 100 kilometres from New Zealand. That is how far out we are.

We are probably the only State in the world that thinks it has the divine right to be able to interfere with nature to the extent that we can set our own time. Nobody else can do that. There are some minor exceptions along the line, but to think that we can adopt a time zone that does not go anywhere near our own continent, let alone our own State, is utterly ludicrous. I fail to see the logic of any individual in this House who thinks that it is a fair and reasonable thing to do.

Needless to say, I am taking up the cause of my own electorate because, the further west one travels, the greater the impact of daylight saving. The experience of people in my electorate, as is the case for people in the member for Eyre's electorate, is that there is another half an hour or 40 minutes on top of what is experienced in Adelaide. As a result of meetings that have been held in my electorate, the suggestion has been made that we should let South Australia try eastern standard time along with daylight saving for a while and we would then soon change back, but that is something that I cannot accept. Western Australia changed back. I think that, once the change has occurred, there would be a sufficient number of people, who are not in the productive section of the community, who would want to keep it that way, because for them it is a time for recreation and leisure and is not related to periods of work.

The proposition has now been put forward by the Government to begin daylight saving one week earlier. I was rather interested to hear that the Government claimed that this proposition had the support of the New South Wales Government as well as the Victorian Government. I suggest that it checks its facts. I understand that such a proposal has been put to the Victorian Cabinet and that perhaps there is general agreement, but I am not so sure about New South Wales. My advice is that the proposition has not been put to the New South Wales Cabinet and that the Government is very apprehensive about the issue. The Attorney-General of New South Wales represents a country electorate, so I think that daylight saving would be the last thing in the world that he wanted. I was indirectly advised through his office that there was a great deal of apprehension on this topic. I think that the Government of South Australia is unwise to go to the public of South Australia and to say that it has the support of the New South Wales Government because, first, it has not been before Cabinet and, secondly, there is a great deal of apprehension within that Parliament as to where it would go. After the by-election of the weekend, one can easily understand why there should be that apprehension.

In an attempt to ascertain where we stood from a legal or legislative point of view, I tried to ascertain just what the position was in relation to the adoption of time zones. Might I say that, at the time the amendments went to Parliament in February, considerable concern was expressed in the Ceduna area (which is outside my electorate) in relation to looking for an area of the State that could be excluded from the provisions of daylight saving. At that time it was not possible, through the legislative process, to exempt an area of the State from the provisions of daylight saving. However, following the amendment by the Upper House and its adoption by both Houses, it is now possible for the Government, by regulation, to exempt an area from the provisions of daylight saving. A campaign in relation to exemption developed initially in the Ceduna area and then people in my area also wanted to promote that campaign. It received strong and fairly widespread support.

In the middle of all this, and out of the blue, the Deputy Premier announced that the Government was considering two permanent time zones, in other words, to split South Australia down the middle and have one part adopting central standard time and the other part adopting eastern standard time. That has raised utter confusion in the minds of the public. In my opinion, it was a deliberate ploy by the Government and a diversionary tactic to get away from the real issues of the day relating to the difficulties that we experienced, because the season had not broken at that stage and considerable difficulties were being encountered in the rural sector with water shortages and, more particularly, carry-on finance. People wondered how they would get their crops planted.

At that time I contacted the Deputy Premier's office and was told that the Government believed that it could introduce permanent time zones without reference to Parliament. In fact, it was even suggested to me that it would be done before Parliament met. That worried me because I understood that our time was set under the Standard Time Act of 1898. Somehow, this Government believed that it could interfere with that. I know that there are two Acts under which times can be implemented: one is the Standard Time Act of 1898, and the other is the Daylight Saving Act, which is a temporary measure relating only to daylight saving. It would be stretching the point for the Government to say that we will have daylight saving for 12 months of the year, and I think everyone would see that as quite a mischievous way of introducing legislation.

In an endeavour to try to find out the rights and wrongs of that, I wrote to the Deputy Premier (Hon. D.J. Hopgood), and my letter states:

Dear Sir,

With reference to the continuing debate about daylight saving, I am writing to you in the hope that you may be able to advise the appropriate legislative procedures that would need to be applied for the implementation of time zones.

It is my understanding that although there is an amendment to the Daylight Saving Act which enables the Government, by regulation, to exempt an area of S.A. from the provisions of daylight saving, that measure would not apply if permanent time zones were to be implemented. I would have thought that it would require an amendment to the Standard Time Act 1898.

I would be grateful if you could clarify this matter. However, if it proves to be that time zones can be implemented by regulation as a result of the amendment to the Daylight Saving Act, would you give an undertaking that the matter would not be introduced until at least there had been some parliamentary debate on the matter?

As you would appreciate, there is a very wide difference between time zones and daylight saving and the effect which that could have on the State generally and more particularly, the effect on the western part of Eyre Peninsula could be quite profound.

From my discussions within the Eyre Peninsula community, there is no support whatsoever for the division of S.A. into two permanent time zones. There is support, however, for the exemption of the western part of S.A. from the provisions of daylight saving as would or could be applicable under the provisions of the recent amendment to the Daylight Saving Act.

Looking forward to your advice.

Yours faithfully,

Peter D. Blacker, Member for Flinders.

I sent that letter on 18 June 1986. To this date, I have not had a reply. Quite frankly, I do not know whether the Deputy Premier intends to reply, but it is now some six weeks down the track and I was asking a matter of legislative procedure. To that end, I think a reply should have been forthcoming.

Taking that one step further, I then wrote to the Parliamentary Counsel, Mr Geoff Hackett-Jones, seeking his advice on the matter. Whilst I do not as yet have that in writing, I certainly have had a number of telephone conversations which have indicated that my assumption that it requires an amendment to the Standard Time Act of 1898 is correct,

and the opinion of Mr Hackett-Jones is that that would be the only way in which permanent time zones could be introduced into South Australia.

Today I presented to Parliament a petition containing 1132 signatures. That is only one of many petitions. The member for Eyre presented petitions of even greater numbers of signatures as constituents of his area, and certainly those in the western part, are just as much or even more affected by this measure. I understand that petitions bearing nearly 3 000 signatures have been presented in the Upper House. So, this proposal has aroused indeed very widespread concern. I do not know how one presses upon the Government as to what is a fair thing. I do not think it is unreasonable on my part to stand up and defend the people of my area in asking for the natural time to be maintained.

No other area of the world finds itself in a position where it has to try and defend itself against unnatural times—yet that is what our Government is doing, and I do not think that is fair or reasonable. I put this back on the Government's shoulders and ask it to rethink this matter. Yesterday the Government said that it had the full support of the Victorian and New South Wales Governments. It may have the support of the Victorian Government, but I am quite sure that it does not have the support of the New South Wales Government. In fact, it is probable that the little support that it might have had prior to last weekend is diminishing quite rapidly.

I think my views on daylight saving are pretty well known by now. I do not think it is unreasonable that I should pursue this issue for as long and as hard as I possibly can. I would like to know whether the Government intends to introduce permanent time zones and, if so, at whose request they will be introduced. I know of no push for the introduction of permanent time zones in South Australia. Someone said that the request came from the Green Triangle. I could find no-one in the country areas in the South-East pushing for this. I have received many letters not only from my own area but from a large part of South Australia, pleading for me not to support the time zone split in South Australia. I am sure that, if members of the Government were honest, they, too, would admit that they have received numerous, spontaneous letters from people in relation to this matter.

Mr Tyler: I've had one.

Mr BLACKER: I am sure that the Premier and the Deputy Premier have received more letters than that. However, I think I will leave that matter there.

I turn now to another issue of some concern, particularly to country people, and I refer to their concerns about the medical services available to them. In my district at this very moment there is an acute need for six or seven general practitioners. It is a very serious situation. We have a situation where hospitals are totally undermanned. The few general practitioners on Eyre Peninsula are grossly overworked and, despite the contrary views expressed by some people, I believe underpaid. The work performed by general practitioners is indeed hard and tiresome and requires a tremendous amount of loyalty on their part to service the needs of their immediate communities.

I am grateful that the Government, in liaison with the Hospitals Association and its Eyre Peninsula branch, is endeavouring to assist in this area. They are endeavouring to work out a system for the provision of locum doctors so that doctors can occasionally take a holiday. I think that is one step towards solving the problem. It will not necessarily solve the problem, but it is one small step down the track. A number of initiatives are being examined, including the secondment of doctors from the metropolitan area to coun-

try areas. One is a little uncertain as to how successful that will be, but I believe it is a genuine step by the Government to try and do something about this problem.

Not only do we have a shortage of doctors—and I do not think I can understate that problem in this Chamber—but it was suggested a few months ago that any hospital that had fewer than 50 maternity cases per year could face closure. I am very concerned about that, because I think only one hospital would be left on Eyre Peninsula. I would like to think, and I hope, that that statement is a gross overlay of reality. As a result of my inquiries I found that the statement emanated from a report commissioned by the Government into maternity and obstetric services at the Lyell McEwin and Modbury hospitals. That report, of nearly 100 pages, came up with 95 recommendations, 94 of which relate specifically to the Lyell McEwin and Modbury hospitals.

The 95th recommendation, however, was a broad, sweeping statement which suggested that the Government should look at maternity services across the State generally and, in particular, at those hospitals that have fewer than 50 deliveries a year. The press picked that matter up and blew it up out of proportion resulting in a scare going right through the community. With the distances that we have to travel on the Eyre Peninsula, and that people have to travel in other parts of the State, it is totally unrealistic that these women should be expected to travel 100 km or more when they are in labour. I know that there have been many instances where babies have been lost, or a mother has been lost because of excessive travel. I would like to think that commonsense will prevail and that, provided properly qualified medical staff are available, general midwifery cases will be allowed to be maintained at those country hospitals.

I have an underlying concern with this matter over and above the obstetrics cases. We all know that where any slight expectation of a complication is present a patient should be immediately whisked away to more specialised services. We have air ambulances, retrieval teams and other facilities so that when complications are expected recovery teams are available. However, why not allow a woman in a normal maternity case to have her baby in the local hospital near her friends and family where community support can be experienced.

I have an underlying concern that, if we take away midwifery services from our country hospitals, we will be downgrading those hospitals and further affecting patient throughput, thereby causing a gradual decline in general health care in country hospitals. That matter is of even greater importance than the midwifery division of these hospitals, because if we get that undermining of the general medical care of country people that can only aggravate the position. Instead of being in the 1980s or 1990s with our medical care we will be back in the 1930s when hospitals were either unavailable or long distances apart.

If we are not careful, we will be going into a backward phase of medical services in country areas. I strongly support the Government in any action that it takes to keep maternity services in country hospitals and, more particularly, to keep general medical care available to country people for as long as possible.

