

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 19 August 1987

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

## ADDRESS IN REPLY

The **SPEAKER**: I have to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor will be prepared to receive the House for the purpose of presenting the Address in Reply at 2.10 p.m. this day. I ask the mover and seconder of the Address and such other members as care to accompany me to proceed to Government House for the purpose of presenting the Address.

*[Sitting suspended from 2.3 to 2.18 p.m.]*

The **SPEAKER**: I have to inform the House that, accompanied by the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Governor's opening speech and by other members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to His Excellency the Address in Reply to His Excellency's opening speech adopted by this House, to which His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:

To the honourable Speaker and members of the House of Assembly, I thank you for your Address in Reply to the speech with which I opened the third session of the Forty-sixth Parliament. I am confident that you will give your best attention to all matters placed before you. I pray for God's blessing upon your deliberations.

## PETITION: CRAB FISHING

A petition signed by 97 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to prohibit professional crab fishing within 15 kilometres of the Ardrossan jetty was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

## QUESTION TIME

## KALYRA HOSPITAL

Mr **OLSEN**: Will the Premier say why the Government has broken a further major election promise, this time to terminally ill or dying people, with its decision to close Kalyra Hospital? The Opposition has firm evidence that Health Commission funding cuts are to force the closure of Kalyra Hospital at Belair. This hospital houses the only public hospice care unit in South Australia. It has been a pioneer in hospice care in South Australia. These are services concerned with the care of the dying, and were initially established to meet the needs of cancer sufferers.

In June 1985, the Health Commission released a hospice care policy document which strongly featured the work of Kalyra. Half of the photographs in the document illustrated work at the hospital and, in a foreword to the policy, the Minister of Health promised additional hospice resources—a commitment repeated by the Government at the last election.

The health policy released by the Premier made specific reference to Kalyra as part of 'a well developed service' and specifically promised an extension of the service. While the

Premier will claim that cuts in health services are necessary because of Commonwealth funding restrictions, the Government was well aware at the time it made its 1985 election promises that Canberra was going to cut back the States. In South Australia the impact of health funding cuts—

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The Leader of the Opposition is clearly debating the question. He has been warned on previous occasions and the Chair would anticipate that the Leader of the Opposition would set a better example to other members. If the Leader continues to debate the matter, I will withdraw leave.

Mr **OLSEN**: The Government has already announced the closure of the Queen Victoria Hospital. The impact of those funding cuts will now extend from the youngest to the most frail in the community. We now find that the Government's broken commitments will be denying to dying people services that the Premier promised them.

The **SPEAKER**: Order! Although the Leader of the Opposition may or may not believe that the material that he was presenting was factual, he was nevertheless bringing facts and opinions together to constitute debate. I warn him against a repeat performance. I call on the Premier.

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: Thank you, Mr Speaker. That question and the explanation attached to it were framed in the most pejorative terms. The suggestion that this Government is turning its back on the terminally ill and dying (and that expression was used two or three times) is real gutter politics. We are becoming accustomed to it from the Leader of the Opposition.

*Members interjecting:*

The **SPEAKER**: Order!

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: The Leader of the Opposition attempts to defend himself from that grubby exercise by saying that it was a statement of fact. I will refer to some of the facts of which I am aware without doing further checking. First, it is not a statement of fact that we have cut back or reduced hospice care. Indeed, this Government has been responsible for more allocation of resources, more direction and more provision than any other Government in this area. It has been a special priority and one that we have attended to because we recognise the problems of the terminally ill and dying and we do not seek to make that area a political football, as the Leader of the Opposition apparently chooses to do.

For instance, within the public hospital system at Modbury there has been an introduction and upgrading of hospice facilities. It is also the case in a number of other areas. I am sure that my colleague the Minister of Health will supply those details and get them to the Leader of the Opposition. Secondly, it is not true that in 1985 the Government knew that Canberra would be cutting funds to the extent it has. In our—

*Mr Olsen interjecting:*

The **SPEAKER**: Order! I warn the honourable Leader of the Opposition for repeated interjection.

*Members interjecting:*

The **SPEAKER**: Order! I call the member for Murray-Mallee to order.

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: The Leader displays his ignorance again by interjecting something about the Grants Commission. If it was only the Grants Commission with which we were seeking to deal, the problem would not be so great. Yes, of course we knew the problems of the Grants Commission and we have allowed for that, but on top of that both in 1986 and 1987 we experienced cuts from the Commonwealth way beyond any expectation, beyond any outcome that had ever occurred at the Federal level. Let me illustrate that by referring to the 1986 forward estimates

published in December by the Commonwealth which talked about the 2 per cent guarantee and a number of other payments that would be made to the States.

In the May Premiers Conference those December figures were cut, in South Australia's case, by an amount that conservatively is calculated to be about \$120 million. Is that something that we could have anticipated in 1985? I am talking about a decision that was made between December 1986 and May 1987. I am afraid that my crystal ball is not as big as those, apparently, of the Opposition. So, that is a false fact.

Finally, I refer to a little throwaway line from the Leader of the Opposition that 'the Government has already closed the QVH.' What a scurrilous suggestion! There is no way that the Government has closed the QVH. The Queen Victoria Hospital and the Adelaide Children's Hospital boards have recommended to the Government a rationalisation program that will provide better facilities than are independently provided by those two institutions. The Government is prepared to work with them to achieve that objective. Far from closing something, we are in fact opening up and improving services, and it is about time that the Opposition stopped these snide throwaways, stopped trying to put ill, terminally ill and dying people in the political arena, and that it faced the facts. As to Kalyra, I do not know the precise details of that institution. I will refer the matter to the Minister of Health for his report.

#### BIRKENHEAD BRIDGE

**Mr De LAINE:** Will the Minister of Transport investigate the possibility of implementing a program of regular opening times each day for the Birkenhead bridge? Because of the limited life as an opening bridge of this very important structure, it would seem a sensible and practical suggestion both to prolong its useful life and, at the same time, to avoid many of the holdups to traffic that occur during the day and night while the bridge is open. At the present time the bridge opens many times a day on call.

**The SPEAKER:** The Chair is of the view that the honourable member for Price introduced comment and debate in his explanations. I ask him to refrain from doing so. The same applies to any other member.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for his question. I presume that the underlying principle of his question related to a regular opening time for the bridge and, as a result, all the motorists and boating people will know what the times are. On the face of it, that proposition seems to make sense. I am not too sure whether my colleague the Minister of Marine had a suggestion put to him when he was both Minister of Transport and Minister of Marine and whether in fact such a suggestion was evaluated. I am quite happy to talk to the Minister of Marine about this matter to see whether there is any advantage to the boating and motoring communities in having a regular opening time for the bridge. There may be some benefits, but also there may be some disadvantages. I think that such a suggestion requires very careful consideration by the Minister before the decision is made one way or the other.

On the face of it, the suggestion seems to have some merit but, to use a current colloquialism, I am not too sure whether it has any downside effects. The matter will be investigated and I will bring back a report for the honourable member.

#### KALYRA HOSPITAL

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** My question is directed to the Premier. Why is the Government now prom-

ising that terminally ill patients be transferred from Kalyra Hospital to the Windana Nursing Home at Glandore when, in a press statement on 29 October 1981 about an earlier proposal to transfer people to Windana, the Premier said the move 'would mean a cruel upheaval' for those involved; that 'once again, the State Government is putting the interests of those who are least able to fight back as its last priority,' and that 'it raises the whole question of what a civilised, humane community is going to do about aged care'?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I am not aware of the circumstances described by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. As I said in my earlier answer, I will obtain a report from the Minister of Health. I suspect that it will be most informative: it will certainly be informative to me and it will be most informative to the Deputy Leader.

#### OVERHEAD POWER LINES

**Mr TYLER:** Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether the existence of high voltage overhead power lines in residential areas represents any danger to people living or working directly under or near those power lines? I have been approached by several residents of Aberfoyle Park and Bellevue Heights who are concerned about the existence of high voltage overhead power lines in an area that is becoming increasingly residential. In fact, the power lines in question are directly above many new houses, as well as a local kindergarten, a CAFHS centre, a primary school, and a playground. My constituents are concerned, as they believe that recent research in the United States has shown that radiation levels around these power lines can be dangerously high and seem to be related to an increased level of cancer in children living nearby.

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** I thank the member for Fisher for raising this matter with me and for his courtesy in letting me know of his interest in this matter and of his constituents. It is an important matter, and I regret that I am not in a position to give him the advice that he has so earnestly sought, namely, whether there are any problems involving electro-magnetic fields inducted by very high voltage power lines. At this stage definite conclusions cannot be drawn from the information currently available. A great deal of research is under way on this question, and it is likely that the picture will become clearer as any findings are produced.

In relation to the local scene, I can report to the House that the Electricity Trust, the South Australian Health Commission and the Department of Environment and Planning are all well aware of this issue and that they are each keeping abreast of developments as they occur. The Electricity Trust has an expert technical committee which maintains a constant watch on all developments in this matter. In addition, the trust is a member of a national committee, which also looks at this matter together with the other members from the various electric supply authorities throughout Australia. They collect information as part of the way in which they research the matter on a world-wide basis and continually analyse that information. Further, the trust has prepared a range of public information material that is available on this topic. This information can be obtained from any of the trust area offices, the trust headquarters or its office in Charles Street in the city. I point out to the member for Fisher that the closest area office to his electorate is situated on Ayliffes Road, St Marys, in that fine electorate of

Mitchell. I will, however, arrange for a supply of the literature to which I have referred to be sent to his electorate office for the use of his constituents.

**Mr S.G. Evans:** They've put some of them underground; why not all of them?

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** That question from the honourable member indicates that he has not given much thought to this matter. There is a difference in cost, alone. Another interesting fact is that Dr Michael Repacholi, of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, has had a substantial involvement in this area for quite a number of years through a World Health Organisation committee, and he is a very valuable source of information on this topic. As I indicated at the outset, a good deal of interest has been expressed in this matter. I think that the interest, attention and care taken in research are warranted. At this stage I do not believe that one can go any further than to say that that research and interest should continue.

### QUEEN VICTORIA HOSPITAL

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Will the Premier confirm that the Government is considering a proposal to privatise the Queen Victoria Maternity Hospital? I have in my possession a letter dated 29 May this year. It is a request from the Health Commission to the Valuer-General's Department for a valuation of the Queen Victoria Hospital and advice on the most appropriate way to dispose of the property. But what is particularly important is that the letter reveals that the Health Commission has already received some expressions of interest from private hospitals to buy the site and that, if the financial return is sufficient, the commission will support such a sale.

In considering this matter, obviously the Premier will take account of public statements he has made on this hospital. For example, in the publication 'Opposition Opinion' dated November 1980, he claimed credit for 'saving' the Queen Victoria Hospital. His role was acknowledged in a statement reported in the *Advertiser* on 9 May 1984 by the Chairman of the Queen Victoria Board of Management. The article states:

Both Dr Cornwall and the Premier, Mr Bannon, had supported the plan to save the hospital when they had been in opposition.

Mrs Roberts said:

A final decision has been made by the Government and the hospital will never shift.

With this background, now that the hospital is probably to be privatised, the Premier's statement to the House only yesterday that 'this Government is not involved in the sale of public assets that are . . . in the public interest' is as laughable as it is totally untrue.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Light should have been fully aware that he was indulging in debate. It is one thing to put together—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! It is one thing to put together, by way of explanation, a brief sequence of events; it is another thing entirely to link that sequence of events with phrases that clearly make the whole explanation constitute part of a debate.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I do not know where the member for Light has been over the past few years, if he has not followed developments in this area. Let me retrace them. Yes, it is certainly true that in opposition, our then spokesman on health matters (the present Minister for Housing and Construction), his successor as spokesman (the present Minister of Health) and I opposed most vigorously

and strenuously the proposals of the then Minister of Health—the present member for Coles who, unfortunately, is not in the House at the moment—to, in fact, dismantle and close the Queen Victoria Hospital. We opposed that very strongly indeed. It was a proposition that was not related specifically to the health care needs of those who use that important hospital or to the fact that it was the only women's hospital or maternity hospital of that kind of specialisation; it was purely to try to avoid capital expenditure that was meant to be taking place and to try to relocate it somewhere else. That was the situation.

On coming to government, we honoured that promise. The hospital was not closed. The plans were scrapped. We said to the board, 'You can feel assured that you will continue operating as long as you wish to', and in fact we approved the capital development funds which are indeed in place and some of which have been spent on redevelopment of that hospital. Every promise we made was kept. Now, let us turn to the most recent situation where the Queen Victoria Hospital Board has approached us. The board has been looking at forward planning, the needs of that hospital, the capital requirements and other future plans and projections. The Adelaide Children's Hospital has been going through a similar exercise and, again, this Government, in restoring capital funding to hospitals which had slumped to \$10 million under the Liberals, in fact lifted it to more than \$18 million. We increased it.

The Adelaide Children's Hospital is also undergoing a major redevelopment plan. The two boards got together and said to the Health Commission and the Minister of Health, 'We believe that we can become more effective, larger, more specialised and serve people better if we get together. Will you prevent us from doing that, because we are aware of the statements you have made that this hospital will always remain?' In that instance, I did not see any problem—nor should we as a Government stand in the way of those hospitals and boards—in saying, 'Yes, if it can be demonstrated to be in the interests of health care and your functions, go ahead. Let us look at the proposal and try to do it.'

That is the situation at present. Then, how does one do this? How do we finance this larger, more specialist institution? The answer is that we will then have an asset that can be sold. Whether it becomes a hospital, hotel, shopping centre, or whatever, that money will in turn be put into developing the Queen Victoria Hospital on the Adelaide Children's Hospital site. That is the simple proposition: it is nothing other than the recycling of funds into that institution and organisation. As such, I should have thought that it would have had the overwhelming support of members opposite. However, I know why it does not have that support: it is because of their embarrassment over the scandalous sellout of the Queen Victoria Hospital which they planned when in government.

### CITY OFFICE ACCOMMODATION

**Mr DUGAN:** Can the Minister of Housing and Construction say whether the rapid increase in current non-residential building activity and planned building activity in the city of Adelaide, to the value of well over \$1 billion, and in particular the substantial increase in office accommodation and Government office accommodation, is likely to lead to a high vacancy rate and whether recent opposition accusations that there is a 'scandalous under-utilisation' of Government office space has any substance?

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I thank the honourable member for his question. As Minister of Housing and Con-

struction, I am pleased that we have such a high rate of building activity in the City of Adelaide district and I am sure that, by good marketing by the developers, that space will be filled soon. As to the accusations of waste, the Opposition indeed has tried to seize on this subject and to make political capital out of it from time to time. In this regard, I refer not only to the member for Hanson, but to the Hon. Legh Davis and the Hon. Rob Lucas. They are heavy on propaganda and very lean on facts. As the House knows, the State Government owns and leases thousands of square metres of office space throughout the city. Departmental space needs are constantly changing and it is a large and complex job to manage the total area with a view to minimising vacancies.

The Government Office Accommodation Committee, which is charged with the overall responsibility, does a very competent job. In 1985, it instituted a computerised monitoring system, which has had a positive impact on management in its first full year of operation. In the time that various Opposition members have issued statements of gloom on this subject, the management of Government office accommodation has improved significantly with the adoption and refinement of improved systems. I have been confused by the kind of statement emanating from Opposition members, especially the Hon. Legh Davis. I am not sure how the honourable member arrives at his conclusions. He has made many trips into Wakefield House, where my office is located. He goes up and down in the lift, staring at us as we do our jobs. He has been to my electorate office, pressed his nose against my window, and frightened my personal assistant there. After he has made his surveys, he issues a statement.

However, it may interest members to know that a body, other than the Government Office Accommodation Committee, has issued statements and statistics indicating that the office vacancy space in the Adelaide private sector is about 3.5 per cent. Further, it is interesting to note that in Brisbane, the capital of the State which the Opposition tells us is doing a good job, the vacancy rate is 8.6 per cent.

The relevant factor, and what the member for Adelaide is concerned about, is that the State Government's office accommodation vacancy rate currently stands at 1.3 per cent and, if one takes out of that 1.3 per cent all of those areas that are being decommissioned or commissioned, the vacancy rate is negligible.

The Building Owners and Managers Association also says that the normal vacancy rate for office accommodation is 3 per cent. How the Opposition can say that the Government is wasting taxpayers' money is beyond me and beyond all reasonable, intelligent members of this House. That association also provided statistics for other areas, including cities in North America. Those who watch such television programs will be interested to learn that, in Dallas, there is a vacancy rate of 22.1 per cent. In Denver, Colorado, the vacancy rate is 29 per cent. In Minneapolis, the vacancy rate is 16.8 per cent and, in Cincinnati, the rate is 19.1 per cent. I throw those figures in to educate members of the Opposition and to deter the member for Mitcham from undertaking another overseas trip so that he will not bore the House again like he did yesterday in his Address in Reply speech about his trip to Sweden, Austria, Germany and the United Kingdom.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister will restrict himself to the content of the question.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I apologise, Sir, I got carried away. To bring my answer back on track, I will make available the latest BOMA figures to the Hon. Legh Davis. I suggest that members opposite bear them in mind

when they seek to claim poor management on the part of the State Government.