I mentioned previously the availability of general practitioners in country areas. There is also a grave concern about the training of nurses and paramedical people needed across the State. They are not just needed in the inner metropolitan areas but Statewide. We are told that there is a surplus of doctors in the metropolitan area, but where they are, I do not know. Why they will not go into the country, I do not know. Perhaps they are frightened of the

long hours, or that the pay is not good enough. However, I am told that the pay for doctors is not good in the metropolitan area because there are too many of them. Perhaps the lack of social life is the cause. I am told that it is the lifestyle that is the problem when trying to attract GPs into country areas. I do not know how we overcome that problem because it is not realistic for a country community to change its lifestyle just to meet the needs of doctors. I guess that it can be said that the same applies to all professions. I support the motion and ask the Government to take particular note of those three main concerns: daylight saving; the availability of doctors; and the provision of mid-wifery sections in country hospitals so that country people are treated equally with other people in South Australia.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I support the motion. I join other members of this House in expressing regret and sadness at the passing of the former member for Albert Park, Charlie Harrison, and the former member for Burra-Burra, Bert Hawke. The last time I saw Charlie Harrison, even though he was quite ill, he did not complain and could still laugh. This was typical of this very genuine man. He will be sadly missed. I offer my sincere condolences to his family.

This year 1986 has been magnificent so far in terms of the support and active participation by the people of South Australia in celebrations and re-enactments to mark our great State's Jubilee 150th year. The organisers and the people who have so willingly supported these events are to be congratulated and thanked for their involvement in making this year a memorable one in our history. South Australians can always be relied on to come out in their thousands to support important events. Because of the enormous number of happenings this year, it has been an extremely busy and demanding time for many people in the community, especially Federal and State members of Parliament and members of local government.

The pressure has eased somewhat these last few weeks, undoubtedly because of the winter weather. However, things should pick up again when spring arrives and continue, hopefully, until 31 December. My electorate of Price has been host to many events of a Jubilee 150 flavour, because of Port Adelaide's and Woodville's rich history in terms of State settlement and development.

Many other things are continuing to happen in Port Adelaide because of the exciting redevelopment occurring there. Federal, State and local governments should be commended for the funds and initiatives which they are continuing to provide to this history-rich area of our State. One would have to say that the highlight of 1986, as far as the electorate is concerned, was the visit of Her Majesty The Queen and the Duke of Edinburgh, mainly because the Royal Yacht *Britannia* was berthed at No. 1 berth in the Port. The crowds of people who were attracted by the presence of the Royals and their yacht were reminiscent of crowds in the Port celebrating the cessation of hostilities at the end of the Second World War.

I guess that dates me somewhat, as quite a number of members in this House would have been either too young to remember or were not even born at that time. The Queen officially opened the historic 120-year-old Neptune Island Lighthouse which has been refurbished and rebuilt at the river end of Commercial Road. This lighthouse is proving to be a major tourist attraction and restoration, by members of several unions, has been beautifully done. The only problem I can find with the structure is that it is not painted black and white. I suppose its being painted red and white will make the Premier happy, anyway.

Other parts of the Port Maritime Museum will be officially opened in early December and still more sections and

exhibits will be opened later when completed. The ketch *Falie* has proved to be one of the real success stories of the Jubilee Year, and everyone who contributed to her restoration should be congratulated on a job well done. The same congratulations should also be extended to the master and crew who did a magnificent job during this vessel's 52-day wheat trade re-enactment voyage around 35 historic South Australian ports. Exciting things are still happening in Port Adelaide. Historic buildings are being restored, roads and footpaths are being paved with cobblestones, trees are being planted and harsh and ugly street lighting is being replaced with artificial gas lights.

There is still a lot to be done. If any members have not been down to the Port for a couple of years, go and have a look. I am sure they will be impressed. Added to this, the Old Port Canal re-development is really taking shape and is expected to be completed early next year.

A joint venture between Devon Homes and the Housing Trust was announced some weeks ago by the Premier to develop a large tract of land adjacent to this canal redevelopment for homes. This will give a much needed additional shot in the arm to the local business area by bringing people back into the Port. There are many other projects too numerous to mention at various stages of completion or planning and I am quite confident that at some later time the tourism potential of this historic port will explode. If members get the impression that I like Port Adelaide they would by only half right.

Mr S.J. Baker: The trendiest area in Adelaide.

Mr De LAINE: That is right, the trendiest area. Having been born and bred in the area, I really love the place and I am extremely excited and optimistic about its future. Another major attraction during the year was the long 13 week bullock wagon haul from the South-East to Port Adelaide. This outstanding feat of endurance by both man and beast was a re-enactment of the hauling of wool from various parts of South Australia to Port Adelaide for shipment via tall sailing ships to many overseas destinations. The arrival of the team at the Port Adelaide Post Office was witnessed by a massive crowd.

A little later this year a re-enactment of the unveiling of the workers memorial in front of the Port Adelaide Police Station will take place. This historic memorial was originally unveiled on 16 September 1921 and 41 original names were carved into the stone. Since then, an additional 65 names have been added. The memorial, in the form of a beautifully carved figure of a woman holding the scales of justice, is approximately 18 feet high. Only people who have made an outstanding contribution to the working class people of Port Adelaide are eligible to be immortalised on this memorial. My reading of the public account that was written at the time of this unveiling back in 1921 describes the occasion more adequately than I could in my own words. It is as follows:

There was a large gathering of Port Adelaide residents at the corner of Commercial Road and St Vincent Street, Port Adelaide, on Friday afternoon, to witness the unveiling of the completed workers memorial, the result of the efforts of a committee formed at Port Adelaide in January 1917. Mr R.H. Smith (former Mayor) became Chairman of the committee and in November 1919 had the honour of laying the first stone of the massive grey granite base, which stood about 12 feet high, with a tiled approach and a modern sanitary drinking fountain placed on each of two sides. It was intended that a marble statue of "justice" should complete the monument, but difficulties created through the war delayed the carrying out of this portion of the work. Then Mr and Mrs B. Winter came forward and offered to provide the money necessary. The work was put in hand in Italy, and carried out in white marble. The figure, as now erected, is a beautiful piece of sculpture and brings the monument up to a height of 18 feet.

A large platform erected at the Police Station corner was occupied on Friday by members of the State and Federal Parliament,

the Mayor and councillors of Port Adelaide and labour leaders. The Mayor (Mr J. Anderson) called at a hospital for the ex-Mayor (Mr R.H. Smith) who has been confined to his bed for nearly 18 months, and motored him down so that he might have the pleasure of seeing the memorial completed. At the request of the committee, Mr F. Condon (the Secretary) acted as Chairman. The Largs Bay Orphanage Girls Brass Band played selections during the afternoon in a most creditable manner.

In introducing Mr Winter, who performed the unveiling ceremony, Mr Condon outlined the formation of the committee and the work it had done. He said the money for the undertaking had been contributed by all parties and, in addition to unionists, businessmen, lodges and other organisations had greatly helped. They had desired to do honour to those who had battled in the interests of the workers in the early days. They were all glad to see ex-Mayor Smith present and to see that his health was showing improvement. They were grateful to Mr and Mrs Winter, whose generosity had made possible the completion of the beautiful monument, at which the relatives of the labour pioneers, whose names appeared there, would be gratified. Mr Winter, having performed the ceremony to the accompaniment of cheers, briefly responded.

Mr Gunn, MP, moving a vote of thanks to the donors for their handsome gift to the people of Port Adelaide, said the citizens had shown their appreciation by attending in thousands to take part in the ceremony. Mr Winter had known many of the men whose names appeared on the monument and knew of the sacrifices they had made on behalf of the citizens and the workers of Port Adelaide. He joined Mr Condon in expressing pleasure at the presence of Mr R.H. Smith. He knew he expressed the wish of all present when he said he hoped he would soon regain his former vigorous health. The memorial was unique, as it was to the honour of men who had worked unceasingly in an every day way, sacrificing much that their fellows might enjoy a little more of the better things of life.

Some of the younger generation had little conception of what the pioneers of the labour movement had to sacrifice as they blazed the trail for those who came after them. The Hon. J. Jelley seconded the motion. He said Mr and Mrs Winter had made it possible to erect such a fine memorial to the heroes of the labour movement who had gone before. Mr Condon then asked the Mayor to accept the monument on behalf of the citizens. Mr Anderson briefly replied. The singing of the national anthem concluded the proceedings.

The memorial is not political, and in fact quite a few people whose names are engraved on it were members of political Parties other than the Australian Labor Party. It seems appropriate in our Jubilee 150 year to remind people of the memorial and to emphasise the sacrifices made by some of our forebears to help their fellow workers.

Although I have been in this House for only a short time, I am becoming sick and tired of the constant criticism by some members opposite of trade unions and rank and file trade union wage and salary earners. I do not know where Opposition members have been for the last three years, but there has been a virtual wage freeze because of the accord. There certainly has not been a corresponding price freeze, as evidenced by the almost daily increase in prices of many goods and services. The Opposition even opposes the national wage case decisions, but these decisions are only possible if they are justified, and the constantly rising prices and charges are that justification.

I will cite an example of a constituent who came to see me immediately after the recent 2.3 per cent wage decision. He received about \$7 a week from the wage rise, but his Housing Trust rent was adjusted upwards and, because of the extra income tax payable, he ended up with 40c a week extra in his pocket. The 2.3 per cent rise was supposed to compensate this man for increases in the cost of living of approximately \$5 a week, but he received only 40c out of the exercise, so in effect he is now about \$4.60 worse off than before. So much for the greedy trade unionists!

Exciting things are also happening on the other side of my electorate, in The Parks area. Regency college is continuing to gain international recognition as an institute of excellence in five main areas—electronic engineering, electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, plumbing and

sheet metalwork, and food and catering. Two of these schools—electronic engineering and food and catering—already have exceptional world-class credentials: in fact, the School of Food and Catering has enrolled students from all over the world.

The State cycling headquarters and track at Woodville Gardens is the facility that has been used to bring the cream of the nation's amateur cyclists up to the class that has seen them create history by making a clean sweep and winning all five gold medals in track events at the just completed 13th Commonwealth Games in Edinburgh, Scotland.

In winning the five events, nine gold medals were actually received as one of the events was a team event. Of those nine gold medals, six were won by South Australian riders, and one silver medal was also won by a South Australian rider. The riders concerned were Michael Turtur, Dean Woods, Wayne McCarney and Gary Neiwand. Mike Turtur is a native South Australian, and the others are registered South Australian riders. I pay a tribute to those riders for their fantastic exploits in Edinburgh but particularly to Mike Turtur. Mike, being a South Australian, has represented Australia at three Commonwealth Games, winning three gold medals and one bronze medal, and at two Olympic Games, winning one gold medal. I feel close to Mike because, when he first started racing as a lad of 11 years of age he trained with me. We continued with our careers until I got a bit too long in the tooth and Mike went on to better things.

Mr Hamilton: It might have been your influence on him.

Mr De LAINE: Yes. Mike Turtur was riding in the team when I won my last State gold medal at the age of 41 years. I believe it was his first senior ride in a State title event. He won the gold and I won a gold at my last appearance in State championships.

He was 18 and I was 41. Apart from the obvious talents of the riders concerned at those games, an immense amount of credit must go to the national track coach, Charlie Walsh. Charlie was born and bred in my electorate and in fact lived only a couple of streets away from the track where he has spent such a large percentage of his life. Charlie and I fought out many sprint races during our careers as racing cyclists, and I can assure members of this House that he is indeed a true professional in every respect.

Mr Tyler: And a great South Australian.

Mr De LAINE: Yes, and a great South Australian, as the member for Fisher says. The people of South Australia and Australia owe a great debt to Charlie Walsh. Following his successful coaching of Australian cyclists to gold medal performances in the 1982 Commonwealth Games and the 1984 Olympics, he has refused several very lucrative offers to coach overseas. To his credit Charlie chose to stay here to continue his work in the country he loves, for vastly reduced rewards.

Since the war cycling has been one of Australia's most successful international sports in terms of Olympic and Commonwealth Games medals won and world title victories. With due respect to the people who have worked long and hard to provide the facilities needed for competition and training, Australia's remarkable success in this exacting sport has been achieved not because of the facilities available but in spite of the lack of adequate facilities. I must hasten to add here that the South Australian Sports Institute has been an immensely valuable resource in the last few years and has contributed greatly to the recent successes of our cyclists. However, apart from this valuable facility and Charlie Walsh, we have virtually nothing else.

I remember back in the 1950s and early 1960s when I was training for Olympic and Commonwealth Games selec-

tion races. There were no coaches, no Sports Institute and quite primitive tracks to train and race on. In fact, when training at night with the State squad for the 1956 Olympic test races we used car headlights to provide track illumination. As a comparison between facilities here in South Australia and those enjoyed by riders overseas, the following situations are factual.

I will quote here the standard of the Hanson Reserve track at Woodville Gardens because this was, and is, the track that is almost always used for State titles, national titles (when held in South Australia) and games test races. In 1951, our track was equal to European tracks of approximately 1890. In 1960, our track had been upgraded somewhat and then compared to European tracks of approximately 1910. Now, in 1986, our track is equal to European tracks of approximately 1936! This will explain why I said that our riders have succeeded internationally despite our facilities.

Since Government funding has been available our riders have been able to go overseas several weeks before the last two Games to train and race on modern tracks in Germany and Belgium. This very short time with good facilities has been instrumental in lifting their performances up to gold medal standard, despite the fact that most of their preparation was done here on a track that was 50 years out of date. Just imagine what Australian cyclists will achieve when we get our indoor velodrome, and the National Cycling Institute is set up here in Adelaide.

Another great event to celebrate our Jubilee 150 year will be held at the Parks complex next month. The event in question is the staging of the 1986 world roller skating titles, held for the first time in the southern hemisphere. The 'Lloyd Bond' skating circuit at the Parks is a world class track and the racing should be fantastic with the cream of the world's skaters competing.

Another first for South Australia occurred in the electorate of Price recently. This is the construction of a new world-class hockey pitch at Finsbury Reserve, Pennington, and it has been named the Woodville Jubilee Hockey Stadium. This magnificent pitch consists of synthetic sand-filled 'super grasse' and is magnificently lit for night use. The project was done jointly by the Woodville council and the Woodville Hockey Club. The pitch was officially opened in mid-June and the first top international test match, between Australia and Argentina, is to be played there on 15 August. It should be a fantastic match, played on a superb pitch, with excellent lighting and spectator facilities. All in all 1986 is a great year for South Australia and a great year for the electorate of Price. I support the motion.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I support the motion and, in doing so, affirm my loyalty to the Queen. I would like to extend my condolences to the families of the late Bert Hawke and Charlie Harrison. I think that all of us were immensely impressed when we heard the tributes to Mr Hawke given in this House earlier this year, and inspired by the fact that any man or woman can reach such a great age and live such a productive life through every decade, as did Mr Hawke.

Charlie Harrison's last term in this Parliament was my first term, and he was one of the Labor members whom we on this side of the House would describe, I think, as the old style Labor members, who came up through the union movement and whose genuineness and courtesy impressed all of us. I enjoyed his company when he was in the House, and I extend my sympathies to his family.

As I did not have the opportunity to speak in the last Address in Reply debate, which was the first following the election, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute

to my former colleagues who were not re-elected. I refer to Michael Wilson, Dean Brown, John Mathwin and Scott Ashenden, men for whom I had very great respect and whose defeat, I believe, leaves this House the poorer. I entered Parliament in 1977 with Michael Wilson. We were the only two new Liberals elected in that year, and it was a good year. Some members of the Labor Party were also elected in that year, and they have found favour with their colleagues and risen to great heights.

Michael Wilson certainly rose to great heights as Minister of Transport in the Tonkin Government, and he is one of the relatively few Ministers in any portfolio who, in years to come, will be able to point to a monument. Many of us provide services which certainly are important but which are possibly not so visible, but the O-Bahn is certainly visible and a long-lasting monument and achievement to Michael Wilson's foresight, and it has been and will continue to be a tremendous asset to the city of Adelaide.

Dean Brown, both as Minister and shadow Minister, and as a very effective debater in this House, was respected by his colleagues and certainly served the State and the Liberal Party well. John Mathwin and Scott Ashenden were both tremendous fighters for their constituencies, and, if all members of the House on both sides, the media and the constituents could have heard the vigorous Party room debates when those two were defending the rights of the people they represented, they would have gained considerable insight into and respect for both John Mathwin and Scott Ashenden. I would also like to pay tribute to Jack Wright and George Whitten from the Labor Party. Again, they are two of what we would describe as old style Labor members; very genuine, both of whom added colour to this House.

I was particularly interested in the speech we have just heard from the member for Price who, in his pride and warmth of feeling for the Port, reflected the pride and warmth of feeling of his predecessor. It was always a pleasure to hear George Whitten speak of the Port, and it is a pleasure to hear the present member for Price speak in the same vein. Since the election, my Leader has given me the shadow portfolios of tourism and environment and planning.

Mr S.J. Baker: And you'll carry them out very well.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Thank you. I believe that these portfolios are very compatible, because I have a very strong feeling that the portfolios, if administered sensitively, can work together for the enhancement of South Australia and for the improvement and development of facilities, in harmony with nature, and that will make this State not only a better place in which to live but also a more beautiful place to visit. I am convinced also of the value of what I think could broadly be called cultural tourism. Today's visitor is hungry not only for recreation, a good time and pleasant visual experiences, but also he wants to learn, and most people will feel much more enriched by their holiday if they have learnt something from it. For this reason interpretative services become more and more important, as does the provision of information.

It is not an exaggeration to say that many of today's conservationists are yesterday's tourists who visited beauty spots in this State, country, and all around the world and as a result they became converted to a commitment to preserve the environment which, as visitors, they enjoyed. One of the best examples of that phenomenon, we could call it, is Fraser Island off the coast of Queensland. I am quite certain that it was because of the hundred of thousands of people who had visited Fraser Island and seen its beauty that a national and international movement devel-

oped to ensure that sand mining did not continue on that island. If not so many people had seen its beauty firsthand as tourists, I doubt that the strength of the movement to save that island from sand mining would have been as strong as it was.

I am equally sure that the strength of feeling, affection and proprietary interest that South Australians have for regions like Kangaroo Island and the Flinders Ranges is due to the fact that so many of us have visited those areas, experienced their beauty, stillness, magnificence and grandeur and, in the case of Kangaroo Island, its peace and tranquillity, and as a result have become committed to the idea that these things should be retained. However, it is not impossible to reconcile the needs of development and facilities with environment and conservation. In fact, the national conservation strategy recognises that the two go hand in hand and that conservation, particularly of the built heritage, rarely can be justified, unless it is justified in economic terms through the economic benefits which tourism brings.

In summary, I believe that the portfolios are compatible and I certainly hope that, during this term in Opposition, I can heighten the awareness of South Australians of the Liberal Party's commitment, both to the environment and also to the appropriate development of tourism that is in harmony with the distinctive nature and character of this State.

Obviously, one of the most important parts of our tourism product, if I can describe it in those commercial terms, and our environment is the State's national parks. It is not an exaggeration to say that the State's national parks have reached crisis point. I do not argue with the policy that has been pursued over the years of acquiring land, when it becomes available, because it has some aspect that is precious and worthy of preservation, but it is very wrong to keep acquiring land when no comparable effort is being made to ensure that that land is managed and developed as it should be, if its true conservation purpose is to be recognised.

The national parks in South Australia have reached a point where Government neglect is threatening the very life and future of these parks. I would like to provide some details to the House. The most visited park in South Australia is Belair National Park. A short summary of some of the very serious deficiencies in this park would include reference to the septic system for the public toilets which is 50 years old. Some 7 million litres of raw sewage flows into the creek system each year. The park has a discretionary budget after meeting its fixed commitments of just barely \$17 000 per annum. With that sum, the park management, the National Parks and Wildlife Service, is expected to maintain all its roads, ovals and tennis courts. There are more tennis courts and ovals at Belair I would suggest than in any other park in the State. There are also many kilometres of roads.

Mr S.J. Baker: And Australia.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: And Australia, indeed, as my colleague the member for Mitcham points out. The sum of \$17 000 per annum to maintain those facilities is puny and inadequate. A number of tennis courts will have to be closed because of resurfacing costs, and that will shut off from a large section of the community the only access that they have to tennis courts. Some of the ovals have deteriorated to dust bowls in the summer and mud patches in the winter because there is not enough money to re-seed and maintain them. Whilst officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service are responsible for collecting fees for the use of the facilities, all the money that is collected in that park is paid into general revenue and not one cent

of it benefits the park itself. There are huge erosion problems in the area which can only be cured by very expensive flood mitigation and planting programs. There is no likelihood of those programs occurring, and I suspect that the axe will fall on the environment budget just as it will fall on the budgets of other departments this year. There are increasing incidences of vandalism and visitation by hoodlums to the park simply because there is no staff to patrol the area. That is Belair, which is the most visited park in the State.