## COUNTRY HOSPITALS

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Will the Premier say which country hospitals will be closed or which hospital building programs will be cancelled in this financial year? The South Australian branch of the Royal Australian Nursing Federation has been advised by the Government of the Government's intention to close hospitals or cancel construction programs in the Riverland, the Barossa Valley and Yorke Peninsula. As a number of hospitals and hospital developments are planned within each of these regions, I ask the Premier to nominate specifically which programs are to be on the health hit list so that the local communities affected can be made aware of the Government's intentions.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The member spoils his question by talking about 'health hit lists' and the like. I assure the honourable member that there will be consultations in those situations—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** There will be consultations—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier will resume his seat for a moment. I point out to the Leader of the Opposition that he has previously been warned for repeated and disorderly interjections. I will make no exceptions in here with respect to the member's status. If he persists in his action, he will be named. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The exact nature of the programs this coming year for the Health Commission will be contained in the budget, which will be delivered on Thursday week.

## HOUSING TRUST

**Mr HAMILTON:** My question is directed to the Minister of Housing and Construction. Will the Minister advise the House what level of service the South Australian Housing Trust is providing to the community, especially those on lower incomes?

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** I will ignore that inane interjection. The State has suffered a \$49 million reduction in Loan Council funding in the 1987-88 financial year for its housing programs. The Liberal Party, at the recent Federal election—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Albert Park has the floor, and no other member.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr HAMILTON:** At the recent Federal election, the Liberal Party threatened to abolish the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement if it won office. That is the arrangement under which housing funds are provided to the States. In the past few weeks, I have had the satisfaction of seeing some of my most needy constituents housed by the trust, and it is timely for the House—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! That is comment. I withdraw leave from the honourable member.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I thank the member for Albert Park for that question. A question of this kind is very timely, because I have some good statistics on the level

of service provided by the trust over the past year and previous years. It is very important that the House should be aware of it.

*Mr Becker interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I am glad to note that the member for Hanson has been reading my press releases. It is very good.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will restrain himself and stay on the subject matter of the question and not respond to interjections.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** The Housing Trust for the third consecutive year has housed a record number of new tenants. In 1986-87—

**Mr GUNN:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, obviously the Minister is reading a prepared statement that would far more appropriately be given as a ministerial statement. It is not a direct answer to a question. He has a lengthy prepared statement and therefore is not giving information.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair takes on board the point of order raised by the honourable member for Eyre. However, the Chair has not been able to hear enough of the content of the Minister's reply (other than the bit that I earlier clearly ruled out of order) because of the amount of interjection. I ask the Minister to continue.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. In 1986-87, 8 376 new tenants were provided with homes by the trust. We are talking about people—something that I do not think members of the Opposition are concerned about. I understand that, whilst I missed the speech given yesterday by the Leader, compassion is the name of the game in the Liberal Party these days. When I am trying to give, for the benefit of the House, some figures to show where this Government is proving—

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to Standing Order 154, which clearly states:

No member shall digress from the subject matter of any question under discussion; and all imputations of improper motives, and all personal reflection on members shall be considered highly disorderly.

I suggest that the most recent comments by the Minister are such that you, Sir, can only find that he has been very disorderly.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Minister to do what I asked him to do a while ago, namely, to stick a little more strictly to the subject matter of the question and not to respond to interjections. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I take your criticism very humbly, Sir. The 8 376 new tenants are people—families, single people, young people and elderly people, and include also their thousands of dependants—who were provided with affordable homes last financial year. It is also important to note that 14 per cent of those people were granted priority and 65 per cent went in straight away on rent reductions. That is what this Government is all about. I would have thought that compassion is something that we would all like to share. When we came in to office in 1982 this Government not only picked up an industry that was on its uppers but also recognised a social need and acted upon it. I would have thought that that was something the House would like to hear about. My criticism is not of members opposite in this place, but I understand that notice of motion has been given in the Upper House to create another talkfest about how we will address housing problems.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister cannot refer to matters under consideration in another place. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** Yes, Sir, I accept that, and I hope that it gets short shrift when it comes up.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! As with any other member, I hope that the Minister is not stepping into the area which comes close to defiance of the Chair.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I do apologise, Sir. Since mid 1983, when the first Bannon budget came down, a remarkable number of South Australians have been helped one way or another with housing. Besides those housed by the trust, 11 300 have received concessional loans under the Government's Home Ownership Made Easier program and 1 650 have received mortgage relief to help them keep their homes. There are 37 000 tenants renting privately who have received rent relief, and 83 000 people have received advice or assistance from the Emergency Housing Office. That totals almost 250 000 South Australians who have received assistance since we have been in Government, and as Housing Minister in this Government I am very proud of that fact.

#### YOUTH HOUSING INQUIRY

**Mr BECKER:** I direct my question to the Minister of Housing and Construction. Why has there been a delay in the completion of the Youth Housing and Construction Inquiry? This inquiry was promised by the Premier at the last election to 'determine needs, review current programs and means for improvement, and make recommendations for new initiatives to ensure young people in need can secure affordable housing'. The establishment of the inquiry was announced by the Minister in June 1986—14 months ago. In a statement dated 17 June he promised that it would report by December 1986.

I understand that the long delays in completing the report have been due to a serious rift between the Minister and the Chairperson of the inquiry, who has told the Minister she no longer wishes to be associated with the project. This inquiry has been trumpeted by the Government as a major initiative in the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless. However, it appears to be another failure, coming on top of the withdrawal *en masse* in May of the Housing Advisory Committee, the IYSH South Australian Community Committee and the IYSH Executive Committee.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I thank the honourable member for that question, although I think that his views on the delay in the youth housing inquiry are totally incorrect. My advice to members, whether they be on the Government or the Opposition side, is that, if they hear a rumour from a possibly vindictive person, they should check the source and we might be able to provide the facts. What the member for Hanson has touched upon is very true, because the problem relating to youth housing is a difficult one: it is a complex problem. The people who drew up that report were very willing and able people who had expertise in different areas in both the Government and non-government sectors. The report proved that there was no easy answer to the problem.

The same situation applies to the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless. If the community, and in particular the media, think that by the end of the year we can solve the problem of homelessness in this State, they are

barking up the wrong tree; and, if they think that one report to me will provide the solution to the problem, they have another think coming.

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** The report will be issued, warts and all. The member for Mitcham, who sits there—I was going to say as an inane idiot—should realise that the Youth Housing Inquiry will not provide a solution or merely issue a set of recommendations saying that \$1 million should be spent and the problem of youth housing in this State will be solved. The inquiry will not do that, and this indicates the strength of the Youth Housing Inquiry. If the member for Hanson looks at the inquiry undertaken in New South Wales, where the end result was that for every new allocation so many of the youth would be housed, with everyone then clapping hands and saying, 'We've solved the problem,' he does himself and homeless youth a disservice.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I rise on a point of order. This is all very interesting, but I question whom the Minister is actually addressing in this House.

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister, like other members, will address his remarks to the Chair.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** If members opposite think that this will all be resolved by just one report, I can assure them that they have another think coming. As I was saying to the member for Hanson (as he is the member opposite most vitally interested in this matter, I would like to think), the report will be the strength of the inquiry, because it will show that there are so many diverse public opinions as to how the conflict can be resolved. I look forward to some positive comment from the member for Hanson when the report is published.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the House to order.

### OPERATION NOAH

**Mr RANN:** Will the Minister of Emergency Services say whether the South Australian police intend to stage Operation Noah this year, and can he provide details of what success previous similar operations have had in securing convictions and the confiscation of narcotics and other drugs that are being peddled to our young people?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The answer is: yes, it is intended to stage an Operation NOAH this year. Once the date has been set I am prepared to make that information available to the honourable member and the House and, of course, the people of South Australia. Having been warned of this question, I am able to give the honourable member some statistics relating to both the 1985 and 1986 NOAH operations.

In 1985, as a result of Operation NOAH, 1 160 telephone calls were received, resulting in 114 arrests or reports for a total of 169 offences. The value of illicit drugs seized as a result is estimated at \$876 000. In 1986, there were 1 252 telephone calls, resulting in 128 arrests or reports for a total of 135 offences. The value of the illicit drugs seized is estimated at \$15 million. This estimate is based on the so-called street value of the drugs and, in the case of cultivated drugs, their street value at maturity. The Government joins with the Police Force in seeking public cooperation for this very important anti-drug initiative.

### GOVERNMENT PRINTING BOARD OF REVIEW

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** As the Minister responsible for the Department of Services and Supply, can the Minister of

Transport say why he has suspended the operations of the Government Printing Board of Review? Since 1980, a board of review comprising Government and private sector representatives has functioned to consider proposals by the Government Printer to purchase new equipment. However, this committee has been in recess for most of this year. The Opposition has been informed that, at the Minister's direction, it has not met since February. In the meantime, the Government Printer has been proceeding with plans for a major investment in new equipment, including a six colour printing machine estimated to cost \$1.7 million.

Printing industry representatives believe that the Minister stopped meetings of the board of review to conceal from them the plans of the Government Printer to embark on major capital expenditure with the intention of denying more work to the private sector. These people question the need for this purchase at a time when Government funds are being cut in other more essential areas, like public transport, and they also make the very valid point that the decision runs directly counter to the Labor Party's new privatisation push.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The last part of that question was debate and comment. I warn the honourable member not to persist in that approach to questions. The honourable Minister of Transport.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** A major internal review in the operations of the Government Printer is being undertaken. I have the assistance of officers from the Office of Government Management and Employment in performing that review. The previous committee considering the matter was responsible to the Public Service Board. There is no longer a Public Service Board and some changes do need to be made prior to making the final decisions. As to the future of that committee, I need first to have a clear definition of the future role, work and activities of the Government Printer. That is a reasonable review that is taken periodically in most departments and agencies within Government. That review is currently under way, at the completion of which the future activities of the printing review committee will be defined, and I will make my decision then.

### LOWER NORTH EAST ROAD INTERSECTION

**Ms GAYLER:** Can the Minister of Transport advise my constituents in the north-eastern suburbs of measures proposed at the intersection of Lower North East Road and Darley Road and the timetable for the works to reduce the lengthy morning peak queues of city bound and Paradise interchange—

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Would the member for Newland resume her seat for a moment. I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to cease interjecting. The honourable member for Newland.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** I was replying to a conversation the Premier initiated with me.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair is quite aware of what transpired.

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

**The SPEAKER:** I caution the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for his attitude to the Chair in view of events that were allowed to transpire last week. The Chair was quite aware of what happened on this occasion. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition interjected with the same remark three or four times in succession, as a result of which an interjection was directed back to him across the Chair by

the Deputy Premier. That was the remark to which the Deputy Leader then replied again, incurring the ire of the Chair was directed.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Well, you do not like it because it is a bit one sided.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Does the Deputy Leader have a point of order?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I would not be on my feet, Sir, if I did not. I took a point of order. I rose and said, 'On a point of order.'

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader, in spite of the disorderly interjections that were coming at that point of time from the Government benches, should not respond to those interjections, despite the provocation. The honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition's point of order?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Mr Speaker, do you intend to warn the Premier and the Deputy Premier when they initiate across the Chamber interjections to which I respond and am then subsequently warned?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! This particular incumbent of the Chair is on record over the past two years as having done just that to members of the Government, whether backbench or frontbench, on many occasions. The honourable member for Newland.

**Ms GAYLER:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. Would you like me to start again?

**The SPEAKER:** Perhaps if the honourable member for Newland would resume the question from the beginning.

**Ms GAYLER:** Can the Minister of Transport advise my constituents in the north-eastern suburbs of measures proposed at the intersection of Lower North East Road and Darley Road and the timetable for works to reduce the lengthy morning peak queues of city bound and Paradise interchange bound traffic? Morning peak queues at this intersection stretch back almost to the Paradise Hotel. Significant traffic growth is occurring as a result of the O-Bahn buses and of traffic going to park at the Paradise interchange. In addition, increased Golden Grove traffic will be added to this route from now on.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for her question and I acknowledge that for a considerable length of time now she has been trying to resolve this problem. I have been informed that discussions between the Highways Department and local government have been able to resolve most of the matters that were current between them and also that the concerns of the local community have been satisfactorily addressed. The Highways Department plans to introduce four measures to improve traffic flow at the intersection of Lower North East and Darley Roads and reduce the consequent delays occurring there.

The first of those measures is an exclusive green arrow right turn from Lower North East Road into Darley Road for Paradise bound traffic. That will also help Lower North East Road city bound traffic. Secondly, a median strip will be installed along Lower North East Road from Gorge Road to the Torrens River. Thirdly, a peak period clearway will operate on Lower North East Road. The fourth and final measure that the Highways Department will be undertaking is an evening peak ban on right turning by outbound traffic at the Lower North East Road and Darley Road intersection. This will reduce delays for north-eastern suburbs traffic during that period of heavy load. The changes are scheduled to be made in October 1987 and I hope that the Highways

Department can meet the scheduled program. The minimum cost of the improvements is about \$70 000.

### COWELL HOSPITAL

**Mr BLACKER:** Can the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Health, reply to the question that I asked on 9 April seeking an assurance in respect of all hospitals on Eyre Peninsula? Since I asked that question, a member of the Cowell Hospital board stated at the annual conference of the United Farmers and Stockowners that the Cowell Hospital had been told that it would amalgamate with the Cleve Hospital. Since then, statements have appeared in the Eyre Peninsula *Tribune* making similar claims and stating that Dr McCoy, Chairman of the Health Commission, was the source of those statements.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for his question. Indeed, today's Question Time is more like the Question Time that I have come to know and love these days. I have from the Minister of Health copious notes which I will try to edit for the benefit of members in reply to the question. I acknowledge on behalf of my colleague and on my own behalf the continued interest shown by the member for Flinders in this matter, particularly as it relates to Eyre Peninsula, and I imagine that that interest is shared by the member for Eyre.

The Minister of Health advises that in regard to country health services no major changes will be made without community consultation. It is fair to say that this bears to some extent on the question asked earlier by the member for Chaffey. The South Australian Health Commission will be conducting a review of country health services to assess fully regional needs and recommend on how resources could be better distributed to achieve an overall improvement in health services for country people. The Health Commission is committed to improving the quality and range of services available to all South Australians.

Priority will be given to finding ways to attract and retain specialist services in country areas, as a step towards minimising the number of patients who have to travel to Adelaide for treatment. It is hoped that the review will devise strategies which will lead to the introduction of additional specialised services that are not widely available on a regional basis at present. The review will also compile a comprehensive picture of regional needs so that the Health Commission can develop regional health plans. The commission's Country Health Services Division will involve local communities during the process of assessing local health service needs and in the exploration of various scenarios for the development of health services within each region. The process will therefore be carried out in consultation with local communities, and no major changes will be made without community consultation.

The recent establishment of a Country Health Services Division in the Health Commission to specifically focus on country needs underlines the Government's commitment to improving health services for South Australians living in rural areas. The Country Health Services Division will have carriage of the review. Another important component of the commission's strategy will be to improve the network of community health and domiciliary care services so that all South Australians will have access to a comprehensive range of health services in the region in which they live. This will ultimately ensure a higher standard of health services for South Australian country residents.

Finally, although the specific hospitals to which the honourable member drew attention are not directly referred to



in the report that I have given the House, they are in the general context of my reply covered by the work that the Health Commission will be doing with the local communities in determining the appropriate services that should be provided in country areas.

### WATER MAINS

**Mr ROBERTSON:** With a view to identifying the cause of obstructions in the Engineering and Water Supply Department sewerage lines, will the Minister of Water Resources investigate the establishment of a library of transparencies and other aids that might help identify the cause of such obstructions? Further, will the Minister ensure that, where such obstructions are caused by tree roots in ceramic pipes, the ceramic pipes in question are replaced by pipes made of PVC or other plastic material in order to prevent a recurrence of the problem?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The State water laboratory has slides, although I cannot swear to their covering comprehensively all the possible species that might be involved in this vexatious problem which arises from time to time. I suspect that it was a constituent of the honourable member who spoke to me some time ago about this matter, because that person was at one time one of my own constituents for whom I had a high personal regard. That person suggested that I take up this matter with the Attorney-General and it was the Attorney-General in his explanation to me (and that explanation was conveyed to the honourable member's constituent) who stated that in fact having a comprehensive bank of such information probably would not simplify the matter of litigation, because the matter of the extent of the damage and of the blame often takes up much of the debate that occurs in the courts. However, in view of the honourable member's advocacy, I am prepared to have the matter re-examined.

It really gets down to two main points. The first of these, which concerns the material of which the pipe is constructed, has already been referred to by the honourable member and the second concerns such things as irresponsible planting of trees close to pipes and, indeed, the possible innocent planting of trees because people did not know where the pipes ran. There is now much information from the Botanic Gardens and the Engineering and Water Supply Department to help people on these matters. As to the material of which the pipe is constructed, the only control that I have concerns constructions of the E&WS Department and they go only to the boundaries of the property. In almost every case nowadays plastic piping is used. There may be some occasions where ceramic pipes have to be used because of the highly corrosive qualities of the soil in that area. However, almost invariably we use the plastic pipes.

There are, of course, in old properties ceramic pipes that were laid a long time ago, and often they are the ones that cause the trouble. We are also continually reviewing the type of material that we should use and that information can also be made available to the public. I invite the honourable member to suggest to his constituent that he take advantage of all the available sources of information both from the Government and the private sector (such as the Housing Industry Association), and I will further consider his suggestion.

### VEGETATION CLEARANCE

**Mr LEWIS:** Is the Minister for Environment and Planning aware that the Native Vegetation Clearance Authority

will meet next Monday (24 August) when it is proposed to consider many long-standing applications for vegetation clearance on farms in the Murray-Mallee? Further, is he aware that many applicants have been told by his departmental staff that they will not be allowed to appear and give evidence to the authority concerning their applications?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The Native Vegetation Clearance Authority meets regularly. I was not aware that it was meeting next Monday or of the circumstances in which these matters will be considered. I will get the information for the honourable member, although I should be surprised if the way in which those matters are to be considered is different from the way in which submissions have been considered in the past.