Another park which is of critical importance, and it is probably the most visited by international visitors, is Cleland Conservation Park. In 1980, when Cleland was administered by a trust, the trust developed in the native fauna centre a swamp complex comprising an enlarged main lake, a small perch lake, a smaller lake at the rear with deep water and a fringing swamp. A swamp aviary was constructed and 10 000 trees and shrubs were planted. The total cost of the overall project was \$250 000, which in anyone's language is a very substantial investment of taxpayers' money. What has happened since—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duigan): Order! Could members keep their private conversations to a minimum.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: It might be worthwhile if members of the Government listening to this were to exert some influence, if they have any influence, on the Deputy Premier. It appears that he has very little clout in Cabinet and staff in his department are frankly incredulous that a Deputy Premier can do so little with Treasury that the parks under his administration are literally in a state of crisis. No allowance has been made for additional maintenance workers to maintain all the above developments. No allowance has been made for materials to maintain pathways, for tree planting, for watering or for mulching. It is estimated that it would take two full-time staff members to adequately maintain that complex and it would take approximately \$6 000 in materials annually to keep abreast of maintenance requirements. None of that finance has been forthcoming and, since the construction of the swamp complex, edge erosion has occurred through water lap and that is causing the collapse of the bank and silting which has blocked the inlet pipes of the circulation pump. A critical point is that no funds were provided for interpretation of the complex.

It is fine to have these facilities for visitors but, if there is no means whatsoever of explaining to a visitor what is unique and of special interest about the facility, the cultural enrichment that can and should come from tourism is completely lost, and with it a great deal is lost in the community sense. At Cleland there is also a native fauna park, as everyone knows, and five kilometres of chain linked fence has been constructed at a total cost of \$150 000. One would think that, having invested that kind of money, the maintenance to ensure that the facility was kept in good repair would be provided. However, no allowance has been made for the maintenance of the fence, which requires constant attention to keep it free of leaf litter, weeds and to replace damaged wire mesh when tree limbs fall on it. The two maintenance workers who should be working on the fence, along with about \$2 000 a year for weed control, have simply never been provided.

During the term of the trust, which, of course, was during the term of the Liberal Government, seven kilometres of new and upgraded trails were constructed. One four kilometre trail, from Waterfall Gully to Mount Lofty, was constructed largely as a new trail and contains 700 metres of dry stone walling. No allowance has been made for the maintenance of these walls and, as a consequence, they are

falling into a state of severe disrepair. In the late summer I walked from the lower fall at Waterfall Gully up to the top fall and, as members will recall, it had been a very dry summer. The creek was so choked by exotic weeds and exotic vegetation, including willows, blackberries and other plants, that even at the end of the dry summer the pathway alongside the creek was flooded because the water could not flow freely along the creek bed. I have not had an opportunity to repeat that walk since the heavy rains. However, I would say that the pathway which South Australians and interstate and international visitors travel to visit these beautiful waterfalls would be ankle deep in water and mud.

The dingo display at Cleland is suffering because no provision has been made for the cleaning of the display building or for the maintenance of fences, pathways, wooden decks and tree plantations. No provision has been made for the maintenance of the wombat display, which would require one half-time staff member per week on a continuing basis. What do visitors see when they come to this showpiece of South Australia, which the Department of Tourism promotes as being the only opportunity in Australia to see our natural fauna within about 15 minutes of the GPO? They see a shoddy park which is deteriorating through neglect and lack of maintenance. The same goes for the euro display, the animal management building, the workshop and for the vehicle storage area.

All in all, it is a very sad story and one which does the Minister no credit at all. The other parks in South Australia, which I am trying progressively to visit, are in an equally bad state. Tolderal Game Reserve, which was established as a large experimental area of ponds for waterfowl monitoring and for foraging and breeding birds, has had no staff to run it or funds to pump water into the ponds, so it has been a complete waste and is now drying up. I notice that the Minister who is in charge of all these areas is finding more interest in chatting with his colleagues than in hearing about the extraordinary state to which the reserves and national parks under his control have deteriorated. Innes National Park, a park of truly stunning beauty at the foot of Yorke Peninsula, has had to close its camping areas because of inability to control visitors.

There are no toilet facilities. There is no one to control littering. Soil erosion is serious and there is extensive damage to vegetation. The other camping areas in Innes National Park are under heavy pressure and may have to be closed, also. In fact, I would say that the Minister has already put the axe into them in terms of the forthcoming budget.

Para Wirra Conservation Park, which is a very important recreation area for people living in the northern suburbs—people who have not got large gardens to enjoy and who like to get out amongst nature—is suffering very severely from degradation due to a combination of public pressure and overgrazing by kangaroos and feral goats. It is absolutely extraordinary that a Government would permit that to occur almost within the boundaries of the metropolitan area. The park has no visitor reception area or centre and, of course, no interpretation facilities.

Sandy Creek Conservation Park is another area which is suffering from degradation. There is no control over the spread of noxious weeds, simply because there is a lack of staff and resources. The Port Gawler Conservation Park is being destroyed by off-road vehicles. I heard the Minister, yesterday I think, or today talk about the precious nature of the dune area of West Lakes in the metropolitan area. The Port Gawler dunes are equally precious, but they are in the process of being destroyed because there is totally inadequate management and no patrolling. Consequently, they are being ripped apart by off-road vehicles.

The Coorong game reserve is an area attracting people from all over the world—scientists from many countries are coming to visit the Coorong, without any real promotion and simply because of word of mouth among the scientific community. The Coorong game reserve has no office, and, although it has a centre, it cannot be opened because of a lack of staff. The Noonameena complex, after having funds spent on it, is still not completed and remains closed to the public; as a result, it is deteriorating. I could speak about Black Hill park or Morialta park in my own electorate, where the story is the same. Ngarkat Conservation Park, in the electorate of the member for Murray-Mallee, has no staff and suffers from off-road vehicles and people cutting brush for the open market. This is permitted to happen under a Government which claims that it is extremely concerned about the clearance of native vegetation.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: We have demonstrated our concern.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The Minister has demonstrated that concern, but in the meantime vegetation in Ngarkat Conservation Park is being cut away and nothing is being done about it by the Government. The farmers who are neighbours of Ngarkat are desperately concerned at the failure to control vermin, the failure to institute effective firefighting procedures and the complete lack of management, which is threatening their properties. At Katarapko and Moorook game reserves the story is the same. There is a deterioration of new roadworks. The Government spends money at some stage on capital works and then lets the whole thing deteriorate because it does not provide funds for maintenance. There is a deterioration of new roadworks due to lack of funds to maintain them. There is no capacity to carry out preventive maintenance. Over Easter 1986, 950 vehicles used that area and yet the Government has done nothing whatsoever to assist a mere two rangers in attempting to service more than 1 000 campers at 150 camp sites.

It is more than human beings can be expected to do, to ask two rangers to attend to as many people as that on 150 different sites. That is beyond human undertaking and no Minister should expect it of his staff, but that is what is expected by this Government. It is a complete physical impossibility to control the area and, as a result, the new game reserve of Lock Tuna is suffering extensive damage from trail bikes, people cutting living trees, and the spread of rubbish over the general area.

That is a very short summary, and one could go on. The situation is so serious that if something is not done soon it could take more than a decade to restore these parks from the state of neglect into which they have fallen. The Minister would well know that morale amongst park rangers is very low. They are desperate and see no help coming their way. They are given impossible tasks to perform and are valiantly trying to perform them.

There have been cries from the Government benches about requests to spend more money. A part remedy is in the Government's hands, if it chooses to use it and if it was not completely bound by its allegiance to a union movement which insists that volunteers are not used in parks. The reality is—and I know this is the case in relation to parks in my own electorate, notably Black Hill and Morialta—that service clubs are crying out to express the community's wish for well managed parks by offering their services free for maintenance, development and patrolling. There is a vast reservoir of goodwill in the conservation movement which the Government could tap if it wanted to and which could be used to help restore these parks to their proper state. The only development that has taken place in

the Morialta park in recent times has taken place because a local service club offered its services. Thankfully that offer to build a shelter and seats has been accepted.

If one multiplied that little initiative throughout the State, and if the Minister would recognise the goodwill that exists amongst service clubs and conservationists and was willing to harness that goodwill, I believe a great deal more could be accomplished at no or little cost to the taxpayer, although some materials may have to be provided.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: You put a question on notice to me in relation to how many volunteers we have used in the past 12 months and you will get the full details.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I could get the answer to that question, but I would not be in possession of any evidence that the Government was committed to a total statewide volunteers in parks plan that could transform the neglect of our parks.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: Ask me and you'll get the answer.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I have spoken to many people involved in the parks and I am told by local service clubs that they would love to do more but they have been told that they cannot do so because the Government tells them that unionists will object to the use of volunteers in parks. The Minister cannot deny that; he knows it to be a fact.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: He can and does.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: In that case I challenge the Minister to undertake a recruitment drive for volunteers in national parks throughout South Australia. I would be delighted to support such a drive, as would the service clubs of South Australia and the conservation movement. I have spoken to enough people in the conservation movement to know that volunteers in parks are very jealously eyed, are frequently not welcome and that a great deal could be done if the offer of help was taken up and enthusiastically used on a coordinated statewide basis. Considering South Australia's superlative record of volunteerism there is nothing to stop volunteers in parks—or VIPs as they are known in other countries—becoming as much a force for good in the conservation of this State as the St John Ambulance Brigade has been a force for good in the health services of this State.

In the few minutes now left for me to speak I will deal with a matter that was raised with me by residents of Devon Drive, Salisbury. This matter concerns the very serious problem of noise that those residents are having to endure because the Department of Environment and Planning is not enforcing the provisions of the Noise Control Act.

It is a long story. I have a great deal of correspondence. I know that the member for Elizabeth has tried to assist these people, but the fact is that, despite the Minister's acknowledgement that noise from the Hexagon Engineering factory is excessive when assessed under the provisions of the Noise Control Act for an area described for the purposes of the Act as urban residential with some manufacturing industry, no fines have been imposed. The residents are suffering genuine distress. In the case of one elderly couple, the husband has to sleep in a separate bedroom at the rear of the house because he cannot tolerate the noise.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duigan): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): In supporting the Governor's Speech tonight, I take this opportunity to put on record some of the achievements that have been logged up in the electorate of Bright in the past three years or so. I particularly want to refer to human services in Bright and to indicate that great strides have been taken during that time.

In 1983, at the beginning of the first term of the Bannon Government we had an economic recovery of unparalleled proportions which was substantially led by a housing boom. The negative side of that, I suppose, was that some of the outstanding growth areas were left with a shortage of human services, which albeit temporary, has been somewhat annoying for the people who live in those areas. One of the areas thus affected is Hallett Cove, which is in the electorate which I represent. I had the good fortune to follow the present member for Mawson in representing that part of Adelaide.

During mid 1983 it became apparent that we needed to look at human services at Hallett Cove, and in July 1984 the then member for Mawson called a meeting of representatives from a whole series of Government or semi-government authorities basically to lay down an agenda for human services in the Hallett Cove area. The member for Mawson had contacted the local councillor from the Marion City Council, representatives of the Department of Community Welfare, the Kindergarten Union, the Education Department, the Child and Family Health Service, and the Baptist Church, which is quite active in the area, as well as several other organisations. We sat around a table trying to figure out just exactly what services were needed for the area and what services could be delivered. Quite clearly, the major onus fell on the Government to provide Government services, although voluntary services provided by the church and community groups were also involved.

It was decided that we needed a number of kindergartens and schools in the area, and I think it is probably appropriate at this stage to log up some of those successes and to indicate the outcome of the deliberations. I also record my gratitude to the member for Mawson for her part in that exercise. The first of the achievements was the Karrara Kindergarten, which was opened in the third term of last year. That has progressed extremely well, to the point where we probably need another teacher for the kindergarten. It is full, and has operated brilliantly under the guidance and leadership of Councillor John Comrie, who was the first President of the committee and, more latterly, under Pam Fitton, who is the current President. The kindergarten has gone extremely well and is catering very well for the needs of children in the Karrara area.

It has also been announced that the new Hallett Cove R to 10 school, to cater for children from reception to year 10, will open in the first term of next year. It is intended that children from reception to year 7 will attend the school in 1987, while in subsequent years the compass of the school's activities will be enlarged one year at a time until 1990 when the school will achieve year 10 status. Under the leadership of people like Danny Magazinovic, Peter van Stuivenberg, and Jeanette Hodgson, and with the co-operation of people from the southern area education office, that school has gone from basically the drawing board to a very substantial building.

It will certainly be open on time, at the beginning of 1987, for reception to year 7 children. Another outcome of the meeting was that surplus land in the area owned at that stage by the Education Department and known as the Patpa school site was sold to community groups for various purposes. The site in question is extremely central to the Hallett Cove area. It lies on Ramrod Avenue, directly adjacent to the commercial and professional centre, and it has been sought-after real estate. However, it was sold to groups who have a vested interest in the community rather than in building more houses.

The Baptist community of Hallett Cove and Marino bought a site, and those people have every intention of

erecting a church, a community centre, possibly a squash court and perhaps an indoor pool on the site. The essence of the proposal is that it will certainly be used for community facilities, and that is a great improvement on many alternative uses. Under the leadership of Pastor Bill Wheatland, the Baptist community at Hallett Cove has grown enormously, to the extent that there are now two pastors instead of one, and the community is thriving and going from strength to strength.

A second part of the Patpa land was sold to the Marion council, which intends to erect a small regional library to cater for the Hallett Cove, Trott Park and Sheidow Park communities. It will also be an administrative centre at which people can pay dog licence fees, parking fines and so on. That will be a considerable boon to the community and will centralise facilities that are already located in that area, keeping them virtually within walking distance of one another. I regard that as a major achievement and a major coup for sensible planning.

A third area of the Patpa school site has been sold to the Children's Services Office, and a child-care centre has been constructed, much to the chagrin of the member for Henley Beach. It is presently up and running, having opened in December last year. Again, the centre is small, such is the growth in that area, and, under the directorship of Jan Blaby and the chairmanship of Barry Edmonson (who is very much an activist in the church and social activities in the area), that child-care centre has gone from strength to strength. The second AGM has been held and a new committee appointed. I feel sure that that organisation will continue to run smoothly and the child-care centre will continue to cater for the needs of that growing area.

It is worth noting that in the concentration on primary and preschool facilities the young children of the Hallett Cove area have not been forgotten. As part of the Karrara kindergarten and the child-care centre, a Child, Adolescent and Family Health Service facility has been included. People no longer have to take their children to cold caravans in winter and hot caravans in summer to obtain services from CAFHS at virtually a roadside stop. Those services are now located in centrally heated or airconditioned buildings, and people who are waiting to see the CAFHS sister can do so in considerably more comfort than has been the case in the past 10 years.

Another major achievement in that general vicinity is the incorporation into the R to 10 school of a community gymnasium, which will be open to members of the Hallett Cove, Trott Park and Sheidow Park communities for use at all times. This gymnasium is not the standard size Education Department gymnasium but is considerably bigger, and it will be used by the whole community. It was thought that a degree of unease would be created if the community wanted to use the gymnasium while school was in session, but I am sure that timetabling programs can overcome that. I look forward to the construction of that gymnasium, because there is a great need in the area, one that I am sure will be appreciated by all residents.

Another part of that site was sold to the Lutheran Church, not in an attempt to place all the churches on the same site but in an attempt to centralise community services. The Lutherans propose to build a community hall on that site that will be accessible to all members of the community for meetings, badminton games and a range of other activities.

The remainder of the Patpa school site has been divided up into two sections. There is a proposal to sell one hectare of the site for aged housing with the thought that, if aged people live in the area, they will be within easy walking distance of shops, services, transport and commercial and

professional services on the other side of Ramrod Avenue. Again, I am confident, provided that a developer can be found to undertake that operation, that it will be a way of restoring a balance to the Hallett Cove community which at the moment tends to be concentrated on the young to middle age group. There are not many senior citizens and, for the sake of balance, we need to retain them in the area so that they do not feel constrained to move to other suburbs. I hope that aged housing on that site will provide the incentive for local people to stay there, use the facilities and live out their days in what I regard as a very pleasant suburb.

A small section of the Patpa land was transferred to the Marion City Council for a reserve, and that now gives a meaningful size to the reserve on the gully at the northern end of the Patpa site so that it can be used by children to kick around footballs, walk their dogs and do various other things. Previously the area was a little narrow but, with the strip of Education Department land, it comes a usable size reserve.

When enumerating the Government services that have been provided to the Hallett Cove community, I need to make special mention of the 681 bus service, for which a number of us worked hard for many years. We had complete cooperation of the local councillors from the Marion City Council, the local progress association and the general citizenry of the Hallett Cove area. On 18 December 1984 that service became operational. It connected the Hallett Cove beach railway station to the Hallett Cove railway station and leads to Marino and Brighton stations. In so doing it gives cross connections to Seacombe and Dover High Schools and Marion shopping centre, and it also provides a way for people from Hallett Cove to get either quick access to express rail service into town or to make their way to places such as Flinders Medical Centre, Marion shopping centre or Adelaide. The bus service is a major achievement for those groups who have worked so hard to ensure that it was eventually placed there.

I would like to record my thanks to the Minister of Transport at that time for his cooperation in putting in that service. It was most certainly appreciated. That was all as a result of a meeting convened by the former member for Mawson on 16 July 1984. For one meeting it turned out to be a fairly productive undertaking. I wish to record my thanks to her and all members of the community who were involved in that exercise.

When we contemplate the growth of an area like Hallett Cove, it is worth recording some of the other achievements that have been made in the provision of Government services in that area and in the wider area of Brighton and, indeed, in the south-western suburbs in general. It is worth pointing out that in the past three years the frequency of STA trains has increased considerably, to the point where almost all rolling stock is currently in use in peak hours. With the acquisition of the new super train rail cars that are currently rolling off the production line, I would expect that those services could be increased ever further. A great need exists for additional services, and in my estimation the STA is working flat out to provide them. The STA makes a point of maintaining its lines, car parks and stations to a degree that it copes very well with its resources.

The eastern car park at Hallett Cove has been logged for an upgrade in the upcoming financial year, and I am confident that that will be a much more salubrious place to park one's car after the end of this financial year. Also the western car park, previously gravelled, will be bitumenised and landscaped with the help of the local progress associa-

tion. I expect that that facility will be far more acceptable to STA patrons after that exercise is completed.

It is also worth pointing out that the STA does a good job of maintaining the Hackham railway line which, of course, has not been used now for a number of years but remains STA property, and for which a use may ultimately be found, possibly as a light rail transit line, for instance. Certainly, it will remain STA property until some decision is made on its future, and in the meantime the STA has a continual battle trying to maintain the area and keeping it free from weeds and dumped materials, etc.

I must record the fact that the STA has to date been very cooperative when asked to perform clean-up operations. Also, aside from the two car parks previously mentioned, it has given attention to car parks at Brighton, Seacliff and Marino which have had a considerable upgrading and are now a good deal better than they were three years ago. The STA also spent \$35 000 in putting in a speed discriminator at the Hove railway crossing, partly with a view to making that crossing safer for motorists but also with a view to speeding up the flow of traffic on Brighton Road.

It is also worth recording the fact that a number of other improvements are in sight for the Noarlunga line. These will include improved headway for operations so that things are moved out of the way of trains, and the higher carriages will be able to operate more easily. Also, train protection will be provided by the installation of automatic warning systems which will alert drivers both visually and audibly if they approach a stop or a caution signal. In the event of a driver failing to acknowledge that alert warning, the system will automatically bring the train to a halt. Again, it is a major safety measure and one for which the STA should be commended.

It has also proposed to improve the passenger information systems which are available on the Noarlunga line. Passengers at wayside stations will be able to obtain 'real time' information on train movements. That is to say, if the trains are late or early that information will be available at the push of a button. Again, I commend the authority on that innovation. Certainly, it is a matter of leaping into the twentieth century in a big way. Also, the system will enable information on train movements to be announced automatically at the push of a button so that commuters waiting for a train which is perhaps late, or commuters unaware of the train timetables, can simply push a button and get up-to-date information via a computer system which monitors the movement of every train on the line.

In addition, closed circuit television will be used for the surveillance of the Noarlunga Centre interchange, and it is hoped that the incidence of vandalism will be reduced and that people, particularly old people and people with children, will feel a little easier about using that facility at odd hours where, perhaps, they now feel threatened. I have already mentioned the \$35 000 spent on the Hove railway speed discriminator, which will improve the traffic flow on Brighton Road considerably, and the fact that overhead power lines will be taken out of the way so that basically the railway line simply looks neater.

The Highways Department has logged up a few successes in the past three years which are worth recording. The vexed question of the third arterial road for commuters in the southern area has proceeded to the point where the Highways Department is currently examining three options. I understand that at the moment geotechnical and initial work has been completed, and the decision finally made as to which of these routes to use will involve geotechnical, gradient, visual amenity and cost considerations, as well as the

degree of noise pollution which can be expected to accrue from the positioning of the road.