### TRANMERE MOTOR REGISTRATION BRANCH

**Mr GROOM:** Will the Minister of Transport clarify the future of the motor vehicles registration branch at Tranmere? The Minister will recall the discussions that I have had with him over a period regarding the future of this branch. My question today, asked publicly, is prompted by an article in the local press which, although I have not seen it, I have had read to me. The article contains a strong suggestion that the motor registration branch at Tranmere is to be closed. As the Minister knows from conversations that I have had with him and the representations that I have made to him, the Tranmere branch services virtually the whole of the eastern suburbs and to terminate its operations would mean a severe disruption to the service in the area, as it is used by a large and significant number of people, especially the elderly. In these circumstances, closure of the branch would virtually mean that the eastern suburbs would be without a motor registration branch.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I understand the honourable member's question and I have some sympathy with him because the headlines in the local press in my electorate are saying the same things about the Motor Registration Division office in those cities. Because of the budgetary situation, the Department of Transport has been required to find some savings within the Motor Registration Division and that will require before the end of the year closure of some motor registration offices. One closure has already been announced and I am well aware that that has caused some concern. Because of the distances that the users of such facilities have to travel to have that access, it is more likely that any further closures that might be determined will be in metropolitan Adelaide rather than in country South Australia.

It is true that some motor registration offices within metropolitan Adelaide such as those at Noarlunga and Elizabeth service a discrete area. The one at Tranmere to which the honourable member referred services all of the eastern suburbs of Adelaide. There are a number of offices in the western suburbs, namely, Port Adelaide, Lockleys and Marion; an office at Mitcham; and one to the north at Prospect. All of these offices are part of the review. It is certainly too early for me to be able to give any absolute undertakings to anyone, either in the city or the country, and I include the Leader of the Opposition and myself in that.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** All motor registration offices in South Australia are under review and, as I have said, that includes the offices in the honourable member's electorate as well as the ones in mine. Allegations have been made that some offices have been excluded from the review, but they are all under review. In fairness, I point out that



the result of the review will indicate that any further rationalisation should take place within the metropolitan area rather than in country South Australia. Because of the area that the Tranmere office services, I would feel reasonably confident if I were the honourable member talking to his constituents that it does provide—

*Mr Ingerson interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I do not know. They are all in good Labor areas. Let us face it: all the motor registration offices are in good Labor areas by and large or in areas that should be good Labor areas such as Kadina, Mount Gambier and Mitcham. Without pre-empting the advice that I will receive from the Registrar, it is my feeling that the Tranmere office provides services for a discrete area and so in that review it stands a good opportunity of not being included in any decision that will be taken.

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

### LONG SERVICE LEAVE BILL

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Labour)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the granting of long service leave to workers; to repeal the Long Service Leave Act 1967; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I move:

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

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

This Bill seeks to replace the current Long Service Leave Act with a new Act which picks up most of the substantive provisions of the old Act but provides for changes which are designed to facilitate the administration of the Act and for a more equitable calculation of benefits. The Bill does not change the quantum of entitlements nor the years of service required to accrue these entitlements but instead seeks to clarify and define the conditions under which long service leave may be granted. As a result the Bill will not place further financial burdens on business in this State.

Many submissions have been received in the past from both employers and employees seeking the provision of a fairer method of assessing entitlements to Long Service Leave. This Bill addresses these problems and the changes proposed on this point provide the major point of variation from the existing Act.

The Government, in consultation with the Industrial Relations Advisory Council, has developed a prescription contained in this Bill which will more equitably cover the calculation of long service leave entitlements.

Specifically, this Bill addresses the calculation of payments for long service leave on a basis that takes into account any variation in an employee's employment contract in terms of the average hours worked, over the period of their service with an employer. The purpose is to avoid either party, whether employer or employee, from being financially disadvantaged if, during the accrual period, the average time worked by a worker changes from full-time to part-time or vice versa. The formula is defined in the Bill to provide an averaging formula to be applied in cases where the contract of hire changes between part-time and full-time during the three years preceding the taking of leave.

Under the existing Act, some inequities occur in the payment for leave, due to the Act's rigid prescription that payment is based on the contract of hire existing at the time of taking leave. Thus a person who has worked part-time for most of the accrual period but is on a full-time contract at the time of taking leave receives all payment at the full-time rate. The reverse also applies and both of those anomalies are amended by the Bill.

The Bill also clarifies certain of the old Act's provisions relating to breaks in continuity of service. Thus this Bill makes clear with greater definition that no worker will be disadvantaged by a break in service where they take parental leave, or where they are temporarily stood down for economic or for other proper reasons.

The Bill more clearly defines the question of territorial application. Thus the Bill makes it clear that, should a worker have a claim both under this Act and a corresponding law elsewhere, the worker must elect to choose the benefits of one Act but not both.

To assist in the administration of the proposed new Act, the Bill provides that the administrative records kept by employers must be kept in a more detailed form than has previously been required. The Bill also provides for workers to have free access to such records to verify that a correct record is being kept of their service.

To facilitate the administration of this proposed new system, the Bill provides for changes in inspectorial powers, with inspectors having greater authority to inspect records. In cases where an employer has unreasonably refused the taking of leave by an employee, inspectors are empowered under this Bill to order that leave be granted where, in the inspector's opinion, undue delays exist. Where the employer fails to keep proper records, there are provisions in the Bill for the onus to be placed on the employer to disprove a worker's claim for long service leave entitlements. This should have the effect of ensuring that greater attention is given by employers to keeping accurate records in line with the proposed new legislation.

The Long Service Leave Act has not been amended since 1972 and as a result the penalties are grossly inadequate by today's standards. Prescribed penalties are accordingly increased under this Bill, in direct relation to the seriousness of the offence and more attuned to the penalties set under other industrial legislation.

The Bill sets out detailed transitional provisions to accommodate the changes proposed in this Bill. The schedule to the Bill spells out the various qualifying periods that mark the changes in entitlement which have occurred over the years.

In summary this Bill seeks to substantially reproduce the Long Service Leave Act without altering the basic thrust or provisions of that legislation. The Bill provides for changes that will enable a more equitable system of long service leave entitlement to be calculated.

I am confident that the administrative changes proposed in this Bill will assist those who administer this area of legislation and the more detailed recording required will remove current areas of misunderstanding and lessen the potential for disputation.

This Bill has received the approval of IRAC and I accordingly commend the Bill to the House.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure.

Clause 3 sets out the various definitions to be used in the Bill. A worker is to be defined as a person who is employed under a contract of service. The concept of ordinary weekly rate of pay is introduced under subclause (2) (and will be used to calculate the worker's rate of pay when

leave is taken). A worker's ordinary weekly rate of pay will not include overtime, shift premiums and penalty rates. If a worker is employed on commission or some other system of payment by result, his or her average weekly earnings over the preceding period of 12 months will be applied. If a worker has been employed on an hourly basis at an hourly rate of pay, or has had a change in hours worked per week with a consequent change in pay, an average will again be calculated (over the preceding period of three years). The value of any accommodation provided to the worker will also be taken into account in assessing a worker's ordinary weekly rate of pay. Subclause (3) provides for the linking of employers to ensure that the continuity of service of a worker who remains with the same business is not affected by a change in his or her employer.

Clause 4 clarifies the territorial application of the Act. The Act will apply to service in the State, service outside the State where the worker is employed predominantly in the State, and service outside the State where the proper law of the contract of employment is South Australian law.

Clause 5 sets out the entitlements of workers to long service leave. The entitlements are consistent with those under the Long Service Leave Act 1967.

Clause 6 provides for the preservation of a worker's continuity of service in certain cases.

Clause 7 relates to the taking of leave. It is intended that, as a general rule, leave should be taken as soon as practicable after the worker becomes entitled to the leave, and should be taken as one continuous period. However, an employer and worker may agree on the deferral of long service leave, on leave being taken in separate periods (of at least two weeks) and on leave being taken at short notice. Leave may, by agreement between the employer and the worker, be taken in advance.

Clause 8 provides that a worker who is on long service leave is entitled to be paid at his or her ordinary rate of pay.

Clause 9 allows the Industrial Commission to determine that long service leave will be granted by reference to a particular award, agreement or scheme, and not under this Act. A determination cannot be made if it would disadvantage any class of worker. A determination may be revoked if the Industrial Commission is satisfied that the employer has not acted in accordance with the award, agreement or scheme, or that it is, for some other reason, inappropriate that an exemption under this provision continue.

Clause 10 relates to the keeping of records by employers. Records will be required to be kept for at least three years (which is related to the operation of clause 3(2) and is consistent with the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act). Records will be required to be transmitted from one related employer to another.

Clause 11 contains various powers of an inspector under the new Act.

Clause 12 allows an inspector to direct an employer to grant long service leave to a worker in cases where the employer has improperly refused to grant the leave.

Clause 13 allows the Industrial Court to order employers (or former employers) to grant leave, or to make payments, under the Act. If an employer has failed to keep proper records under the Act and the period of a worker's service is in issue, an allegation made on behalf of the worker as to his or her service, or hours worked, will be accepted as proved in the absence of proof to the contrary.

Clause 14 prevents a worker engaging in other employment in substitution for his or her usual employment while on leave.

Clause 15 provides that offences against the new Act are summary offences and proceedings may be commenced within three years of an offence being committed.

Clause 16 provides that the Act is not to apply in relation to workers who have long service leave entitlements under another Act or a Commonwealth award.

Clause 17 empowers the Governor to make regulations for the purposes of the measure.

The schedule provides for the repeal of the Long Service Leave Act 1967, and for transitional provisions required on the commencement of this new measure. The anniversary day of a person who accrued leave under a previous Act will be clarified and simply stated and previous entitlements will be preserved. An exemption under the repealed Act will continue.

**Mr S.J. BAKER** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 13 August. Page 215.)

**Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition):** By tradition, the Opposition supports this Supply Bill. Ultimately the spending authorised by this Bill will be considered in detail by the Estimates Committees. I take the opportunity to foreshadow to the Government the Opposition's expectations of the Estimates Committee sessions next month. The Opposition has become particularly concerned about the Government's resort to the subterfuge of 'commercial confidentiality' whenever it is asked difficult financial questions. During the Premier's Estimates Committee last year, these grounds were given on a number of occasions for the refusal of information.

I highlight just one of several blatant examples. Page 310 of *Hansard* for 7 October last year records my colleague the member for Light requesting the Premier to submit for insertion in *Hansard* details of cost blow-outs on the ASER project. The Premier's colleague the member for Mawson sought other detailed information about the impact on employment of the ASER project. The further *Hansard* published for Estimates Committee A for the insertion of information requested records that the Premier quite willingly supplied information to the member for Mawson but just ignored the request of the member for Light.

More recently, the Government has used the excuse of commercial confidentiality to deny information about the Electricity Trust's leasing arrangements and the brief given by the Department of State Development to Dominguez Barry Samuel Montagu Limited. There may well be occasions when the Government is justified in claiming commercial confidentiality. However, these occasions need to be rare and capable of easy justification based on clearly established criteria and standards. After all, the Government is the custodian of taxpayers' money and anything it does with taxpayers' money must remain the subject of accountability to this Parliament and, through it, to the taxpaying public. Otherwise, a cornerstone of democracy breaks down.

So far, the Government has not laid down clearly established criteria and standards upon which the claim of commercial confidentiality is justified. Instead, it has made the claim in an arbitrary and inconsistent manner to save it from political embarrassment rather than to protect the interests of the State. The Opposition puts the Government on notice that it will not be satisfied with that excuse should the Government continue to refuse legitimate requests for

information on matters such as the cost of the ASER project, virtually all of the activities of SAFA and contracts between the Government and organisations such as Dominguez Barry.

Taxpayers are entitled to information—detailed information, if it is sought by their elected representatives—on matters such as those to which I referred. With the advent of SAFA, Government finances have become increasingly complex. That is all the more reason why the Government must be prepared to account fully and effectively to this Parliament for its financial policies.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer):** I do not intend to make any response at this stage. As the Leader of the Opposition has indicated, it is not traditional to have a prolonged debate on this Bill.

Bill read a second time.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer):** I move:

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

**Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition):** The Parliament is now debating appropriation for the first four months of the financial year which will form a part of the total budget to be introduced in less than a fortnight. A thorough analysis of the Government's financial performance must await the presentation of the budget. However, I propose to say something in this debate about the context in which this assessment must be made.

The Premier has already told us that the major factor influencing budget decisions is Commonwealth policy on the allocation of funds to the States. There is general agreement within the community that Governments at all levels must limit their spending in the longer term economic interests of our nation. I have been saying that ever since I became Leader of my Party, and certainly for far longer than the Premier. The Premier presents the arguments about funding cuts as though the need for them has only just become apparent. He does this to justify the breaking of promise after promise made before the last State election.

In highlighting this, I will deal with one particular commitment made in 1985—that relating to country payroll and land tax rebates. In debating the Government's decision to renege on this commitment I will make the further point that the Government, as a deliberate policy, is forcing country regions to shoulder a disproportionate share of the burden of funding cuts. I refer first to the Premier's promise before the election. In August 1985 he published a document entitled 'South Australia's Economic Future—The Next Five Years'. It referred in part to a regional industry program. I quote the reference in full, as follows:

A comprehensive development strategy must take account of the special needs of industry which is located outside of metropolitan Adelaide. To complement the South Australian Development Fund, a regional industry program will also be established.

This program will fund initiatives aimed at enhancing employment opportunities and overcoming structural problems within the main regional areas of South Australia. It will also encourage active community participation in regional development. Also, following detailed examination of the country payroll tax and land tax reimbursement scheme, the Government has endorsed its continuation. The Victorian Government recently moved to phase out a similar rebate scheme in recognition of the argument usually put against such rebates, that is, that they are a comparatively ineffective means of encouraging regional development. The South Australian Government will continue to provide payroll tax and land tax rebates to eligible firms. Withdrawal of assistance to regional enterprises at this stage of the recovery in the State economy would be potentially damaging to the economic viability of some firms and regions which rely heavily on continuous provision of tax rebates.

In summary, here was a promise from the Premier, just two years ago, to continue the country payroll tax and land tax rebates and to augment them with a regional industry program.

Let me now show just how much the Government has gone back on these commitments. First, the Premier made the point that the Government would encourage active community participation in regional development. But, in deciding to scrap the rebate scheme, there has been no consultation with the companies and the communities directly affected. They were not consulted about its impact. The first they heard about it was through media reports following last month's announcement by the Minister of State Development and Technology.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** The Premier said that is not true, but he ought to check the facts, because it is true. In his announcement the Minister used, as part of the justification for this decision, the Victorian situation. The Minister stated:

Victoria introduced a similar scheme at that time and has also acted to phase out the rebate and replace it with specific incentive programs.

Of course, the Premier emphasised the point in his pre-election promise that South Australia would continue these rebates despite Victoria's decision.

*The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** Well, they did! They kept it on for about 18 months and dropped it out as soon as the election was out of sight. That is what the Premier and his Government did. That is what they do about breaking election promises: they get away from the election campaign a reasonable distance and then break promise after promise, as we have seen highlighted in the House in Question Time today.

The Premier also rejected the argument that such schemes were an ineffective means of encouraging regional development. Yet the Minister of State Development and Technology turned this argument on its head in his announcement when he said (and I quote for the Premier's benefit):

The rebate scheme is non-selective in who it supports, and since its introduction in 1979 has done little to add to growth in employment opportunities in country regions.

It is in direct contradiction to what the Premier stated. It is a contradiction of the Premier's head nodding one minute ago. The Minister produced no evidence to support this contention. He did not because he cannot, that is the simple answer to that. To repudiate him, I repeat the Premier's own statement:

Withdrawal of assistance to regional enterprise at this stage of the recovery in the State economy would be potentially damaging to the economic viability of some firms and regions.

*The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** It is dead right. In other words, the Premier is now prepared to expose some businesses in rural areas of South Australia to bankruptcy. There can be no other conclusion drawn from what the Premier has previously said. This is indeed a distinct possibility.

The Liberal Party has undertaken a survey of businesses affected by the Government's decision. In general, it will have the following results: employment losses; a transfer of some activities to metropolitan Adelaide, thus reducing employment opportunities in regional areas; and a revision of investment decisions.

**The Hon. J.C. Bannon:** Let's see the survey.

**Mr OLSEN:** If the Premier is patient I will list them and will get to it. He should sit down and be patient. It shows him up for the hypocrisy of his policy as displayed before the last State election. The Premier has been caught out yet again and he does not like it—that is the truth of the matter.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr OLSEN:** In addition, the fact that the decision was made without consultation, without notice and is in effect retrospective (and that is what the Premier has done—applied it retrospectively) has caused serious difficulties to many companies which had made budget decisions for this financial year on the assumption that the rebates would continue to be available. Of course, the Premier and the Minister of State Development and Technology would have little appreciation of those problems because they have never run a business.

Let me give some specific examples, as the Premier wanted, of how this decision will affect the viability of country businesses. A Clare Valley winery will have to consider relocating its bottling line to Adelaide to reduce transportation costs as an offset to higher labour costs. Local staff would therefore have to be retrenched. An engineering company will have to add \$1 per employee per hour to its cost rate. The company has just branched into exports, but the extra costs associated with the loss of rebates would curtail that activity—again, retrenchments would be another result. A company well known for its product throughout Australia—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr OLSEN:** We have certainly examined the scheme.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Leader to resume his seat. I have been fairly tolerant in this debate in regard to interjections. I understand that in the cut and thrust of politics there will be interjections across the Chamber, but any speech must be able to be delivered in such a way that the speaker does not have to strain himself and raise his voice above the hubbub going on in the House. I ask the House to come to order and request that the Leader of the Opposition's speech be heard in relative silence.