It is worth pointing out that, as I understand it, the three routes that have been designated are of comparable cost and that at least two of them are relatively free of environmental consequences, so it is hoped that the final route chosen will be one that does not subject the residents of Seacombe Heights and Darlington to undue levels of noise pollution and does not spoil the visual amenity of those who enjoy looking out over the hills and, indeed, who have paid extra money for house blocks in order to do so.

The Highways Department has done a good job also of completing Dyson Road and, at least so far as I am concerned, the roadworks have now moved south of the electorate of Bright and I have stopped watching them quite so anxiously. Dyson Road now has been completely remade as far south as Flaxmill Road. The vexed problems of the O'Sullivan Beach Road intersection, which really was a death trap for a number of years, now have been overcome and traffic appears to move a good deal more freely and quickly on Dyson Road. Again, I think it is worth recording my gratitude to the Highways Department for doing such a good job on that road. It is worth pointing out also that the department has provided a good access road for commercial premises in Lonsdale, so that people no longer have to risk their lives when they stop on the Lonsdale Highway in an 80 km/h zone in order to buy something from a hardware shop or a second-hand yard.

The Highways Department has been responsible also in the electorate of Bright for implementing a system known as the Adelaide coordinated traffic signals system, which in July 1985 was put into effect on Brighton Road. Since the traffic signals on that road have been coordinated, traffic movements have improved considerably. They have probably increased also, which of course is of some concern, but traffic now moves much more freely and there are fewer delays at places such as the Hove crossing, the Jetty Road intersection at Brighton and the Seacombe Road lights. The Highways Department has its share of maintenance to carry out and, in fact, the embankments along the Lonsdale Highway have been extremely well maintained.

In the area of Government services, the E&WS Department deserves, I think, a few accolades. At last, we will soon have sewerage in the eastern portion of Hallett Cove Estate. I am on record as saying that I regarded the Hon. Mr Hopgood as being the greatest living Minister for Environment, to which statement I could almost add the greatest Minister of Water Resources, but I will reserve that accolade until the sewerage project is finished. I am reserving my comment in that regard and will keep it under my belt as a sort of bribe! People in that part of the State have waited for sewerage for quite a while. The subdivision was made initially in 1912. I understand that it was drawn up on paper in London from photographs, sketches or some such thing and the roads went out over the cliff and came back in again. They went over sheer precipices with gay abandon and, really, the subdivision was not as easy as probably visualised by the people who initially bought the blocks. Finally, after 74 years, we have sewerage in the eastern portion of Hallett Cove Estate, and I think that the people in that area would wish to express their appreciation for that. I found the E&WS Department most helpful in obtaining that innovation for the area. It certainly has been a long wait, but the people are grateful that it has finally arrived.

The E&WS Department has done its work very well also in places like Marino, where perhaps the pressure of water supplied to consumers in that area is somewhat subject to fluctuations. The tremendous growth of population in the

area of Trott Park, Sheidow Park and Hallett Cove has placed enormous stresses on the pumping system in that area and, unfortunately, the people of Marino are on the end of the line. The E&WS Department has installed at Marino a pumping station which will boost pressure in that area and, aside from a few nervous ripples initially, because the noise levels were a little high, that is working extremely well now and the people, in my view, are quite satisfied with the arrangement.

I think it is worth pointing out the part played by the various community groups in the development of a growing electorate like Bright. I pay some tribute to the many community groups that have been worthy recipients of grants from both Federal and State Government sources. In a very quick review of these, I suppose I should put at the top of the list the Kingston House Committee, which so far has obtained \$100 000 in State grants in order to refurbish Kingston House to its well deserved former glory.

Kingston House, some five or six years ago, was in danger of being demolished, and with the heritage money put into that place and the very capable leadership of the Kingston House Development Committee (including people like Gerry Govier and Bob Tait) and with the cooperation of the Heritage Branch, great strides have been made. We now have a group of local residents who sell Devonshire teas there every Sunday morning, and Sadie Clayton's Devonshire teas have to be tasted and consumed to be believed. It is a very good innovation in an area that so far has not had a community focus. The refurbishment of what was a fairly derelict sort of old building is a shining example both of what can be done to a building of that type and also what can be done to provide a community focus in an area that previously lacked one. It is also worth putting on record the possibility of a further \$30 000 to complete that job, and we are hoping to obtain that by way of a federal grant.

Moving further north, the Brighton Bowling Club has been in receipt of a grant from the CEP, and with the \$12 000 obtained and under the stewardship of ex President Bob Watson and the present President Noel Bromilow, new greens have been established and new skills have been obtained by the young people who were employed to lay and maintain the greens. Also, shelters have been erected around the greens. The size of the Brighton Bowling Club is now 33½ per cent greater than it was before the grant application was made. The Brighton Women's Bowling Club is also worthy of mention. It has applied in the very recent past for a \$4 000 grant to reconstruct the walls around the end of one of their rinks to prevent the bowls from going next door. Under the leadership of Mrs Finlayson and Mrs Crawford, that organisation is fighting it very hard to provide services for the growing number of aged people in Brighton. To keep people of that age happy and content and active is certainly a major imperative and one that I am sure all members of the House would support. Incidentally, that grant has been applied for under the small grants for seniors scheme, and I look forward very much to the time when they obtain that money and are able to carry out the work that they so much need.

Another group that furnishes a much needed service to the senior citizens of Seacliff is the Seacliff Over 50s Club. They have already been the recipients of a similar grant in a previous year to buy indoor bowling mats. To go down there on an afternoon and play them at indoor bowls is a challenge that I do not rise to very often and, when I do, I get comprehensively hammered. It is worth recording the work done by people such as Mrs Maureen Baldock, who has provided leadership for that group over a number of years, and complimenting the Seacliff Over 50s on their

success in both obtaining the grant and putting it to extremely good use. In passing, there are a number of other groups to which I would like to refer, but I guess I can save that for another occasion.

I want to turn now to the grants that have been obtained over the past couple of years by the Brighton City Council, which has always acknowledged its role in providing facilities for the aged and a quick run-through of those will suffice to indicate the nature of the support which this Government has given to councils in that area. Brighton City Council received a \$10 000 grant from the local heritage grants scheme to survey the built history of Brighton, and that has been received in the very recent past. The council has also obtained \$373 000 from CEP money for a foreshore renewal program. That program is now finished. The sand has been stabilised and the foreshore looks about 3 000 per cent better. Under the very watchful eye of council employees, that work was carried out and a number of people benefited from the new skills obtained. It is worth pointing out that the Seacliff boat ramp, which has long been a cause for concern in the Brighton area, has obtained \$12 500 from the Coast Protection Board funds to be rebuilt.

That is half the total cost of rebuilding. The yachties and boatics of Seacliff and adjoining suburbs will see the benefit of that and will be able to use the ramp. The community has needed the ramp for many years and it will be very much appreciated. In conclusion, I think it is worth paying credit to the highly motivated and selfless people on the executives of the various management committees, voluntary groups and local organisations that have done the research, written the grant applications and administered the schemes over the years. It seems to me that it is a just reward for some of the many hours that these people have put in. It is their own time that they have invested on behalf of the community. I pay full credit to them for their work on the community's behalf and I wish them every success in the future with similar applications.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): I will not take my full 30 minutes, given the lateness of the hour. I support the motion and join with other members in offering my condolences to the relatives and friends of Bert Hawke and Charlie Harrison. Had we not had curtailed an opportunity to speak at the end of the last session a number of my colleagues and I would have paid a tribute to four members on this side of the House who were defeated in the 1985 election. I believe that the House is the poorer for that result. I refer particularly to John Mathwin, whom I always called 'the little British battler' because he was a fighter. He did what he believed and he supported his electorate and its people 24 hours of the day. The people who knew John Mathwin as their member regarded him as a person that they could rely on, trust and hold high in their esteem. Scott Ashenden was of a different mould but, nonetheless, he was a tigerish champion for his constituents, a person who had to fight hard because at the last election the Government provided resources to assist in its campaign in his area. On many occasions Scott Ashenden embarrassed the Government. He managed to put a fairly human view on some of the challenges, problems and many of the facets of living in the north-eastern suburbs. The House is the poorer for his absence.

The most appropriate statement I can make about Michael Wilson, the former member for Torrens, is that he was a gentleman, a statesman and a person of enormous capacity, great generosity and humanity. There is no doubt that, if an award was made in this Parliament for the person who conducted themselves with decorum and had respect for

other people, certainly Michael Wilson would win the award. I do not forget his contributions, which were always intelligent, well reasoned and thoughtful. Last but not least, Dean Brown had a number of very strong attributes which stood him in good stead when he was in this Parliament. I think there are two achievements for which Dean Brown should be remembered: first, his vision in respect of setting up the pre-vocational training in this State and, secondly, Technology Park.

I was out at the opening of the new wing of Technology Park recently, and I was a little dismayed that the Premier did not acknowledge the presence or the contribution of Dean Brown to the establishment of Technology Park. I noticed that the member for Briggs spent most of his speech talking about technology, yet he also failed to mention the contribution of Dean Brown. Without Dean Brown, Technology Park would not exist today. The way in which he established it and set the standards gave it a better than even chance of succeeding in a very competitive world.

When I was overseas I had the benefit of visiting places in Britain such as ICL and the British Technology Group; in Sweden, TEKNIKODJEN, which means Hi Tech Hill; and, in Japan, Nippon Telecommunications and FANUC. A picture emerged from these visits about the future of technology and where we are heading. It is a little bit different from the story told by the member for Briggs, who suggested that there is this wonderful wide world of technology out there to be embraced. What he failed to do was talk about the challenges that face Australia to be able to choose the technology that will be best suited for its future, to be able to resist the pressures upon it to adopt some of the overseas technologies that will be in the market, and to be able to compete in a very highly competitive market.

For example, some people in this House might know that the great battle between the Japanese and the United States giants in the computer area is in the area of information technology. IBM in America, and some conglomerates in Japan, are dominating the market. The Europeans have put together a combine called ESPRIT, which is investing 1.2 billion pounds to get into the race. Australia does not feature in that market and does not feature in the developments. Technology transfer from the massive amount of research and development will be borrowed or passed down the line when certain of our trading partners see fit.

It is, indeed, a very difficult path we have to tread in the next few years and technology could run over us in the same way as it has tended to run over us in the past 10 years. In Sweden it was interesting to note that the organisation called Hi Tech Hill is in much the same development position as South Australia's Technology Park. Their beginnings were much the same and a number of firms that have set up on the hills above Stockholm are much the same except for biotechnology, which we do not have. They agree that our recipe is the right one and they have done research in all countries around the world.

Again, I must pay a tribute to Dean Brown because he, indeed, set the right standards. Many of the technology parks that have been set up around the world have become *quasi*-industrial parks. They have been set up next to institutions such as institutes of technology and universities, and what has happened is that some of the people with the greatest capacities in the academic field have moved over into the manufacturing field in these industrial parks.

While the manufacturers have benefited, the country and those regions where this has occurred have become the poorer because they have lost some of the people with the greatest capacity to teach. Interestingly enough, Nippon Telecommunications, in Japan, is embarking on a saturation

of Tokyo and its environs with the optical fibre cable, which has an enormous capacity to carry data. Members would find that one hair of the head, if viewed as optical fibre cable, has the capacity to carry as many as 24 000 telephone lines. One can imagine the enormous strength that Japan will have if its market adapts itself to the total use of the optical fibre cable. Japan has recently signed an agreement with America to lay this cable across the various oceans. It is a project of immense proportions and will have far-reaching effects on Australia and the South-East Asian region.

If Japan controls the imparting of knowledge—the information technology revolution, as we call it—it will be in an enormously powerful position to control much of our resources. My visit to FANUC was not as enlightening as were my visits to some other places, but it is interesting to see how a company has grown from nothing in 1974 to be the largest manufacturer of CNC machines in the world. It is also a major producer of robotics.

What came through from these visits—and I hoped to be able to speak to experts in the European countries I visited, but unfortunately that was not possible—is that the rest of the world is advancing at such a rapid rate and we are being left behind because of our size, distance, and our lack of willingness to understand that massive changes are still taking place. In other debates I will refer to the role of management and unions, because they are fundamental to some of the change that is taking place. If we are to have our technology and the people capable of making inventions in Australia benefit from those inventions we have to make a number of fundamental changes to the way in which we operate. It is not good enough to say that Technology Park is the bright shining star. More things are needed.

For example, when I visited the British Technology Group, it clearly set out the path to a successful Technology Park, and five years down the track we have to have in place a direct inroad into very large and flexible capital resources. That is not apparent at this stage and there will have to be changes in the management structure to allow that to happen. The pay-off with Technology Park will not come for more than 20 years. We are not talking about tomorrow, but 20 years hence. Meanwhile our basic industries are crumbling because of the policies of this Government and the putrid industrial relations that exist in this country.

Members interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: If members opposite are amused they should visit some of our trading partners and ask them their view of Australia. They will be told what those trading partners think of Australian unions.

I wish to develop a number of topics as a result of my overseas trip and a number of matters in terms of the State economy and the national economy, but I shall do that in later debates. At this time I simply say that if we want the State to advance there must be a change in thinking on behalf of all South Australians and particularly the Labor Government.

Mr GREGORY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): Tonight I want to refer to the much vexed question of pest control and the Adelaide Pest Control issue that was raised in the Chamber earlier

by the member for Hanson. I will not descend to the type of flippant remarks and nitpicking in which the member for Hanson engaged in his contribution. I think the issue is serious enough to deserve clarification by me, and I have every intention of putting on the public record tonight some of the details that were omitted by the member for Hanson. I shall outline to the House the events as they actually occurred, as opposed to the complexion thrown on the matter by the member for Hanson. I shall deal with the events chronologically, carefully and slowly so that all members of the House will be able to follow the logic.

After the question was raised in the House on Thursday, I received a courteous call from one of the Directors of Adelaide Pest Control, Mr George Murray. Mr Murray asked whether he could come to my office to discuss the matter. I agreed, an appointment was made and Mr Murray saw me at my office on Monday. In our discussions he raised three points, and I wish to make those quite clear and to set them on the record.

First, he claimed that the much touted so-called quote was not in fact an invoice but a quote. Secondly, he asked why I had not bothered to approach Adelaide Pest Control rather than raise the issue first in Parliament and, thirdly, he claimed that Adelaide Pest Control did not overcharge and that it could in fact justify its charges. In our discussions I answered Mr Murray in the following terms. First, in relation to the charge that the invoice was not an invoice, I submit to the House that it certainly looks like an invoice. It has on it a number of services that have been recorded in two ways—in written form and also as a numbered code, with the key to the numbered code being recorded on the document. The document says that payment is to be made at head office on or before 15 December 1985. To me, Sir, that looks very much like an invoice, and my constituent most certainly took it to be an invoice.

Secondly, as to the question of why I had not approached Adelaide Pest Control directly, I point out to the House, and I want to put this on the public record, that, in fact, my constituent had taken the trouble to approach Adelaide Pest Control. He had queried the invoice when it was sent to him, but received the following response from one of the principals of Adelaide Pest Control:

I think, Mr Young, you should get your facts straight. Our contract is with your tenant, not with you.

It is quite clear that under the Residential Tenancies Act no company is empowered to enter into negotiations with a tenant. The negotiations must certainly be carried out with the landlord and not the tenant. I submit that my constituent had approached Adelaide Pest Control and the nature of the reply he received forced him to see me to seek some form of redress.

In answer to the third claim, that Adelaide Pest Control does not overcharge, I can table tonight (if members require) a quote for exactly the same three services. One company quoted \$75 for the services enumerated by Adelaide Pest Control. For the record, I point out that my constituent obtained a second quote for \$85. In each case, the job was exactly the same: the same three components were listed, although the wording varied slightly from company to company. The quotes were, basically, to remove the nests from the ceiling, to fumigate the roof space, and to bird-proof the entry points of the offending birds. Those three components were listed on all three documents, but the charge from Adelaide Pest Control was \$250, whereas the corresponding charge from Amalgamated Pest Control was \$75. As I said when I asked a question the other day, needless to say my constituent accepted the latter quote.

It is also worth noting that the warranty offered by Amalgamated Pest Control was twice the length of that offered

by Adelaide Pest Control, which was another reason for acceptance of the second quote. Following my discussions with him, Mr Murray agreed with the points I raised. He agreed, first, that Adelaide Pest Control should have used separate forms for the quote and the invoice, and he accepted my point that the document sent to my constituent was, in fact, more like an invoice than a quote. Certainly, there was no indication on the document that it was a quote. When the inquiry was subsequently made about that document and a photocopy was sent to the Attorney-General, the words 'Quote only' had been written on the document in another handwriting. I have the original document and the words 'Quote only' do not appear on it. It is quite clear that the original document was intended to be an invoice and not a quote. I submit that that is the way in which my constituent read it.

In response to the second point raised by Mr Murray, namely, that I had not approached Adelaide Pest Control when perhaps I should have, I submit that the landlord is the person who had to make the approach. In fact, he did make the approach and received a fairly pointed letter in response. In that regard, as I said earlier, the company breached the Residential Tenancies Act in not approaching the landlord directly but instead making a contract with the tenant. Under the Act, the company has no right to do that. Mr Murray accepted that point in my discussion with him and, when he left my office, he was quite satisfied with the point I had raised.

I also point out that a document that has come into my possession subsequently from Adelaide Pest Control indicates quite clearly that the contract was with a Ms S. White, the tenant, and not with the landlord, Mr Young. Mr Young's name has been written on the document, but it is in other handwriting and was written at a later time. It is quite clear that in this case there has been an attempt to justify what occurred, and I submit to the House that my constituent was quite within his rights in putting the construction that he did on the events that occurred.

In answer to the third charge, that Adelaide Pest Control does not overcharge, I concede that that point could probably be debated for some time, but I pointed out to Mr Murray that in fact Adelaide Pest Control had charged roughly 330 per cent more than the other quote. While I acknowledge the company's right to do that, in regard to identical services as listed on the invoice, I submit that that is a fairly major and significant mark-up. Although Mr Murray said that the other operator was an owner/operator and did not have the same overheads, I submit that 330 per cent is a fairly healthy margin.

I must point out to the House that at the conclusion of my discussion with Mr Murray he left me on what I took to be cordial terms and explained that he had only just become a Director of Adelaide Pest Control. He said that he would make every effort to try to tighten up on the company's operating and accounting procedures. I made it clear to Mr Murray that the landlord and tenancies legislation and various other things had been breached and that I thought that it would be in the company's interest to tighten up the procedure so that the same thing did not occur again and the company never again found itself in a situation where a client misconstrued a quote or confused a quote and an invoice. I made it clear to Mr Murray and in my submission to the House that there was no doubt whatsoever about the company's competence in the area of pest extermination but that I was simply questioning its scale of charges and, to some extent, the accounting procedures followed by the company.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have the opportunity tonight to address the House for the first time this session. I will not be speaking on the agricultural industry at any great length but will save that for later. The first matter I wish to raise is the deplorable exhibition that the Premier gave this afternoon in his weak attempt to justify the support that the State Labor Party in government gave to the obnoxious fringe benefits tax which is having such a disastrous effect on this community and the nation as a whole. Yet the Premier is not prepared to condemn the Federal Government and Keating and say that a mistake had been made. The Premier went along with that tax package and now has to wear it. The nervous nellies on the back bench of the Labor Party will feel the chilly winds of the ballot box as the time approaches. They will have to suffer it. One good thing about this obnoxious tax is that it will bring about the demise of the Federal Labor Government and this Government because those members who are here under false pretences, through telling untruths to the people of this State at the last election, will find that the public will not be fooled on the second occasion.

A number of members would not be in this House today if the public had been aware of what was in store for them. They will be reminded on every occasion that any Government that is so foolish and naive to support such obnoxious forms of taxation that we currently have in this country, namely, the fringe benefits tax, the capital gains tax and those other forms of taxation which the Keating socialists have inflicted on the people of this State, will be condemned on every possible occasion.

It is amazing that the member for Henley Beach had the audacity to make a press statement whingeing about it. Why did he not put pressure on his Premier? What about his Federal Labor Party Senators? Why did they not show courage and backbone? It is too late now that the horse has bolted, but they were warned. It is all right for the honourable member to make a press statement. However, we know what has happened; obviously a lot of the honourable member's constituents are getting right on to him. He is feeling the public pressure. Why did he not do something about it? If two groups are to blame it is the weak Democrats who are going to keep the people honest and the Federal Labor members. They are the ones to blame, and they will not escape the wrath of the community across this nation.

Why should parking spots and people's homes be taxed? I thought that the Labor Party stood to improve the benefits of people in isolated communities. How much tax will the State Government pay on homes in Leigh Creek? What effect will it have on housing construction at Olympic Dam? Already the company is having concerns about it. Make no mistake: the \$6 million or more that this State Government has to pay to its colleagues in Canberra could well be invested in a more intelligent manner in other parts of this State. Why would a Premier be so naive and weak as to go along with a package of taxes that will have such a detrimental effect on his own State?