**Mr OLSEN:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I refer also to a company well known for its product throughout Australia and involved in mineral processing. It would have to reduce output and might therefore lose markets. An agricultural machinery firm has already applied to the Government to review this decision and, at the very least, have it phased in over 10 years. Coming on top of the 4 per cent second tier rise and the superannuation deal, the company's viability is right on the line. It will have to increase sales by \$5 million just to offset the cost of the withdrawal of payroll and land tax rebates. A Riverland fruit processor faces a rise of \$39 000 in labour costs and has also made representations to the Government on this impact.

Another fruit producer with American markets faces competition which is so tough—particularly from countries where labour costs are relatively low—that it cannot possibly increase its prices without losing markets. A Yorke Peninsula bakery employing 70 people has just undertaken a major expansion which would not have gone ahead had the company known the rebates were to go. It will have to retrench staff to maintain viability. In addition, the viability of bakeries at Port Augusta and Whyalla is threatened while yet another bakery may be relocated from Murray Bridge to Adelaide. Three people will lose their job at a Mid North agricultural engineering firm.

A transport company in the Murray-Mallee is shelving plans for an expansion. A country newspaper has been able to employ a cadet journalist through this rebate scheme. It has written to the Department of State Development. I have nominated a number of the companies that have already informed the Department of State Development about the impact of this decision. The Premier says, 'Let's know and

we'll review it.' They have already told the Department of State Development, but to no avail at all. The letter states:

Opportunities for employment and in particular youth employment in country areas are extremely limited. Too many of our responsible, intelligent young people have to leave their homes and local communities to obtain the training and experience necessary. We question the logic of removing money from established business to possibly help new business which may or may not be successful with questionable employment prospects. Experience proves this.

I have given 10 examples, but there are many more. In 1985-86 this scheme assisted 289 companies, employing 11 846 people. It was worth just over \$6.2 million—2 per cent of the Government's total revenue from payroll and land tax in that year. While the gain in revenue will be marginal, the impact in many country towns will be quite significant. Invariably, news of a retrenchment travels quickly in small, close communities. The loss of pride is often difficult to conceal. Yet this is not the sort of decision the Premier would have inflicted on the metropolitan marginal seats his Party holds at present.

Because the Government has failed to produce any justification for this decision, it has to be concluded that it is based on crude political rather than sound economic judgment. The Government has decided that it will never win seats in the areas most affected. That is the simple, cynical basis for this decision. Announcing the decision, the Minister referred to an exciting new \$3.5 million policy. What he did not go on to say was that this policy would replace a scheme worth more than \$6 million. What the Minister was excited about was the prospect of saving revenue at the expense of jobs in regional areas of South Australia. The Minister's statement made no reference to whether the \$3.5 million was a one-off allocation or an annual one, so we do not know whether it is for just 12 months or whether it will recur. With payments of up to \$500 000 available, as few as seven companies will benefit. Nor is there any guarantee that the amount promised by the Minister will be spent: it will depend on applications and on the determination of the Department of State Development as to whether they will get anything.

If the Government is finding that funds are tight, it can simply make the quality criteria just that little bit more difficult to meet. The strength of feeling about this decision has only confirmed the view in many country regions that South Australia is becoming a deeply divided State in economic terms. The metropolitan area, where the Government needs the votes, will be looked after, while country areas, which continue to produce the bulk of this State's export income, will be cast adrift in the totally uncertain and unpredictable economic winds created by Labor policies, both here and in Canberra. This decision has the potential to do as much damage to South Australia in terms of employment losses alone as the submarine project has to bring benefits. The Premier will never convince South Australian country regions of the benefits of building submarines while he helps to demolish their local businesses.

In concluding my criticism of the Government's decision to phase out these rebates—a retrospective decision; a decision taken without consulting those most directly affected; an illogical decision—I suggest that the Department of State Development must not become so drowned in hype about the submarine project that it neglects the economic base this State already has. On the opening day of this session, the Premier arranged a Dorothy Dix question about the submarine project. He tried to criticise the Opposition for raising concerns about the proportion of the total work South Australia will actually receive. I reject such criticism. I have no doubt the reason for the Dorothy Dix question was that Mr Leigh Hatcher took up that question that

morning on 5DN and discussed what percentage of the share of the contract South Australia would receive. That was not the Opposition but, rather, an independent media commentator who took it up, so we heard the Dorothy Dix question. In this, the Premier must be judged against the expectations he deliberately created before the last election about this important project.

I make no apologies for raising this matter. The Liberal Party has strongly and consistently supported South Australia's case. Indeed, something that the Premier does not acknowledge is that the potential of the project was first recognised by the former Tonkin Government. At the 1982 election, had we been in the business—as Labor has done in the past on projects like a petrochemical plant or an entertainment centre—of making premature announcements about possible developments, we could have sought to make political capital from approaches which had been made to us. As the Premier well knows, it was John Rundle, South Australia's Agent-General in London at the time, who identified that this project was on the drawing boards and indicated that South Australia ought to do something about it. It is about time that we gave a little credit where it is due, and John Rundle, the former Agent-General, ought to receive some credit for this project.

We rejected this option in the hope that these approaches would lead to a subsequent development, and I am pleased that they have. I personally visited the two final tenderers for talks with their senior management, and I assured them of our full support for the project. Our role was acknowledged by the *Advertiser* during the 1985 South Australian election campaign. An editorial on 28 November 1985 stated:

When in his policy speech [referring to the Opposition] he expressed his total support for the Government's efforts to secure the project and pledged a continuing bipartisan attitude, these were hardly the expressions of what Mr Bannon brands a negative attitude. Mr Olsen's European trip to meet the final contenders for the project hardly indicated a Party—again in Mr Bannon's words—doing its utmost to undermine South Australia's case. Trying to smear the submarine contract cheaply across the campaign trail insults the intelligence of voters.

Of course, during the recent Federal election campaign, the Premier again tried to insult the electorate with a quite base and disgraceful scare campaign about the submarine contract. I suspect that his sensitivity on this issue follows some of the Government's pre-election statements. I invite the House to recall some of them. In the *Advertiser* of 10 April 1984, the Submarine Task Force chief, Mr Jim Duncan, stated:

Most of the hull construction would be done in South Australia and about 50 per cent of the submarines' combat systems.

I hope that occurs. The House is entitled to monitor whether it will and, in doing so, not to be abused by the Premier for trying to criticise the project, when our every endeavour has been quite the opposite. The same observation applies to a further press statement by Mr Duncan on 22 July 1984 when he stated:

A 12-month detailed study will follow, leading to the selection of the winning contractor of the \$1 500 million project. Then we will know whether South Australia will be the manufacturing base for the project.

Will the extent of our participation allow us to claim that we are the manufacturing base? Surely that is a legitimate question and again a question that we put to the Government. In the *Advertiser* on 19 October 1985—less than two months before the election in which the submarine project featured so heavily in Labor Party advertising—the Premier stated:

Construction was just one aspect of the \$2 600 million submarine replacement program and about \$800 million would be spent on electronics, combat and weapons systems and high technology software.

The public is entitled to know how much of this extra work South Australia expects and subsequently will receive. A newspaper advertisement published in the *Advertiser* on 26 November, just before the election, stated:

South Australia is leading the pack to win the \$2.6 billion submarine project. It's a massive project that will put our industries on the map.

This advertisement invited South Australians to believe that every last cent of that \$2.6 billion would be spent in their State and that every rivet and every wire on the submarines would be put in place here. This, of course, will not happen. Indeed, I am led to believe that senior officers in the Department of State Development are becoming very concerned about the true extent to which South Australia will participate in the total contract, and there are memos floating around the Department of State Development clearly identifying the extent to which South Australia will participate in this project. This was perhaps the reason for the Dorothy Dix question the Premier arranged on the opening day of the session and the almost plaintive plea in his reply for industry to make sure that it snares as much of the action as possible. We are just starting to shift the emphasis to industry. Industry has to go out there and make sure that it gets its share.

My Party certainly hopes South Australian industry responds to ensure maximum benefit to our State. We will do everything we can to achieve this. At the same time, we will continue to measure this against the Premiers' promise. The Premier likes to believe he can say one thing before an election and then do something completely different afterwards.

I have given the example of the country payroll and land tax rebates. The latest rise in public transport fares is another example—a blatant deceit of the electorate. With the submarine project the Premier's pre-election promises cannot be ignored. As the Minister of State Development and Technology said in a statement, reported in the *Sunday Mail* of 3 August, we want more than 'just assemblers who put them together and plug in the black boxes'.

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** It is appropriate that I have the opportunity to speak at this time, as I want to talk about matters pertaining to the submarine contract. Once again it is interesting to hear the Leader of the Opposition's carping criticism of the submarine contract. His is a Clayton's support for the South Australian submarine contract. The Leader of the Opposition says that he supports it, but in fact he does not support it.

*Mr Olsen interjecting:*

**Mrs APPLEBY:** On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, I would very much like to hear what the member for Albert Park has to say, but I cannot hear over the Leader of the Opposition.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The point is well taken. I ask the House to show the same courtesy to the member for Albert Park as has been shown to Opposition speakers. I remind honourable members that they have only 10 minutes to speak in this grievance debate and that time should not be taken up with interruptions.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I thank the member for Hayward for her support. Unquestionably, the submarine contract will provide many thousands of jobs for South Australia. The Premier's press release of 18 May states that some 7 000 people will earn their living from the impact of the total submarine contract, about half of them being South Australian residents. The number of people involved may pose some problems for the western suburbs of Adelaide. For example, we have to look at the question of housing, a matter to which I will

refer on a later occasion. Further, we must look at the impact of such a project on the number of children attending schools. With the creation of 7 000 jobs in the western suburbs, a certain percentage of those people involved would live in the area, and this would have an impact on primary and secondary school enrolments. I am concerned about this and would welcome advice from the Minister of Education about whether this prospect has been addressed.

Currently, two high schools in my area, the Seaton High School and the West Lakes High School, are considering the question of bussing students between those two schools. This applies to stream 7 and 8 courses. While there might be initial teething problems in terms of timetabling, I do not believe that they will be insurmountable. Nevertheless, with the submarine contract work in full flight, I believe that we will perhaps need additional facilities in relation to the high schools and primary schools in the western areas. I can speak only for the schools which might be affected in the electorate that I represent, namely, Semaphore Park Primary School, West Lakes Shore Primary School, West Lakes High School, Hendon Primary School, Seaton High School, and Seaton Primary School. It is those schools that would most likely be affected. I am most interested in details of projections of the likely impact of the submarine contract on the activities undertaken in the western suburbs and, indeed, on the schools. On the question of bussing students between the two schools to which I have referred, I also ask the Minister of Education whether a bus will be provided for this purpose.

Whilst I do not have the opportunity to ask in this House as many questions as I would like to, because my colleagues, naturally enough, like to have their turn, this debate provides me with an ideal opportunity to pose such questions to the Minister. For some 12 months I have advocated the need for advertising on and sponsorship of school buses in South Australia. I persisted with this request, and I was delighted when the Minister advised me in correspondence dated 16 August that he had given approval for the Education Department to proceed with investigations on the viability of advertising on school buses. I firmly believe that tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of dollars could be obtained by the Education Department by inviting advertising on and sponsorship of school buses.

The two schools in Albert Park electorate to which I have referred currently have business houses interested in advertising on or sponsoring a school bus. As a consequence of that, I believe that the cost of maintenance of tyres, servicing, etc. could be borne by those advertisers and/or sponsors. That would help school councils, which we all know do a magnificent job in terms of raising funds to look after the students in their respective schools. I believe that this effort should be recognised, and indeed it is recognised by this Parliament. Fundraising in the manner that I have described provides an ideal opportunity for the Education Department to get with it and for school councils with school buses to obtain some hundreds of thousands of dollars that I believe could be available in not only the metropolitan area but the country areas as well.

I hark back to what has taken place at the West Lakes Aquatic Centre, situated in my electorate. About 18 months ago I went down and spoke to the instructor in charge about his requirements in terms of additional aquatic equipment needed for primary school students who go through the program that is offered for them. He advised me that money was tight. I put a proposition to him about sponsorship or advertising on equipment that belongs to the West Lakes Aquatic Centre, which comes under the jurisdiction of the Education Department. As a consequence, during the past

18 months almost \$100 000 has been obtained by the West Lakes Aquatic Centre through sponsorship.

In this regard, I suggest that in more affluent areas of Adelaide the schools with school buses could obtain even larger sums through advertising and sponsorship, and that the Education Department or school councils would not have to pay for the maintenance of school buses. Indeed, I suggest that perhaps some of these sponsors would be prepared to sponsor trips to the country or even sponsor a school bus for a period of, say, 12 months. I am delighted that the Minister has agreed to this proposition, although he has qualified it in the last paragraph—and correctly so, in my view—by saying:

I assure you that the welfare of students and their educational needs will be foremost during consideration of this matter.

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

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** I am gratified that the member for Mawson is present, because I want to take up the theme which she developed yesterday, and I feel more comfortable in doing it directly rather than her having to read it. It is much along the same lines as the theme developed by the member for Adelaide when he talked about the quality of life. It is possible to identify a great inequality of life regarding the services being delivered by this Government to the people of South Australia at the moment. In her contribution, the member for Mawson said:

The development of policies and strategies for a more equitable distribution of wealth will provide a complete picture of wealth distribution and I believe that this must be established if we, as a community, are to develop the sorts of policy and strategy that will address this growing inequity and imbalance.

That is a quite useful comment, a quite useful and desirable approach, but in his address His Excellency the Governor closely identified that the State Government accepts that it is part of the Federal Government—that is, they are buddies and their philosophy on the economy is the same. That is the Government which has been party to the sudden rise to billionaireism of Mr Bond and Mr Packer. Where is the equality or balance of funding going when a Federal Government, supported by a State Government, is quite happy with that sort of situation?

Having said that, I now relate it closely to the South Australian scene in relation to vine pull, because here we have the situation where a large number of people were invited to lodge applications for vine pull but, because the rules were changed halfway through, they have been denied the opportunity to live in dignity and to sustain a life pattern where they make both ends meet. Who, amongst those who applied early for vine pull funds, benefited most? If one goes out and looks around the countryside and does an analysis of those applicants who were paid out (that is, the first 350 applicants), one finds that a great number of them are people who have large companies. They were part of a company which qualified under the terms that applied when the first applications were called, people who did nothing wrong or illegal; the opportunity was there, and they took it and benefited. And I am quite happy for them.

However, the smaller people who were a little slower off the mark and who had failed to put in their application before No. 350 but had lodged it well before the closing date were suddenly confronted with the fact that, if the wife worked two or three days a week in the local hospital and brought home some money, or if the husband was the groundsman at a local high school or primary school and brought in some money, albeit that they were below the poverty line—the poverty line so often referred to us by members on the other side of the House—they were left with a deficit in total funding. We are looking at a poverty



figure. Those people were told that, because less than 50 per cent of their total income came from grapes, they did not qualify.

So, these people who are in grave difficulty are constantly being denied, in reassessments, the opportunity to get out of an industry which has had its difficulties or to get out of particular varieties of grapes which they cannot sell because the wineries have moved on to newer types. They are in a position where, because they have vines on their properties which return them nothing, their properties are being valued, for the purposes of rates, taxes and Government charges, as vineyards at an elevated price compared with open blocks. They find themselves going around in circles, being told on the one hand that they do qualify and therefore they do not have to do anything about the pruning, but then being told that, if they do not have vines in good heart—that is, vines which are pruned—they must try to bring them back from an unkempt condition into a properly marshalled or properly husbanded vineyard.

However, a biological peculiarity exists in that it is almost impossible to bring back into productive condition in the future a vine which has not been properly pruned for more than two years.

**The Hon. R.G. Payne:** Does it also apply to sultanas?

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I do not quite see the point, but yes, I would say that was applied to sultanas also, but there are the exceptions to the rule with odd grapevines compared with total grapevines. I make that point, because a vine which is in a household circumstance where there is adequate water and some competition from other trees and vines is more likely to respond to late pruning than one which is in the open paddock circumstance, and my colleague the member for Chaffey would be able to explain that.

The point I want to make is that people have been lulled into a false impression of being able to obtain the benefit of the vine pull system but have been denied it, they are finding themselves in a very critical financial circumstance whilst many people, some of them high school teachers or business people, certainly a number of proprietary wine companies, have benefited from the pull because the funds were made available in the early stages. I do not want, nor do I intend at this juncture, to identify particular growers. Most of them are known to the Department of Agriculture. The department has had many discussions with these people. The Department for Community Welfare is fully appreciative of the very difficult financial and social circumstances into which a number of these people are being forced. In a number of other circumstances these people are earning the wrath of their next-door neighbours because they have unkempt vines on their property; the people who are still in the industry or, in some cases, who have benefited, are suggesting that, because some people are not looking after their vines properly, the vines are a danger to their neighbour from a disease point of view. In a tourist area such as the Barossa Valley, the fact that vines are untended is leaving a bad impression or is reducing the scenic amenity of the area.

On top of that, because a number of these people have been unable to obtain what they were offered and what was due to them, they are having to leave their property or their community and work where work is available at great distance from their home. There are many social aspects of this. I have had quite pleasant words with the Minister of Agriculture wherein he indicated the amount of money that has been available and some of the problems which developed. However, I make the plea, albeit belatedly, that the

Government has a responsibility to consider those persons who applied in time to ensure that an inequality has not been enforced in the distribution of those funds by this rather shortsighted and, to the grower, unfortunate policy that has been developed by the Government.

**Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide):** In explaining the Supply Bill, the Premier indicated that it provided for a sum that was being sought to enable the Public Service to fulfil its normal functions. I believe that one of the normal functions that should be associated with the operations of government relates to the very activities of this Parliament. This week, I have had the pleasant opportunity and obligation of escorting two school groups through Parliament House and, when I was organising my times with the Speaker's secretary, it was instructive to find exactly how many other members were escorting similar groups of school children and other people from their districts through the House.

Yesterday, 80 members of the public were formally booked into the House of Assembly by three members; today, 140 members of the public have been booked in by five members of Parliament for a tour and a position in the gallery to watch Question Time; and tomorrow, about 150 members of the public, senior citizens and students, have been booked in by five members of Parliament. That record has been duplicated on each of the five other sitting days this session and it is likely to be duplicated on every other sitting day until the end of the year.

The two groups which I had the good fortune to bring through this week were the sixteenth and seventeenth groups respectively that I have escorted through Parliament House this year. That number was exceeded not only by me but, I am sure, by other members last year, because it was South Australia's Jubilee year and many people wanted to take the opportunity of seeing in operation, at first hand, the system of representative parliamentary democracy that we have in South Australia—and so indeed they should. That year of close concentration on the political history of South Australia has obviously created much interest in schools and it has been enhanced by the existence of, in particular, the legal studies program operated at the senior secondary school level, where the Parliament House itself and its role in the law making function of our democracy are very much a prime focus of many subject areas.

When students undertaking the legal studies course look at the contemporary method of law making, they obviously look at the past traditions and history of law making in South Australia and the constitutional and political antecedents of the position in which we now find ourselves; so obviously they use the resources of Old Parliament House, as it is called, adjacent to this building. When they do so, they have at their disposal an education officer who can arrange the program for them and guide them through the political and constitutional history of this State which is relevant, at least in respect of the legal study students, to the course that they are undertaking.

However, that officer can also guide other groups through and ensure that the information that they receive and the analysis that they are given of the development of South Australia is relevant to their needs and to their level of understanding. In fact, that education officer in the old Constitutional Museum last year escorted about 20 000 students. The education officer dealt with that extraordinary number of visitors with great professionalism to their great satisfaction.

The education officer in Old Parliament House is very much on his own in providing this kind of program, whereas



other South Australian public institutions on North Terrace have more than one education officer. For example, the three education officers at the South Australian museum last year dealt with 40 000 visitors. Further, the Art Gallery of South Australia has three education officers. I also understand that one of the other major public institutions, the Zoological Gardens, adjacent to Botanic Park, has a number of education officers. There are a number of public facilities to which, because of the importance that is placed on the asset by the State, an education officer is attached to ensure that the visiting public can take full value of the opportunities presented.

In this regard, Parliament House stands out in not having such an education officer. An education officer at this institution would be of considerable benefit not only to members who escort through Parliament House people who have come to their electorate office but also to other members of the general public who arrive unannounced at Parliament House to partake of the proceedings as an observer. Last year, about 7 500 students alone visited this Parliament as guests of member's of Parliament. For groups of school children from member's districts who wish to see how we work and to see at first hand how Parliament operates, all we have to give them is about 45 minutes of our time at the lunch hour, a quick visit to the library, the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly and, if we can book them in, an opportunity to observe Question Time.

Previously, I have asked that the quality of the documentation that is available for visitors to Parliament be upgraded and that a document be available to explain the whole process of how a policy or proposition is put to the House by a Party or by an individual member. By this means, people could see the whole process of Parliament and how eventually such a policy or a proposition became law. I understand that attention is being given to this matter by the Commonwealth Parliament and I draw to the attention of members the massive investment that is being made in this regard.

It has issued a substantial broadsheet entitled 'How Parliament Makes Laws' and this is one of a series of documents that is being put out by the publications branch of the Commonwealth Parliament. Many tens of millions of dollars are being spent so that this document may be sent to every school in Australia with the purpose of highlighting the new Parliament House that is to be opened on the occasion of next year's bicentenary.

However, although it is still important that people gain a better appreciation of their national Parliament and how it works, I do not know how many people are designated as education officers within that Parliament, but there is no doubt that that Parliament has a substantial budget to ensure that the institution, a live and vibrant institution that is creating the laws and conditions under which we will all operate, is more accessible and understandable to those who visit it.

An education officer attached to this Parliament House could assist many of the people who already visit it, and there are educational benefits to be gained. Already, the time of the Speaker's secretary is taken up in the substantial administrative task of organising and coordinating visits to Parliament House.

The time of members is already taken up, and, when one looks at the opportunity cost of members' time, there is already a considerable impost in terms of people visiting Parliament House. It is necessary to look at ways in which this institution, the educational benefits that it can provide and the political and community benefits that flow from it

are looked at in terms of an education officer being allocated.

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham):** In the brief time available to me, I will mention a number of aspects of the WorkCare review undertaken by the Victorian Congress of Employer Associations. It is important that members understand some of the problems that Victoria has experienced, because the South Australian Act was modelled on the Victorian legislation. Some changes were made here but, if I recount some of the problems that have occurred in Victoria, it will make members more appreciative of some of the difficulties that we in South Australia will face, despite the greater safeguards.

It is useful to recall that the WorkCare plan was introduced with some very strong support from the Australian Chamber of Manufactures because the manufacturing sector benefits from the scheme in terms of premiums. Premiums for workers compensation in that sector have fallen dramatically under the WorkCare scheme. In that regard, it could be said that the Australian Chamber of Manufactures was quite supportive of the scheme. It is worth mentioning that against a background in which the Victorian scheme has now accumulated liabilities of the order of \$1 billion. The problems downstream of those accumulated liabilities will be quite considerable. If members will bear with me, I will read from the introduction to the report of the review of the WorkCare scheme because it is most relevant. It is to be hoped that all members of this Chamber will read the document, because it points to some problems that will have to be overcome if WorkCover will be successful in this State. The report states:

Response to VCEA organisations reveals five areas of continuing concern:

1. an increasing number of claims under the present system compared to the old workers compensation system;
2. an increase in the proportion of soft tissue and RSI injuries;
3. an increase in the number of man hours lost;
4. increasing staff costs arising from WorkCare administrations; and
5. interest costs associated with delays in reimbursement for compensation paid.

Further, statistics have shown higher costs per claim than costed due to either:

1. an average longer duration of claims; or
2. the fall away and closure of claims not happening as predicted, resulting in higher costs.

Initially the general decrease in premiums paid by employers disguised the future additional costs of paying directly up to the first weeks of compensation, the cost of carrying out and administering further payments and carrying additional staff and interest costs arising from reimbursement delays. Many industries have seen a significant jump in claims under WorkCare and consequently are suffering a destabilised attitudinal change at the workplace.

That is pretty important to remember. The report continues:

These developments are beginning to cast doubts as to whether the generally reduced premium costs under WorkCare compared with the previous workers compensation system are not being offset as far as employers are concerned by other, negative cost impacts.

When WorkCare started the Accident Compensation Commission proudly advertised 'WorkCare, We Care'. After 18 months administrative attitudes generally have caused many employers to suggest that nobody cares. Claims administration agents have no incentive and employers no role to defend claims or to apply for reduction or termination of compensation.

The definition of injury is so wide that the attitude now is 'If you can't work (no matter the cause) you are entitled to compensation.' Weekend injuries, soft tissue injuries and symptoms of the ageing process are now being compensated readily. Such injuries should be subject to scrutiny by specialist medical boards for acceptance and for on-going supervision. Presently there is no provision for an employer to have the right to demand a further medical examination nor are medical boards provided for in the legislation to assist resolution of differing medical opinion.

Compensation is obtainable so easily that it is being used as an alternative to sick leave and as a disguise for taking long weekends or holidays. Compensation is now the alternative to other welfare benefits, such as unemployment benefits. Compensation is claimed increasingly to cover lack of annual leave entitlement and for the period of maternity.

The more aggressive workers are using the threat of compensation claims to demand particular work, conditions and privileges. The cunning are organising dubious claims by having a short absence accepted readily and then alleging aggravation or recurrence which is hard to reject because of the earlier acceptance. Many claims are accepted by the Accident Compensation Commission without challenge or investigation.

Others have identified they can get more on compensation than by working either by:

1. having sufficient dependents; or
2. both spouses claiming and each claiming the other is dependent and their children dependent on both of them.

There are flaws in the legislation which can result in payments exceeding actual rates of pay at work because of indexation of payments and minimum rates which increase with number of dependants. This does not encourage a speedy return to work. Further, in the textile, clothing and footwear industries, piece rates may no longer be available to those employees working. Despite this situation, such piece rates have been included in the calculation of compensation under s. 95 (3) of the Accident Compensation Act for those injured workers receiving weekly payments with the results that those on compensation get the same or nearly the same as those working.

There are cases where the cause of an injury has subsequently been discovered to be unrelated to work yet the workers are allowed to remain on compensation. The Accident Compensation Commission fails to scrutinise such claims despite the attempts of employers to bring such disclosures to the attention of their claims administration agents.

The commission and claims agents have no legal obligation and obviously feel no moral obligation to reimburse employers promptly for the compensation payments they are obliged legally to make. Carrying tens of thousands of dollars at today's interest rates adds considerably to employers' costs. Small businesses are further prejudiced by such financial burdens.

The commission may threaten employers to force acceptance of a return to work but it has done little to stop compensation for workers who refuse rehabilitation. Surveillance of claimants is discouraged. Fraudulent and false claims are thought to be non-existent or minimal. Unrealistic assessments may be placed on a claims potential to the prejudice of employers' premiums.

Under the WorkCare scheme emphasis has been placed on rehabilitation. Such emphasis was to add to the financial viability of the WorkCare scheme. Yet there are many instances where 80 per cent compensation (in practice a rare minimum) is perhaps a greater incentive not to return to work than the lump sum provided under the old scheme. It is submitted that workers who refused rehabilitation without proper justification should automatically have their weekly payments terminated. Further, there is a looseness in administration overall which derives from the basic philosophy in the legislation. This is evidenced by:

1. Relationships between the commission and the VARC are not as close as is necessary with examples of VARC refusing to provide the commission with information on individual cases.
2. Delays in commencement of rehabilitation programs are averaging over five months.

It is five months before someone can get on to a rehabilitation program. The report continues:

The system is heavily loaded in favour of employees with little real discipline in terms of testing of dubious claims or continuing incapacity to resume work. Basically the role of employers is limited to that of levy and benefit payment, with significant administrative costs and bound by an onerous timetable in processing claims. Employers have no real role in disputing claims and find it most difficult to obtain information on particular claims once they are in the hands of a claims administration agent. Presently only an employee can have the decision reviewed by the tribunal. Further, employers are obliged to continue making payments to an employee even though the employment relationship is terminated. Managers are finding it difficult to cope with compensation threats, constant work absences and the dead weight of people on light duties. Overall, employers recognise the problems but are frustrated from taking action because they only have a minor role in the system.

The application of the legislation to certain contractors via sections 8 and 9 is complex and totally confusing. It permits duplication of levy payment and complexity in determining lia-

bility apart from determining compensation. It admits a situation where an employer can be liable for an injury in circumstances when he has absolutely no control over the work situation.

That is the situation in Victoria. We do have an Act superior in some regards and that addresses some of these issues, but the underlying issue is that we have to work in this State and cannot let WorkCover—

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

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** I take this opportunity in the first part of my speech to refer to a problem within my electorate. I speak on this issue with some reluctance because, when somebody reads the speech, they may think that I am passing judgment, which I certainly do not intend to do. There is a new Housing Trust development on the edge of Trimmer Parade at the back of the Royal Adelaide Golf Course whereby newcomers have recently entered the electorate. A problem has arisen which I would describe as a 'people' problem, especially between the newcomers—the young newcomers—and the older, more established residents.

Unfortunately, the children, whose ages range between 7 and 17 years, congregate in the streets to play sport and socialise. The conflict arises because the children play football and cricket and undertake other activities in the area; the older residents feel that this is intrusive and not in keeping with the sort of district that they are accustomed to. In recent weeks the Woodville council has had the opportunity to resurface a reserve in the area to the extent where it can be used by the youngsters, but they are not prepared to utilise it.

I do not enter into debate when people say that the younger generation are far worse than they used to be. It has been put to me from time to time that the younger generation are more difficult to get on with, perhaps more cheeky and do not respect their elders in the way that youngsters used to 10 years ago. I do not accept that argument and one only has to remember one's own youth to recall some of the things that happened in those days. My youth was spent in a Housing Trust area and I recall playing sport on the streets. Indeed, I remember playing cricket on Tapleys Hill Road. That shows how old I am, because one certainly could not do that these days.

The problem to which I allude is an interesting social problem, because the local residents are complaining about the activities of the youngsters, particularly on weekends. It has been alleged that we are talking not only about noise and the odd football going over the fence but also about vandalism, destruction of local property, graffiti and similar problems. Part of the problem is the fact that newcomers have entered an area that has been established for some time and are at a definite disadvantage in weaving themselves into the local community. To make things more difficult, not only are these residents newcomers but they are on the lower economic scale. No judgment should be cast upon them for this, but it seems that, because they are on the lower economic scale, they do not have the same opportunities as people who live near them and who come from the West Lakes area—a relatively affluent area—to join in with community activities.

Most of the complaints arise from the activities of these youngsters on Saturday and Sunday. Most of the alleged vandalism takes place during, although not exclusively, that time. It is difficult for some people who have lived in the district for many years to fathom why, with all the opportunities that abound in the surrounding area through organised sport, scouts, cubs, community organisations and

anything else that one would like to mention, these children cannot take part on Saturday and Sunday.

An interesting sociological problem must be addressed. If some professional people put the time aside to analyse the situation, we would be well down the track in overcoming the problem. It is my guess that the socioeconomic situation has something to do with it, because it is a problem for these children to join sporting clubs. The cost of entry fees, uniforms, football boots, tennis shoes, and so on, has put beyond reach entry into such clubs by some people in the lower socioeconomic scale. I am only guessing in putting forward such a proposition and there may be other reasons why something needs to be done to meld these people into general community activities.

As the local member, I believe that the delivery of human services has largely been taken over by local government. Certainly so far as the Woodville council is concerned (and I pay tribute to the way it has entered this field), that is the truth. In addition the State Government usually provides grant money for the establishment and delivery of human services. This has certainly been true of the Woodville council in providing the network in and around the Woodville Town Hall.

I have taken the opportunity to write to the Mayor of Woodville seeking his cooperation to ascertain whether something could be done and whether social workers or anyone else whom the Mayor would care to nominate could put aside time to try to assist with the problem that now exists in this area.

The Housing Trust has also been very good in the field of social services and in looking at these problems, and I have taken the opportunity also to write to the trust to see whether it can help in the sort of study that needs to be undertaken to solve this problem. As a community we think that, by merely putting people into new houses, even though their needs are extremely great, we have solved all the problems. This is a big mistake which the community should correct. We need to back up with other services what is happening in this area.

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

**Mr BLACKER (Flinders):** This is the fifteenth time that I have spoken on a Supply Bill. I do not wish to indicate how old I am or how long I have been in this Parliament, but I raise the point that, on the first occasion when I spoke in this debate in 1973, we debated an appropriation of \$50 million, compared to \$875 million with this Bill, presumably for similar reasons. I know that no great issue can be made of that point, because the circumstances for which money needs to be appropriated can vary, but I believe that it is a sign of the times and that the amounts of money we debate are quite exorbitant. No doubt it is a matter that concerns not only the Government but also the Opposition.

Earlier today I sought from the Minister an undertaking regarding a reply to a question that I asked in Parliament in April. I again take the opportunity of raising the issue relating to assurances for continued health services on Eyre Peninsula. I believe that the issues have been debated on many occasions; they have been raised at many forums ranging from the Hospitals Association through to the Health Commission; they were raised at the last Estimates Committees; and they have been raised in Question Time on numerous occasions, but still the rumours persist that there will be hospital closures on Eyre Peninsula. I would like to believe that the assurances that I have been given will be honoured and that there will be liaison between the Government, the Health Commission and local communities

before any reduction of health services takes place, particularly if it involves the closure of any hospitals in my electorate.

Nearly 18 months ago a report into the maternity and obstetrics services of the Lyell McEwin and Modbury Hospitals was tabled. One of the recommendations in that report was that every hospital that had fewer than 50 deliveries per year needed to be re-examined. Immediately that created fears in the community. That scare may have been politically motivated but, irrespective of the intent of that scare, the report greatly concerned country hospitals. At that time the Government initiated a further report and then indicated that every hospital with fewer than 20 deliveries per year needed to be looked at. That then put minds to rest in relation to most of the hospitals in my area. Had the original 50 deliveries criterion been used, every hospital except Port Lincoln and Whyalla would have been closed, and we all know that that would be utterly ridiculous.

Following the release of the second report by the Government, there was a general feeling of acceptance that the Government's attitude would recognise the plight of country people. Moreover, it indicated that every pregnant woman should be within 45 minutes driving time of maternity services. Obviously, if we take the reverse situation and apply that criterion to residents in my electorate (and no doubt other parts of the State), the Government would have to build hospitals, but nobody suggests that that should be the case at the moment. We are trying at least to maintain the services that we have. Some weeks ago there was a meeting of the Eyre Peninsula Hospitals Association at Elliston at which Dr McCoy and Mr Ray Blight were present. At that meeting I sought an assurance from Dr McCoy, on behalf of the people present, that the current medical services would be maintained. Although we did not receive a categorical assurance that each of the hospitals would be maintained, a general assurance was given that no reduction in services would take place without community consultation and that, basically, the Health Commission was charged with the responsibility of trying to cut costs wherever it could, and at the same time having to maintain a high level of health services. I think that, in the main, that assurance was accepted.

However, some weeks later, there was an annual general conference of the United Farmers and Stockowners, and one of the delegates at that conference was also a member of the Cowell Hospital Board. The general topic of amalgamation of Government departments was raised and that delegate, speaking as a board member, said, 'We have been told that we will amalgamate with Cleve.' It was quite a definite statement which took me by surprise, because I, along with most of the other hospital representatives of Eyre Peninsula, had attended the Elliston meeting. Later that same week quite a lengthy article appeared in the *Eyre Peninsula Tribune*, and that again raised the question of the validity of the statement made by that hospital board member. The article in the *Eyre Peninsula Tribune* of 30 July stated:

At that meeting Dr McCoy suggested Cowell hospital becomes a 'long term' hospital for the region while Cleve hospital handles all surgery and short term patients. After the meeting—

and this is the part that I wish to emphasise—

in a private conversation with Cowell Hospital Board member, Mr Paul Kaden, Dr McCoy said the total closure of the hospital was also being considered.

It is that statement that has caused concern in the general community. When I saw that statement I immediately became concerned and rang the Health Commission. I tried to speak with Dr McCoy, but at that time he was overseas with the Minister. However, Mr Ray Bright, the Executive

Director of Country Health Services, who was also present at the Elliston meeting, responded by way of a letter to the editor.

At that stage, I believed that effectively the issue was put to rest, but I have since been told that another member of Parliament who attended the meeting at Elliston claims to have overheard the Chairman of the Health Commission (Dr McCoy) actually make that statement. I am very concerned about that claim. Either Dr McCoy made a statement privately and did not tell the general meeting, or he has been misquoted. In fairness to Dr McCoy, I believe that he should be given the opportunity to make an unequivocal statement as to the position which he is alleged to have put forward. He is alleged to have stated that the Cowell Hospital will amalgamate, and that matter needs to be clarified.

I have endeavoured to speak with the Minister. Initially when I tried to make contact he was overseas, and then, upon his return, a tentative arrangement was made for me to see him this week. However, I understand that, for very personal reasons, the Minister is not available today and I express my sympathies to his family concerning that matter. Nevertheless, I use this opportunity to place on record my grave concerns about this matter. I am seeking from the Government some sort of clarification from Dr McCoy in relation to the actual position as it stood and whether in fact he did make the statements to a hospital board member that have since been printed in the local media.

I now raise another issue that is of some concern to the community. Perhaps this situation has arisen due to public misunderstanding: I refer to the Government's support to issue oyster lease licences in the Coffin Bay Peninsula area, the Coffin Bay waters and the Franklin Harbor waters. Many sections of the community have expressed grave concern that oyster licences will be granted *carte blanche*. Suggestions have been made that entire bays or inlets will be closed off and that generally much of the recreational waters used for skiing, fishing and other recreational purposes will no longer be available to the general public. The concern in the general community has been such that the Coffin Bay Waters Protection Committee has been established in an endeavour to fight these so-called infringements on the general community.

At the outset, I should say that I believe that there is room for aquaculture in conjunction with the recreational pursuits of skiers, fishermen, swimmers, and anyone else who wishes to use the bays in these areas. The people who have these concerns should approach the appropriate authorities and find out what the real facts are. I contacted the Department of Fisheries and found that many of the allegations that have been made are not in fact correct and that, although statements have been made that leases have been issued, in the main, I understand, that is not correct, and some of the sites claimed to be involved in fact will never be subject to the issuing of licences on the basis of an infringement of the general usage of the area that has been established over a long period. I have been assured that there will definitely be no dredging for oysters in the bays to which I have referred. This assurance needs to be made more widely known due to the general concern that exists in the community at the moment.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** First, I refer to an extract from the 'SACOSS (S.A. Council of Social Services) News' of April-May 1987. Headed 'The Impact of Poverty', it states:

Poverty is not simply revealed in short-term cash problems, but also as repossessions, foreclosures and mortgage sales. Poverty in turn involves loss of cars, transport, housing and home appl-

icances, with conspicuous humiliation and exclusion from the mainstream society.

Few will deny such conditions generate stress, manifested as resentment, envy, frustration, even hatred. One ultimate effect is violence leading to physical abuse against others (including partners and children), and self abuse including alcohol and drug abuse, even suicide.

In addition to these more readily measurable demands, a widespread but partly hidden social cost afflicts a large proportion of the community: the offenders who react to social distress are, in a real sense, the victims of unemployment and poverty, while their victims suffer both financially and emotionally.

In many ways the symptoms of poverty and other forms of human misery are reflected in the escalating demands made upon welfare agencies for a variety of services, and in increased social costs such as crime.

Front line welfare agencies are witnessing the brunt of a hurting community in which more and more South Australians are experiencing difficulties in keeping their heads above water. A growing number of persons no longer have the support of a sturdy social safety net to fall back on.

This is occurring at a time when the so-called 'friends of the poor' occupy the Treasury benches. I then read with interest a report in last weekend's *Sunday Mail* where, under the banner headline, we were invited to 'meet the mega rich Aussies'. I shall quote briefly from this article, as follows:

Holmes a Court's net worth is \$1.4 billion, up from \$600 million last year, and Packer's \$1.3 billion, compared with \$275 million last year . . .

*Business Review Weekly* says that, in terms of gains in wealth, 1987 is simply the best year Australia has had since the 1851 gold rush.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** That is for some people!

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I will come to the point in a moment. The article continues:

Holmes a Court rolls quietly on, while Packer has reaped huge dividends by investing the \$1.05 billion from the sale of the Nine TV network to Mr Alan Bond.

Holmes a Court increased his wealth by \$3 205 a minute or \$53.42 a second (assuming a 60 hour week) since last year's Rich 200 listing.

And Bond has been no slouch in multiplying his wealth from \$25 million in 1983 to \$400 million—an increase of 1500 per cent.

These are the people who are the friends of the Prime Minister. Mr Bond got up at a business dinner in Sydney and said that Mr Hawke was a marvellous fellow. Up gets Mr Packer and says, 'We think that Mr Hawke is wonderful. He is our friend. Our business is able to prosper and we are able to become mega rich.' These are the friends of the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister went on holidays, a long earned rest, after the Federal election: where did he go? It was south in Victoria, with some millionaire property developers, and while he was hanging the fishing line over the end of jetty or, more likely, the million dollar yacht, what was he doing—and this applies also to the Government in this State—about the people that SACOSS is seeking to look after? The poor are getting poorer and the rich are getting richer—and the rich are getting richer at a quite staggering pace. What has the Labor Party got to say about all this?

**Mr Oswald:** Very silent.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** They are very silent; they are immersed in their reading material. But the fact is that the poor in South Australia are getting poorer—and there are more of them—under the so-called friends of the underprivileged. These so-called friends have presided over the disintegration of this society, and it will get worse. Their ill-advised economic policies have allowed one citizen of Australia to gain his wealth at a rate of \$54-plus per second—while SACOSS in very moderate terms makes the statement, 'Frontline welfare agencies are witnessing the brunt of a hurting community in which more and more South Australians are experiencing difficulties in keeping their heads above water.'

What has been the Government's answer as regards rescuing the economy of South Australia? I must confess that more and more I find that statements emanating from the organised trade union movement are striking some sympathetic chord in my thinking, and that Mr Lesses may be more in touch with reality than the newfound economists in the Labor Party, as evinced by Mr Lange, who has presided over record unemployment, inflation and hardship in New Zealand—but, nonetheless, he managed to get re-elected—and the Hawke-Keating axis in Canberra, presiding over an economy which is breeding friends that are quite happy to get up in public and endorse them.

The Bonds and the Packers of this world are prepared to get up and say about the Prime Minister, 'We love this man, he has enabled us to become not millionaires but billionaires,' while, as I say, the poor and the underprivileged are hurting, and more and more of them are joining those unfortunate ranks. That is an absolute condemnation of the policies being pursued by this Government and their brothers in arms in Canberra. What is the Government's solution? It is that the submarine project and the Grand Prix will fix the economy.

I think it was Mr Tumbers, one of the union fellows, who made a very sensible statement a couple of years ago when he said that we are not interested in bread and circuses. I heard the Premier spruiking on some women's midday TV show not long ago—it obviously cut him—saying, 'We are not interested in bread and circuses', and off he went with the usual spiel. But, in fact, that is the diet members opposite have been feeding the public. I think it was Mr Tumbers—I think I am doing him credit; it was one of the more articulate union advocates—who suggested that maybe we are a bit more interested in bread and circuses in South Australia than in building a strong, industrial and broad based economy on which we may be able to redistribute wealth.

I am jolly pleased to know that the union movement, the ACTU, has now grasped that point, a point which we have been hammering and certainly I have been hammering for years: that is, we cannot make the average Australian better off unless we bake a bigger cake. If we do not bake a bigger cake, it just depends on who gets the biggest slice. But if we want everyone to be better off, including those who suffer most in times of recession—the poor and underprivileged—we have to expand the economy. Members of the ACTU, although they came back from overseas with some pretty funny ideas, have this idea that the economy must expand. So, they are progressing, and some of the union leaders from time to time say things which I think are sensible.

The answer here is to go for the subs—they will fix us—and the Grand Prix. The submarine project will give the State 20 per cent of the project, so we get more than our share—full marks! It is certainly not the whole project. I was so bold, as I said earlier, to say publicly that this is just regurgitating taxpayers' funds. It will generate some local activity, but let us not fool ourselves; we will not generate wealth. All we are doing is spending some billions of taxpayers' funds. So do not let us kid ourselves that the submarine project is baking a bigger cake. All we are on about is seeing that South Australia gets its slice. I said 20 per cent was not the whole project.

I had a telephone call from Mr Jim Duncan who, for his efforts, has been promoted. He said to me, 'You shouldn't be saying this. The submarine project will be bigger than Roxby Downs.' I had a big question mark over the economic judgment of Mr Duncan. I did not have time to say so. But for his trouble Mr Duncan has been promoted. The

suggestion that the submarine project, a redistribution of taxpayers' funds, is comparable with the new wealth, the bigger cake baked, and the capital being spent at Roxby Downs and the activity generated there indicates to me that Mr Duncan is an economic babe in arms. Obviously I upset him by suggesting that, by getting 20 per cent, we were not getting the project but we were—

*Mr Tyler interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The honourable member opposite is entitled to his opinion, and I am entitled to mine. If he does not understand—

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

**Mr ROBERTSON (Bright):** I was unfortunate enough to miss three minutes of the Deputy Leader's customary tirade. I am pleased to note that he has done his regular review of newspaper headlines for the print handicapped who happen to be listening in. I welcome the new found enthusiasm of the Deputy Leader for social welfare issues, and in particular his new found interest in our trade union comrades.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Yes. I must say that I cannot help feeling a little cynical about the timing, the coincidence, of this new found interest of the Deputy Leader and the new found soul and heartfelt sympathy that the Leader seemed to evince yesterday in his Address in Reply speech. It seems to me that there is a coordinated tactic on the part of the Opposition to at least generate and drum up a little phoney enthusiasm for the interests of the people who are more socially depressed. I welcome that; if that is a genuine concern, I can only applaud it and I would encourage members of the Opposition to continue saying and doing those sorts of things. If they should ever be fortunate enough to be in a position to carry out some of those well meaning ideas, I would welcome that also.

I referred a moment ago to the Deputy Leader's concerns about trade union courses, and it occurred to me that they were somewhat at odds with the views expressed by the member for Mitcham the other day in his fairly traditional union bashing exercise carried out in this place. It seems to me that perhaps the degree of coordination that appears to exist between the Leader and the Deputy Leader ought to extend to the rest of the members on the front bench. I am sorry to see the Deputy Leader leave because I had a few other points to raise. The other thing I wanted to welcome was his new found interest in domestic science. He appears to be interested in baking bigger cakes, and I can only welcome that in view of the fact that our efforts to obtain submarines and the Grand Prix, which have been so fruitful and productive for this State, have in fact been about producing bigger cakes. I am glad to see that the Deputy Leader has enthusiasm for our views on that subject.

I want to use the opportunity in debating the Supply Bill (No. 2) involving \$875 million to pick up a couple of issues that are relevant to the District of Bright and to record some of the work carried out in that electorate during the past five or six months, the period which this Bill covers. In the area of transport, on the Noarlunga railway line, the major railway line in the southern suburbs, during this period two major works have been carried out on railway station car parks. First, the Hallett Cove Beach railway station western car park has been completely resurfaced with bitumen and a considerable number of car parking spaces have been provided. The STA has provided trees, tube stocks, a watering system and mounding which local people are looking after, and that again shows admirable

and eminent cooperation between the local community and the STA, and I welcome that.

I also welcome the STA's work with the community of Brighton in supplying tube stocks and watering systems for the Brighton railway station. It is a step in the right direction and shows community concern on the part of STA, which is sometimes accused of being less than concerned with the local community. I also welcome the new car park at the Hallett Cove railway station, the station further north of Hallett Cove Beach—a new car park on the eastern side of that station is nearing completion this very day.

I also welcome in this context the indication of the Marion city council that it will build another railway car park at Hallett Cove on the other side of the line as a result of a land swap with the State Government. It will result in high standard parking for the residents of Hallett Cove estate. It is also timely to mention that the STA is proceeding with the signalling project on the Noarlunga line. Work is going ahead to erect a compound for the containment of vehicles, hardware and software to be used on the project. Although that has caused a few ructions locally, the signalling project is a welcome innovation in relation to the southern line and should provide quicker access for those people who live in the southern suburbs through to the central business district of Adelaide and beyond.

I also welcome in this context the arrival of the first of the new 3 000 class locomotives on the southern line during the past week. The reception of that vehicle certainly suggests that those locomotives will be a major success. They continue the high standards which the STA is now setting in its passenger services.

In the area of education, I wish to devote a couple of minutes to local schools. The Hallett Cove R-10 has received a new computer system in the last six months. A before and after school program is being set up and should be running before the beginning of next term. New play equipment is being installed in the primary and junior primary school this week. Stage 2 of the new school was set for completion at the beginning of next year and should be open in 1988. As a matter of interest, stage 2 came in under budget. The surplus from stage 2 will enable the department to construct a lay-by for the safe dropping off and picking up of children from the beginning of next year.

At Hallett Cove South Primary School, which was completed in 1977, there is a demonstrated need for attention to the problem of children crossing roads and I understand that, if Marion council is prepared to recommend that a crossing be established, the Education Department has indicated that, as a matter of policy, the cost of a crossing at that point will be met by the department.

In the area of education, coincidentally the repainting of Mawson High School was completed this week. Over the past three months, Brighton Primary School has received a new air-conditioning system. Schools, such as Brighton Primary, now between 15 years and 20 years old need maintenance and that work is being done.

I now refer to the community involvement throughout the electorate in respect of which the Government has taken some part over the past six months. The Brighton scouts have received a grant to rebuild their historic hall, which was first built in the 1920s. The sum of \$120 000 has been spent thus far on Kingston House, which is very much a public facility that should be used by the public. Much of that money is Federal CEP money, although the State has made a contribution. In this context, I again welcome the contribution of about \$20 000 announced by the Brighton

council this week for the completion of work in the grounds of Kingston House.

On the subject of housing, I point out that emergency housing has continued to be supplied in the southern suburbs and there is a project to rehouse and mainstream some of the residents of Ru Rua in Housing Trust accommodation at South Brighton. I certainly welcome that development. I also welcome the support of the local community for the cooperative housing scheme announced and sponsored by the Minister of Housing and Construction. This very week, I have had two individuals from local church groups in my office to talk about cooperative housing. I believe that the development of cooperative housing as that model needs to be continued and encouraged. Indeed, I have certainly been encouraged so far by the response of local community groups, including not only churches but also service clubs and resident groups.

I would welcome the involvement of churches generally in issues such as housing, youth shelters and recreation spaces. In the Bright electorate, taking the Baptist Church for example, the Hallett Cove community is presently planning a large recreational space to serve the Hallett Cove community; the Brighton Baptist Church is considering cooperative housing; and the Seacombe Road Baptist Church has established a mobile youth bus to service the needs of youth in the area. I welcome the involvement of churches and service clubs of all kinds in projects to meet the housing, shelter and recreational needs of the community.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** Earlier today, members heard that the Government might have a hit list of rural hospitals that had been singled out for closure or for deferral of redevelopment. I noticed in questions addressed to the Premier that the Mount Gambier Hospital and the Mount Gambier extended care facilities were not mentioned, although they could well have been because they are among the largest redevelopment programs deferred by the Government.

In support of that comment, may I point out that the Mount Gambier Hospital redevelopment, which was promised in the election campaign of 1982 by the then shadow Minister of Health (Hon. John Cornwall), and again promised for redevelopment in the 1985 campaign by the same person as Minister at a cost of \$15 million, had been planned during the interim period by a firm of consultants (Ernst and Whinney). That redevelopment plan, approved by Cabinet, was scheduled to be implemented as a staged program. However, we are now told (and the Chairman of the Mount Gambier Hospital board has expressed sorrow at the statement) that the work has been deferred and we have been given no date for the commencement of the redevelopment scheme.

A few days ago, I said that the Mount Gambier Hospital, although constructed in the post-war period, was really of a pre-war design and needed considerable upgrading to bring it to the standard of modern hospitals. The Mount Gambier extended care facility was the subject of a front page press release in the *Border Watch* on Friday 8 November 1985, very shortly before the date of the State election. The headline carried the Minister's statement that a multi-care village was planned for a new centre. Every indication was that the Mount Gambier extended care service would be converted into a village style health centre with a number of additional facilities to be provided as well as the ones that exist at the present Mount Gambier community health centre.