The motor industry is suffering. In my own electorate, what is happening with the garages? We are facing a massive downturn in the rural industry. The people who made this country, have kept it and would sustain it if given a fair go are all feeling the pinch. On top of it, the Government will start taxing people's motor cars and other benefits which have been accepted as normal for many years. I will have more to say about that issue on another occasion.

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: The honourable member is one of those arrogant people who has never done anything constructive in his life. He is an academic socialist who gets up here and

talks about credibility. He is the person who removed the back page of a confidential report and gave it to the media. That is the sort of person he is. Let the public of this State know the sort of character who promotes himself as the good guy, honest member of Parliament. We know the sort of tricks he gets up to. He can hand it out and thinks he is smart, but he will get it right back!

Mr Rann interjecting:

Mr GUNN: He is the man who was going to make 400 people in my electorate unemployed. I suggest that he try his smart alec tricks up at Olympic Dam and see what happens to him. That was the honourable member's track record: he tried to have 400 of my constituents put out of work; the honourable member did everything in his power to have that indenture stopped. So, we know the sort of track record of the honourable member. I am sure that the people of New Zealand were pleased to see the last of him. Unfortunately, we have been landed with him, and I hope that the people of this State do not have to put up with him for too long, because I do not believe that he will be an asset to this House or to the community.

I want to refer to one or two matters relating to my electorate, because I believe that my constituents have been badly treated. We have just heard the member for Bright. I think it is, list to the House a number of organisations and groups which have had very large quantities of money handed out to them. I have in my electorate constituents who have made the most modest requests to have adequate water supplied to them. One group wanted \$12 000 to have a well repaired; it put in a request for a grant under the rural industries assistance program, and was given a loan.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I am not talking about Coober Pedy. Unfortunately, I understand that geography was not the honourable member's area, so he does not know what he is talking about. These were people west of Ceduna. A second group put in for \$25 000 to have the well repaired. It was told that it could have a loan and could pay it back at the rate of 10 per cent interest. To top it off, the first group was told that it would have to pay \$3 000 to purchase the facilities; it was then told that it had to buy the land from the Lands Department. The Government can find hundreds of thousands of dollars for other projects, yet people who are doing something for the State and who live in these isolated communities are treated in such a cavalier fashion. They are entitled to a bit of justice, and I sincerely hope that the appropriate Minister—the Minister of Agriculture—will review these two areas and give these people a grant and not a loan.

We heard the honourable member for Henley Beach talk about the problems of preschools and kindergartens—childhood services. His colleagues in Canberra just lopped about \$3 million from the State Government. That is one of the reasons why there is a shortage of funds. I was approached on the weekend by the people from the Murat Bay children's centre at Ceduna who expressed concern because they have had to raise in excess of \$4 000 so far this year for projects at their preschool, and they are finding it very difficult to make ends meet. I quote from the letter, as follows:

We, the committee and staff of the Murat Bay children's centre, are concerned about the excessive cost of maintaining these premises of the centre over the last financial year. The matter has been the subject of lengthy discussions at parents meetings, and the committee is concerned that the funds raised by parents at trading tables, raffles and catering for public functions has to be paid out for maintenance on the buildings and surroundings of this centre.

I could go on. I was also approached at the weekend by representatives of the Ceduna school, who told me that they have had to spend \$3 000 of their own resources on normal

operating costs, such as the replacing of power points and things of that nature.

In the time that I have been a member I have never had so many complaints from school councils or teachers in relation to the problems that they are having as a result of lack of adequate maintenance in my electorate. One group offered to erect a classroom if the Government provided them with the materials to do it. Unfortunately, the administration building of that school was burnt down at the weekend, so the department has a real problem on its hands there. No doubt it will be doing everything possible to rectify that problem.

I wanted to mention the disastrous Flinders Ranges plan and one or two other matters, but I will not have the time tonight to do so. I am of the view that these irresponsible minority conservation groups are having far too much involvement in areas such as the Flinders Ranges. Those areas should be left to the people who live in them and who have a far greater knowledge than those groups of those areas, I am concerned—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duigan): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Tonight I want to raise the problem of aged care within my electorate, I have given very careful consideration to the note sent by the Speaker to me and the suggestions that he made about naming people. After taking those suggestions into consideration I have no compunction in naming the people whom I will name in this address and in naming the companies involved. I am prepared to provide to any member of the House all the necessary documents, some from the Royal Australian Nursing Federation, some from Touche Ross and Co. and some from other people.

I will now read a letter sent to me by one of my constituents. It is addressed to me and reads:

I write to seek your advice and assistance on a problem which is currently causing me great concern. Until June 1984 I was employed as the Director of Nursing of Lansdowne Nursing Home, a position from which I was dismissed. My case was taken up by my union, the Royal Australian Nursing Federation (S.A. Branch) and I was awarded compensation of \$60 000 by the South Australian Industrial Commission which found that my dismissal was harsh, unjust, or unreasonable.

In a second case, prosecuted through the South Australian Industrial Court, I was awarded a further \$12 142 for underpayment of wages in my position as Director of Nursing of Lansdowne Nursing Home. Both judgments were against Lansdowne Nursing Home Pty Ltd which operated Lansdowne Nursing Home at the time I was employed.

During the time that the first case was proceeding before the South Australian Industrial Commission I was informed by a staff member who was still employed at the Nursing Home that Mr Gordon Filmer (who I understood to be the owner of Lansdowne, and the person who dismissed me) was openly boasting to staff members that he was in the process of changing company names so as to avoid any liabilities arising from the case.

I had been employed as Director of Nursing at Lansdowne Nursing Home for some 3½ years prior to the purchase of the company in February 1984 and from that date took my directions from Mr Filmer who acted in all ways as if he was the new owner.

It was not until after my dismissal and the matter had been taken up in the Industrial Commission that I discovered that Mr Filmer while handling all nursing home business was not only an undischarged bankrupt but also was not the owner of the nursing home. The company was actually in the names of Mrs K. Filmer and Mrs M. Bastian.

During my four months employment under Mr Filmer I found him to be a very difficult person to follow and understand. Not only were his directions very inconsistent, his manner dictatorial, but I also had grave reasons to suspect his honesty. My disagreement with Mr Filmer, which subsequently led to my dismissal, not only stemmed from his ignorance of the regulations governing the conduct of nursing homes subsidised by the Commonwealth

Government but also his unreasonable and improper demands of me.

These included:

1. That I enter his name, and his wife's name, on Commonwealth rosters as full time employees when in fact they were not working on the premises.
2. He directed me to put pressure on various doctors concerning keeping patients categorised as 'extensive care' to gain a higher level of subsidy from the Commonwealth Government.
3. He insisted that I instigate cuts in the number of nursing staff and directed me to dismiss staff over the age of 18 years and to replace them with inexperienced 15 and 16 year old girls which led to a fall in the standard of care available to our elderly patients.
4. He instructed nurses to do yard duty such as carrying out large garbage cans, and shovelling beach sand from the front entrance of the nursing home.
5. He required that I be at his beck and call whenever he chose even on my rostered days off.

I always had difficulty in obtaining sufficient surgical dressing from Mr Filmer, and to have broken equipment repaired, and to have outdoor maintenance attended to such as window cleaning, lawns cut, etc.

During July 1984, Lansdowne Nursing Home Pty Ltd issued a note of dismissal to all remaining staff at Lansdowne Nursing Home, and subsequently some staff were re-employed by a company called 'Eteria (No. 7) Pty Ltd', which then commenced trading on the same premises under the name of Cobham Nursing Home.

In order to pursue compensation awarded to me by the Industrial Commission, and acting on legal advice, I sought to liquidate Lansdowne Nursing Home Pty Ltd. The liquidator, appointed by the Supreme Court, now advises that the creditors of Lansdowne Nursing Home Pty Ltd will need to provide substantial additional resources to enable further investigation to proceed. As I am only on a limited income I am unable to meet further costs. It is in this matter that I seek your advice as to whether there are any further channels open for me to pursue.

By using the due process of law available to me I have an order from the Industrial Commission and an order from the Industrial Court to an amount of some \$72 000 which is being avoided by my former employers by use of a legal device, in this case simply changing the name of the company operating the nursing home and leaving the former employer, Lansdowne Nursing Home Pty Ltd, as an empty shell.

I would also like to take this opportunity to ask how a person of Mr Filmer's background can be allowed to operate, and make a profit from, a Government subsidised business providing care to our aged citizens.

It seems to me that persons of such ilk are only concerned with their own profits which they make by exploiting both the elderly and those unfortunate enough to be in their employ.

I hope you can provide me with appropriate advice on this matter.

Yours faithfully,

The letter was signed by my constituent. Unfortunately, I cannot assist this lady. There is nothing that can be done. This is the sort of thing that happens in business from time to time. Business people leave a shell company—and I have had it in the printing industry, but I will not name them—transfer the assets, expertise and everything else to a company with a different name, making sure that a person of their family is involved with the new company, they continue to run the new company, and all of the debts owing to the shell company are of course not paid.

In the cut and thrust of business, I suppose this is one of the things that people put up with from time to time, but this is a different proposition. This is looking after our elderly, and I put to Parliament that there needs to be a reassessment of the licensing of nursing homes. At present, local government provides a licence to the Director of Nursing of a nursing home, but the qualifications of the ownership of the nursing homes are not considered in any way whatsoever. Once the Commonwealth start providing a subsidy to the patients in the nursing home, then it is very difficult of course for the Commonwealth to stop providing that subsidy because one is left with a group of old people who have nowhere to go.

So, we are caught up in a proposition where we have companies who have been provided with an asset, and that asset is the subsidies that have been paid by a Commonwealth department, and that asset is traded from time to time at considerable amounts of money (the amount of money that was involved in the original purchase of the nursing home that I am talking about was \$250 000), and that asset cannot be touched when a shell company is put up in this way, even when money is owed to the former staff of that organisation.

The provision of a Commonwealth subsidy to a nursing home is an asset that is not available to any normal business and, therefore, the ownership of a nursing home brings more responsibility to the community than does the ownership of any other business. Therefore, it is logical to say that

greater care should be exercised in the choice of owners of a nursing home than in any other area. It could be well and truly justified that not only the nursing director of a nursing home should be licensed but also the owner. The licensing of an owner could then emphasise certain qualifications, one of which would be that the owner of a company should have a sound financial basis. This is not the first time that I have had problems with this nursing home. In previous speeches to Parliament I have mentioned the problem experienced by one patient in the nursing home who had to provide key money of \$6 000 to enter the nursing home.

Motion carried.

At 10.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 7 August at 11 a.m.