The Chairman of the Mount Gambier community health centre is a lady of some distinction in Mount Gambier. I



believe that she was the first lady mayor in South Australia. She has been exemplary in the way in which she has led womanhood in the South-East and the rest of South Australia by her achievements. As Chairman of the community health centre she has brought to my notice that, despite promises that were made in 1985, the service has not received any development funds for the past two years and there is no indication as to when that program will begin.

I will take up the debate about the Mount Gambier Hospital at a more opportune time when a longer period is available, but in the remaining time I will refer specifically to the Mount Gambier extended care centre. Mrs Lenora Bishop pointed out to me that the extended care centre currently receives far more patients than it ever has, and that is because the Mount Gambier Hospital discharges patients earlier in the knowledge that the extended care centre is available to look after them. Among the various functions performed by the extended care centre are social work, physiotherapy, occupational therapy, dietetic services, speech therapy, paediatrics, hygiene care, day-care centre, home help services, loan of equipment, home handyman assistance, transport for the infirm, mental health services, a visiting psychiatrist, podiatry, diabetic education and renal dialysis. The unit not only serves Mount Gambier but it provides assistance to other local government areas including Port MacDonnell, Nelson (which is over the Victorian border), Millicent, Penola and Naracoorte. It is a very wide ranging and worthwhile service.

The number of individual contacts with clients during the 1985-86 financial year was over 42 000 and almost 43 000, including 9 500 physical therapy and treatment contacts, nearly 5 000 counselling and support contacts, almost 11 000 health hygiene maintenance contacts and a number of other functions that are part and parcel of the everyday services provided by this worthwhile facility. A major concern that I have for the Mount Gambier community health centre is that it occupies a former doctor's surgery, the old Ferrers Clinic on Ferrers Street, and a house immediately adjacent that was purchased some years later. The centre has 44 staff, who represent 20 full-time equivalent staff, operating virtually from two houses. Members of this Chamber will recognise that there is a great deal of overcrowding just from the staff point alone, yet many of the 42 000 contacts are made on those premises.

In addition to the services provided inhouse, a vast amount of equipment is on loan to people who have been discharged from hospital or to people who have not been admitted but who utilise the range of equipment provided by the centre. I draw this matter to the Minister's attention and remind him that I wrote to him on 10 August 1987, and I have yet to receive a response to that letter. However, I admit that it is a relatively short time since I wrote and that the Minister has much to consider. Nevertheless, I ask him to bear in mind that his commitments have been made over two State elections, that they appeared to be very firm commitments and that the people of Mount Gambier and, I suppose, the people of all other rural areas accepted his promises prior to the elections as promises made in good faith.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Price is out of order.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The people have been let down by the deferral of these projects for an indefinite period by the Minister, no firm commitments having been made. With respect, I ask the Minister to reconsider his decisions to defer these developments in rural areas and to do every-

thing he can to ensure that these projects are commenced as soon as possible.

Another matter on which I would like to spend some considerable time—but that will not be possible in view of the two minutes remaining to me—is the question of subsidies to rural areas. The South Australian and Australian farmer in general is among the most efficient in the world. That is indisputable. I refer members specifically to the 9 July 1987 edition of the *National Farmer* and to the article on page 27 headed 'It's official. We have the lowest subsidies.' The article appeared under the byline of Don Jones. It is quite obvious that the Australian farmer, with a total subsidy of 4.7 per cent, is far behind the United States farmer, with a 16 per cent subsidy; the New Zealand farmer, with a 15.5 per cent subsidy; the Canadian farmer, with a 23.9 per cent subsidy; and farmers from the rest of the world whose subsidies range between 26.1 per cent and, for Japanese farmers, 59.4 per cent.

I draw to the attention of members of this Chamber the plight being experienced at the moment by members of the dairy farming industry. I will discuss this matter in far greater detail, along with the plight of other farmers in Australia, in another debate. At this stage, I simply alert members to the fact that dairy farmers need subsidies.

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** Once again members have to proceed at this stage of the new parliamentary session with this debate to approve funds to pay the Public Service until after the State budget has been dealt with. This is an absolutely stupid arrangement. I have been saying it for years and it becomes more idiotic the longer I stay here that we have to deal with budget moneys in August, that the State budget is brought down at the end of the month, and that at some time in October Government departments and authorities know exactly where they stand. I have always said and believed that the State budget should be brought down early in February, when Parliament resumes after the summer break, and that it must be dealt with by Parliament by mid June. So that, come 1 July, each Government department and statutory authority would have all its financial arrangements in place and could operate from day one. They would know exactly where they stand and how they can proceed. In the present situation sporting and voluntary organisations within the community which are dependent on Government assistance do not know until November where they are heading and generally have five or six months of the financial year to spend their money. It results in the incompetent, wasteful system of spending up big in the last few months of the financial year.

I recently attended a parliamentary Public Accounts Committee conference in Sydney at which I found that the New South Wales Public Accounts Committee discovered that Government departments wrote out cheques in June, put them in the department safes and, when the invoices for goods that had been ordered in June arrived in July, August and September, the cheques were passed on. Effectively, it made the entry appear as though it had been put through in the previous financial year. It is a clumsy, incompetent financial system. I can only urge State and Federal Governments to correct it. I know that many members in Federal Parliament also want the system changed. The sooner we do it, the better. It will not come unless a few of the States get together and urge the Federal Treasurer to take the action that he should take.

Two problems were raised today in this place to which I will refer now. The first was highlighted in the question that I asked the Minister this afternoon on the youth housing report. A terrible situation has occurred where information



is urgently and desperately needed. It was promised before the 1985 election; it was promised in June 1986 that the report would be brought down by December 1986 so that in the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless we would have something to work on. I was at a meeting in April at which the Minister was guest speaker and he said that various reports would be brought down, but nothing has happened. I understand that the chairperson of the committee responsible for this report offered to resign because she could not agree with the Minister. The compromise was that he would refuse to accept her resignation, but that she could put forward a letter covering her views and dissociating herself from certain aspects of the report. As the Minister indicated this afternoon, unofficially, perhaps the report will be brought down in about three weeks. It is a terrible situation where a Minister in charge of a portfolio as important as housing—one of the most important of all the welfare agencies—is in this position.

The other aspect is in relation to youth. The Minister does not seem to be able to get on with, communicate, associate or come to terms with young people and their problems. Let him get the report off the ground and put it forward to us so that we can look at it. We will not agree with all of it, but that does not matter. Let it come forward so that we can work on it for the betterment of the State and the young people whom we are trying to assist and for whom we are trying to find compromises or solutions. We are not knocking the report or the idea, but we want to see the report as a starting point. The Minister has to learn that, if he wants to seek volunteers to assist him in attending to the duties of his portfolio, he must listen to the advice he is receiving and accept that he will not agree philosophically or in other ways with some of the points brought forward.

We understand that the members of the Housing Advisory Committee have resigned *en masse* and that the members of the Community Committee and the executive committee of the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless have also resigned. If that is the situation, the Government should be quite worried, because great play was made in the 1985 election campaign of the Government's commitment to the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless and, more importantly, to housing the community and its young people, the disadvantaged and the disabled.

It was interesting this afternoon to hear the question put forward by the member for Albert Park. It is the first time we have had an admission that there is a downturn in funds, in nominated loans, for the South Australian Housing Trust. It is the first time we have been given the actual figure—and I take it that that was the actual figure. For the year ending 30 June 1986, the South Australian Housing Trust received \$138 300 000 in nominated loans in the top up of moneys from the Loan Account. For the year ending 30 June 1987, the amount was \$152 896 000. It enabled the Housing Trust to carry out the program established by the Government of providing about 3 000 rental units of accommodation. I do not object to that at all, because there is an horrendous waiting list and we must do something about it. What worries me is that there is a \$49 million downturn of nominated loans this year for the Housing Trust. The decision has come from Canberra to cut back this amount of money. Last year the nominated loans component was \$101 million, so there has been a 50 per cent cut back in 53-year term loans bearing an interest rate of 4.5 per cent.

If the Government is to make it up with SAFA funds or top up as much as it is allowed by the Federal Government,

there will be an impact on current market rates and tremendous problems for the South Australian Housing Trust. Trust tenants face a 40 per cent increase in rents between this year and next year. Is it any wonder that even you, Mr Deputy Speaker, complain about the problems associated with Housing Trust tenants? I will raise that subject on another occasion. The behaviour of difficult tenants is a worry in the community and is one of the worst problems that the South Australian Housing Trust faces in regard to community acceptance of what the Housing Trust is endeavouring to do for South Australians.

Tens of thousands of South Australians have their best and first opportunity of owning a home through the South Australian Housing Trust. Many sell as they improve their station in life and move to other areas, thus enabling those who can afford it to acquire a basic house at a reasonable rate, thereby improving their situation in life. In the 50 years during which the Housing Trust has been in operation in South Australia—over five decades—it has helped a lot of people. We certainly hope that that will continue and we will do all we can to encourage that type of assistance.

Difficult tenants are causing a problem. I understand that the general manager in a memo recommended to the Minister of Housing on 27 February 1987 that a committee be formed involving law enforcement, health and community welfare representatives to deal with responses to neighbourhood disruption and violence and in particular with mechanisms for coordinating agency responses to individual situations and mechanisms for ensuring appropriate support for individuals who face difficulty in the community, including health and welfare support for those with special needs and the potential for broadening the availability of community mediation services.

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** I take this opportunity in the grievance debate to raise a subject that I have spoken on briefly in the past. I refer to our double standards as a country in our dealings with other countries, whether it be in culture, sport, trade or whatever. I refer to South Africa. I do not support apartheid, nor do I support the rule by gun of some other countries. I find it strange that we as a country say to Russia that we will accept its ballet, its basketball team and its circus (none of which I object to, as they are capable performers in their field of talent and I enjoy watching them on television or in a live performance if I have the opportunity), but that country in the last few years has killed one million Afghans—not even on their own soil—but we sit back and say, 'That it is all right.' We will buy their tractors and sell them wheat when they do not have an oversupply. During 1932 and 1933, in the famine created by human beings, 7 000 000 Ukrainians died—a greater number than the tyrant Hitler and his Nazi friends killed in terrible camps during the war.

I do not condone any of it, but there are double standards on our part. What effect does it have when we say to the South Africans that we object to their policy of discrimination against coloured people? Do those in power apply these rules partly because of fear? Of course, the answer is 'Yes'. It is fear because, if they relinquish their power, many of them also will die or suffer atrocities. Some people will say that, if those in power end up in that position, they deserve it, but not only just those who hold the power will suffer, but also those of the same race or with the same occupation in the community, whether it be in commerce or industry.

It is easy for us as a country to say, 'We will not trade with you. We will not have your cricketers or rugby players to play here. We will not have your cultural activities here.

We will try to stop people from travelling from this country to that country to see what is happening,' etc. That is an easy decision to make, but we do not achieve very much by it when a country such as China, for example, has a constitution that discriminates against Indians and other races.

We say that we will forgo trade, and suddenly we squeal because 1 000 jobs are lost in the coalmining industry as a result of South Africa saying that it has good quality coal, equal to that in any other part of the world, and that it has not tried to fully exploit the reserves and export it in large quantities. Whether or not we like it (and I do not condone it) South Africa forces coloured people, as well as some whites, to work for rather low wages. Japan said that it would accept the coal because South Africa would sell it \$4 a tonne cheaper than Australia. So, as a result, Australia has 1 000 people out of work. South Africa has not suffered: it just stopped mining a few diamonds and went into another field of finance to support its economy.

There are other what we call third world nations struggling financially. Business houses in South Africa in the fishing industry cannot export and pack the fish. They then set up a company in a third world country and say, 'It will be your country's company, but we will have the interest in it. We will pack the fish in your country and export it.' Where does the world stand in relation to that position? Does it say to those third world countries participating in this exercise, 'We will not trade with you, either'? If we did that, we would be even more hypocritical by putting people out of work in those countries. Where does the hypocrisy start and finish?

What happens to those people in Yugoslavia who speak out and exercise some freedom of speech? Where do they end up? They end up in gaols, without clothes, in below zero temperatures, starved and threatened, and their families also are threatened if they speak up. But the rest of the world, including Australia, says, 'That is all right; we will trade with you. We will turn a blind eye to that.' I can cite many other examples in the world where countries have discriminating laws against individuals or groups. I repeat again that I do not condone the policy of apartheid, but I do not know the answer, nor does any member in this Chamber. It is easy to say that we will give everybody an equal vote and have democracy, but at the moment one group lives in fear because it is suppressed (and I believe sometimes quite badly ill treated) whereas, if the situation is reversed and all that anger and frustration are released, those now in power will suffer, so they are not prepared to relinquish that power.

If Canada, the United States of America, the United Kingdom, New Zealand and Australia were genuine, they would say, 'Look, there is a problem (and a minority happens to be a few million): over the next five years we are prepared to accept the minority as migrants as long as their country will allow them to take enough wealth, if they have it, so that they may reestablish in our country.' Our way of life is not much different. Where they do not have the wealth, we could still take them, as has been the case with Vietnamese people, and give them cheap loans to set them up. In that way we will take them away from the country so that the other group can rule, and we thus remove that potential for more killing. But we will not have the courage to say that. We will say the reverse: 'We will take some of the dark races because they are suppressed.' However, that does not solve the problem, except for the individual who is allowed to migrate to a place where a more stable society exists.

What are we achieving? By adopting that position, we make a race of people, who are determined to succeed, even more determined; and when there is a mixture of Dutch, German and English backgrounds, along with a few others, the determination not to be suppressed and trodden on can be great because of fear of death or the loss of all that they have. It is easy to sit here in Australia and say that that is what should happen, but I do not believe that any member in this Chamber is prepared to go to South Africa and say, 'We will come over and live with you and help solve the problem.' First, we all have too good a life in Australia and, secondly, we would not have the intestinal fortitude to make that sacrifice.

I know that many people in the community support me, because I talk to them, and I say to Australians, 'Wake up; don't be hypocrites.' The best way to solve the world's problems is by playing sport against one another, by performing in the theatre alongside each other, by trading with each other, by working with each other and by communicating with each other. That way the barriers that exist will be broken down, and in the end we will get the stability that we want. If we are not prepared to do that, we must be prepared to accept into Australia those people who, we say, because of their power in government, are ill treating people in other countries. By doing that, we will let the others rule, and we will see what happens to the minority black groups in that society. The result would be the same.

**Mr OSWALD (Morphett):** During my Address in Reply speech I went to some length to highlight what I saw were the deficiencies in the long-term strategic transport planning that the Government has undertaken in the south-western corner of metropolitan Adelaide. During that resume I analysed the long-term implications of when the Government made its first move to sell the north-south corridor, or to sell the land between Darlington through to Anzac Highway. I repeat that that was a decision that was taken at the time against the good advice of the Highways Department. It was a decision taken within Cabinet, and every member of the Southern Region of Councils came forward and on more than one occasion appealed to the Government not to proceed with that decision. They requested that, if it was to be put on the backburner, the land not be sold, but in fact it went ahead and sold the land.

As I pointed out, once the land had been sold, from 1982 onwards the Government engaged in a series of planning exercises on what it they would do when traffic arrived at Darlington. In the meantime it went ahead with projects south of Darlington, but at no stage did it really address in real terms what it would do with the traffic when it arrived at Darlington.

I highlighted this scenario to the House, and the member for Hayward took me to task during last night's grievance debate and set down in *Hansard* some 14 examples of the roadworks undertaken in the south by the Highways Department. I believe that by doing that she simply highlighted the point that I was trying to make: only two of those 14 Highways Department projects are in fact being undertaken on the plains; the rest of them are being undertaken over in the Labor marginal seats, south of the hills face.

We must not lose sight of the fact that the figures that the Government used in 1982 to justify its selling off the north-south corridor are now proving to be wrong. We told the Government at the time in 1982, as did the Southern Region of Councils, that the projected figures that it was using from the Department of Environment and Planning were not accurate. The Southern Region of Councils had its own figures on building approvals, and it indicated that

the Department of Environment and Planning figures were not accurate, as did the Highways Department, when it told the Department of Environment and Planning not to proceed with that move. However, the Government went ahead. The Australian Bureau of Statistics figures, which came out in 1986, have justified the stand taken by the Southern Region of Councils and have highlighted that the figures that were used previously were wrong.

We are now seeing a buildup of traffic on the five urban arterial roads on the plains—and I refer to Brighton, Morphett, Marion and South Roads and, to a lesser degree, Goodwood Road. While they are satisfactory and are holding their own in 1987, the projections now are that by 1996 those roads will not be able to handle the traffic. The Government's answer has been that it will plan for a third highway to duplicate South Road, between the road connecting with Ocean Boulevard and Main South Road. That is certainly appreciated and a wonderful step forward for people who live in the southern region. But we have argued consistently that, unless this is part of the package in relation to the five urban arterials on the plains, the Government will simply be shifting the congestion from the Darlington bottleneck a little farther to the north.

In 1984, the Mayor of Marion, as Chairman of the Southern Region of Councils, actually made this point to the Government: he issued a press statement to the local press saying that all it would do would be to shift the problem further forward if at the same time the Government did not do something about widening our urban arterial roads on the plains. The only response we got on behalf of the Government was from the member for Mawson, who was reported in the local *Southern Times* as referring to the Mayor of Marion, Ted Newberry, as a mealy-mouthed mayor. She said that he was inconsistent and did not know what he was talking about. That was most outrageous language to use in relation to one of the most respected mayors that we have seen in the southern area for many years. Nevertheless, the Government made such statements in an attempt to silence the critics.

In analysing what has happened with these urban arterials since the Government announced its plan for the third arterial road, the fact is that the Government went ahead and widened a bridge at the Darlington bottleneck so that motorists coming from Flagstaff Hill could use a slip lane and get on to South Road a little more quickly. As the member for Hayward pointed out, the Government has also improved the intersection of South, Marion and Seacombe Roads. But it has done nothing else.

I took the trouble to get out the 1985 South Road, Anzac Highway and Daws Road proposals. If members take the time to read the report in detail they will note that in the assessment of South Road the impact of selling off the north-south corridor from Darlington to Anzac Highway was clearly analysed. That factor was clearly written into the assessment made, and it is stated quite clearly there that the widening of South Road and these other urban arterials must be undertaken as part of the total package. In the recommendations and conclusions the statement is made that the construction of the widening was scheduled for 1985 and that it would be completed between 1985 and 1987. In other words, that project should now be complete—but that has not happened. Nothing has happened on the Adelaide Plains in that south-western corner to help contend with the traffic that is now arriving at Darlington.

Recently we were told that the electoral commitment made by the Government prior to the last election to build the third arterial road, commencing in 1990 with a completion in 1995, has been put back. So, once again, no plans

are afoot or have been announced in relation to doing something about getting that traffic up to Anzac Highway or through into the city. I hope that in the budget papers we will find out the fate of South Road—work on which was supposed to have begun back in 1985.

If the Government turns a blind eye to these five urban arterials and does not start work on them as a matter of urgency, what the Liberal Party predicted in 1982 will happen: that is, traffic will simply be shifted just around the Darlington intersection. It will all come through from the Southern Vales, where new houses are being built by the tens of thousands. We have just heard that another 10 000 houses are to be built at Seaford. Traffic from these areas has to get to the city: an analysis of the figures pertaining to the area shows that some 70 per cent of people living down there commute to Adelaide. The Government is either incompetent or has been unable to come to grips with the transport problem in the south-west corner. Either way, the Government has no plans—and no announcements have been made—to compensate us on the plains. To me this highlights absolutely the bad strategic transport planning in the south.

It is interesting to note some figures that I have obtained on the estimated annual average daily traffic volumes on South Road. When South Road was first duplicated, with construction of the Lonsdale Highway, there was a dramatic drop in the traffic on South Road—which I would say was quite predictable. Since then, due to the development down south, the volume of traffic on South Road has built up again to that which existed prior to the construction of the Lonsdale Highway. So we are now back to the situation that obtained prior to the opening of the Lonsdale Highway. The South Road is full: it is holding its own, I accept that, but it cannot take much more traffic, and the traffic predictions for 1996 are such that, with the latest figures coming in, the strategic transport planning for Darlington and the five urban arterials is a disaster. If this Government does not hurry up and address the matter and do something about the traffic on the plains, only one avenue will be open to it, namely, to step aside and let a Liberal Government come in and do the work, the planning for which the present Government is obviously incompetent to undertake.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** I want to take up a number of issues in my 10 minute grievance period this evening. The first one I want to refer to and express my concern about is the statement made a few months ago suggesting that the Government would be looking to charge extra for police presence at some sporting and entertainment events. I have particular concerns about this and I believe that a number of questions need to be asked. Certainly, the information that I have sought has not been forthcoming and I am sure that many individuals and organisations in the community are seeking serious answers to a number of these issues.

It has always been the case that the function of government is to provide to the community adequate resources to ensure law and order and personal safety. We in this State have come to recognise and have considerable respect for the Police Force and the work that it does. I am sure that there are very few people in the community who would not give support to the South Australian Police Force. However, I am concerned, because what happens if this additional cost discourages organisers from requesting police presence at their events? Already some organisers are saying that if it will cost them a lot—and at this stage they have no idea what the actual cost will be—they just will not involve the police. I have particular concerns about that. We need to

know what events will be affected by this new proposition. One could suggest a number of major activities in the State where large crowds are expected, particularly with the bicentennial activities next year. At all of those functions, will the organisations responsible have to pay for police presence?

One of the most pertinent questions is what is happening to our taxes in this State if the Bannon Government cannot even afford to provide one of the most basic services expected by the public. We all realise, and I made the point in my Address in Reply speech, that, since the Bannon Government came into office, taxes in this State have risen by something like 86 per cent, but the Premier still finds it necessary to examine a plan to charge taxpayers more for a service that they have quite rightly come to regard as essential over a very long period of time. I suggest that people will find it hard to accept that they will need to pay more for police presence and protection when the Premier himself has been able to find money in recent months to buy two hotels and an island, and to provide over \$14 000 for the Prostitutes Association and \$10 000 for an alternative theatre group to stage a play on homelessness. So we could go on. I suggest that it is a matter of the Premier's getting his priorities right and, if he did have his priorities right in spending taxpayers' money, there would be no need to charge more for police services which surely the public are entitled to expect given the high sums they already pay through State taxation to the Government.

I believe it is a subject that we will hear a lot more about. I have had discussions with a number of sporting organisations that are particularly concerned about it. Unless the Premier or the Minister responsible is prepared to come out and provide some clear guidelines as to the functions at which organisers will have to pay for police presence, I suggest there will be a considerable number of problems in this area.

The State Transport Authority is an organisation with which I seem to be constantly at loggerheads at the present time and I am looking forward to having the opportunity tomorrow to say something more about the grievances I have with that organisation in regard to the Bridgewater rail service. Another matter that has come to my notice of recent times involves the District Council of Stirling. I have received a copy of a letter that the council sent to the State Transport Authority referring to a letter from the authority concerning action required by the council to accommodate articulated buses. I am sure that members would realise that articulated buses cause particular concern in the Hills because of the curves in the road and the different situations relating to transport issues in that area. The letter states, in part:

As stated in council's letter of 24 April, there is still concern over the introduction of articulated buses in the Stirling council area. The length of these buses requires many of the bus bays to be extended, and, as they are provided solely for buses and their patrons, the cost of modifying the existing bus bays should not be borne by all ratepayers.

The estimated cost to carry out the works as listed in your letter of 3 June is \$6 530. Council accordingly seeks your agreement to meet this cost before work is commenced. The comment in your letter of 28 May—

and this is what the STA said—

The State Transport Authority pays road taxes the same as any other user and fails to see why council should single out the authority and seek additional contributions for road maintenance. We consider we are already meeting our obligations.

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

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Prior to the dinner adjournment, I was reading from a letter from the District Council of Stirling. The council feels that the quote to which I referred is not relevant in regard to the provision of bus

parking bays in the Stirling council area and it requests that the State Transport Authority accept responsibility in this matter. I support the stand that the Stirling council has taken. It is an important issue and it is not one that the ratepayers of the Stirling area should have to fund. I realise that the amount—\$6 530—is not significant, but it is, as a matter of principle, the responsibility of the STA to take up that amount. I urge the Minister of Transport to look into this matter immediately and to resolve it as a matter of urgency so that the District Council of Stirling knows exactly what its responsibilities are in this matter.

In the last two minutes remaining, I shall refer to a letter that I have received from a young constituent which emphasises the frustration experienced by younger students at present. He writes:

After recent demonstrations by TAFE college students and teachers it has come to my attention through the media that the Government is not encouraging further education in any form. Through the year 12 economics course, I know that Australia needs its youth to go on to further education so that we can, as a nation, become technologically equal with the rest of the world. Even a fool can see that, by imposing fees, as introduced in 1987 by the Federal Labor Government, on university students and now the TAFE problems that are being experienced by principals and staff of TAFE are not encouraging Australia's youth to be educated further.

I am sure that you are aware of Australia's situation technologically against the rest of the world. The future looks bleak for me if the Federal Labor Government continues to knock the youth of Australia into the gutter. I feel that the Government is at times helping the law breakers through such programs as those involved with drugs and then making it harder for those wishing to do the right thing.

Some of my ideas may be biased or exaggerated by the media, but it is the way that I and I am sure many other young Australians have interpreted what I would call politically embarrassing moves. Please put me on the right track if in fact I am wrong in what I have said.

I do not think that that person is wrong. There is a considerable amount of frustration and it is recognised that there is a need to go on to further education, and these young people are just not being assisted.

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** In the first instance I will discuss a point concerning the Wallaroo hospital. Members would be aware, as His Excellency addressed in his speech, that work on the Wallaroo hospital has continued and will continue in this financial year for some weeks and months. That is very pleasing because, although it was a fairly topical subject of debate some years ago, when the Labor Government got into power in 1982 nothing happened until the next election in 1985. Thankfully, the earthworks started and now the buildings are virtually a reality.

Tomorrow and Friday, the new Wallaroo hospital will be at a stage at which the transfer will be made from the old operating theatre to the new operating theatre. In the normal course, one would say that that is very pleasing and it is to be hoped that everything goes smoothly, and I wish those involved in the shift a smooth operation. What disappoints me is that for tomorrow and Friday, anyone from Wallaroo needing an emergency or urgent operation will not be allowed to have that operation at the most logical hospital nearby, namely, Kadina or Moonta.

That operation will be performed either at Maitland, which is more than double the distance to either of those two towns, and which rarely performs operations, or Adelaide. That is disappointing, because Kadina hospital opened on Sunday a new wing that included a new operating theatre, the most up-to-date theatre in this State. I believe it is of the same dimensions as the theatre that will be opened at the Wallaroo hospital. It has the most modern facilities. The only difference is that the Kadina hospital is a private hospital and therefore public patients will not be allowed

to have an urgent operation at Kadina hospital, if it should be necessary tomorrow or on Friday.

I rang the Minister's office on Monday of this week requesting that the situation be reviewed, because I thought it was an obvious area where the Minister could practise what he preaches. He seems to preach from time to time that there needs to be more cooperation between hospitals. He has been openly in favour of the Area Health Board which has been proposed for the Copper Triangle towns of Kadina, Moonta and Wallaroo. This proposal is for public hospital beds to be made available in Kadina and Moonta. Here was the perfect opportunity for a period of only two days for the Minister to at least agree, if the occasion arose, for public patients to be operated on at Kadina, but despite my representations the answer came back, 'No, it will not be possible to do that.' As I said earlier, the patients would have to go to either Adelaide or Maitland. I suppose I am pleased that I made representations on Monday, because, prior to my contacting the Minister's office no agreement had been reached with the Maitland authorities to give visiting rights to the Kadina, Moonta or Wallaroo doctors. At least that situation has been put into place in case it is needed.

I would remind members that the cost of a St John ambulance from Kadina to Adelaide is \$269. Therefore, if a patient had to go to Adelaide instead of Kadina as a public patient, \$269 of the taxpayers' money would have to be forked out, plus other expenses. This is a small point that has annoyed quite a few residents in the area. I trust nothing untoward will eventuate during the next two days, but it is disappointing that a Government that openly preaches more cooperation, in practice does not seem to want to have anything to do with it. That is par for the course as we have come to know it.

The second area which I believe the Government ought to be addressing—and I raised this matter two years ago in this House—is the fact that so much native vegetation along our roadsides is dying. The last time I raised this matter the Minister for Environment and Planning, who was in the Chamber at the time, acknowledged the points I was making and said, 'Yes, you are right; that vegetation needs to be addressed.' I forwarded a proposal at that time to have the vegetation cut back because our eucalyptus trees and mallee trees grow best if, when they have reached the stage where they are starting to die, they are cut back. Then they reshoot. However, little or nothing has been done, certainly with Government oversight, since that time. A few of my constituents have pointed it out to me and I wonder what I am supposed to do. Should I keep putting out releases and keep making representations in this House to at least save the vegetation which we have along our roadsides?

This Government is very happy to dedicate areas in country regions as parks or as national parks, and that is about where it stops. Of course, with things within the metropolitan area sometimes the story is different, but I will not sidetrack onto that. I urge the Minister once again to look at the problem immediately: otherwise, people in 10 years time will find that there are far fewer mallee trees and far less evidence of native vegetation along our major highways as they leave the city area. Not only could they be cut back, but also there is so much scope for revegetation and new trees to be planted, and this is an area that the Government is neglecting.

The third point that I wish to bring to the attention of this House is an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* recently by Rex Jory. Headed 'Over-confident Labor—lazy, aloof and arrogant', it states:

The Government has become lazy, smug and arrogant . . . In recent months Ministers, including Mr Bannon, have become

more aloof and less approachable. Requests from community groups, constituents and the media have been ignored or only partly answered.

That is not news to members of the Opposition. We have noticed it for a long time, although it seems that the media are only just beginning to recognise it. Certainly, the Government will probably try to lift its performance a bit, but that will be difficult, too, because, as Mr Jory rightly points out:

The Government frontbench, particularly in the House of Assembly, lacks depth, and some Ministers would make slow moving targets even Mr Bannon cannot protect against the sharp Opposition in Parliament.

Certainly, the slow-moving targets have been very obvious. I would like to refer that particularly to my electorate. Whilst I do not like to mention these things, seeing that the press has brought it to the attention of the public I would say that I have been very disappointed—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I call the House to order.

**Mr MEIER:** I have been disappointed with the result of some of the representations I have made to Ministers. Time will not permit me to detail all of them, but I mention the fact that some four or five months ago I brought up the very poor state of the buildings at the Moonta Area School and I still have not received an answer to my representation. Perhaps that illustrates how correct Mr Jory's article is.

**Mr Lewis:** I have a letter going back 11 months.

**Mr MEIER:** Eleven months: that is not unusual. At least Ministers should have the decency to let members know if they are coming into our areas. Whilst I recognise that a Minister such as the Minister of State Development and Technology has had the decency to let me know, there are Ministers who have not. I particularly identify the Minister of Recreation and Sport. He has attended two official meetings at Balaklava—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr MEIER:** Those meetings were on Wednesday 15 July and Wednesday 12 August, and neither time did he let me know that he was coming into my electorate. I hope the situation will improve in the future.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Murray-Mallee.

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** How can I follow such a distinguished contribution as that? And it was, Mr Deputy Speaker. And you know, as well as do members opposite, particularly the Minister at the bench, that Ministers have been less than courteous in their lack of observance of what were the formalities and decencies of being Ministers of the Crown.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Eyre is not making a contribution.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr LEWIS:** During the course of the Address in Reply debate I drew the attention of the House to the situation in the electorate I represent. That is contrary to what we hear from members opposite about all being well in South Australia, and getting better.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** You represent them with distinction, too.

**Mr LEWIS:** I am pleased that my Deputy Leader considers it to be so. I understand that the people I represent believe it to be so. I want to go on from where I left off in

the course of my Address in Reply remarks. I explained to honourable members how farmers and, indeed, people who live in rural communities have seen their terms of trade deteriorate recently, in no small measure as a direct consequence of the twin factors of Government taxes and charges as well as the increasing costs imposed by the stupid arbitration system we presently have in this country which apportions wage increases which are not in any way relevant to the capacity of the economy and the consumers in the economy to pay but rather in the settlement often of an artificially contrived dispute between a union and an employer.

Where we have a closed shop union we usually get the commencement of the leapfrogging process because nobody else is allowed to do the job except the union members and they simply will not work until their employers agree to pay them whatever they demand. They go to arbitration. If the result obtained at arbitration does not suit them they simply continue their process of industrial disruption through strikes and guerilla tactics until the employer and Arbitration Commission meet their terms. Accordingly, everyone's costs go up because the cost increases of the goods and services produced by the union in the closed shop feed through the economy and other people then demand an increase according to the way in which the CPI has escalated. Those costs have to be borne by the exporters in this country. They are the people whom I represent—people in rural communities. They are least able to cope with the cost but are most frequently required to bear it.

The end result of this process over more than three decades, particularly during the last five years, has been that many of them, through no fault of their own, now find themselves and their family enterprises (whether on farms or servicing the needs of other people in rural communities) in financial difficulty and under grave stress—stress of a kind that trade unionists would never have had to suffer.

I have heard the member for Mawson, among others on the Government backbench, bleating about the poverty trap. The poverty of families in rural communities leaves by comparison people who claim to be in the poverty trap in the urban situation well paid and well cared for. They have no idea what it is like to live—that is, a man and wife with two or more children—on \$60 to \$80 disposal income a week in the household. Yet that is what is happening and is required of them. It is small wonder they are in distress.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** While Bob Hawke goes swanning out on a million-dollar yacht—

**Mr LEWIS:** Indeed, Bob Hawke does that kind of thing and his Minister for Primary Industry, John Kerin, has the gall to offer a counselling service to the communities I represent at half cost if they find the rest—the gall! How can communities already in crisis find half the cost of providing a counselling service to help them sort out the problems that the individuals and families to which they belong are experiencing? They have done nothing wrong but simply stood there and copped what was being dished out as cost increases in their production cycle against which they have to balance the reduced prices they are paid on world markets.

This is especially true in the case of broad acre grain production or mixed farming. It is just as well the livestock industries are holding their own with inflation or improving presently. That is cyclical and will not last forever. Members need to recognise the importance of the situation to which I have referred for two reasons: first, already there has been a reduction in the capacity of the rural communities to produce as much as they used to produce in making a contribution to the balance of payments problems with

which this country is confronted. Those balance of payments problems are enormous and are getting worse in spite of what Paul Keating or anyone else might say about them. We saw those figures released only yesterday, illustrating the point I am making.

I need not dwell on those figures. The bottom line is that it is unfair, unjust and unrealistic of the Minister for Primary Industry and the rest of the Hawke Government to expect people in rural communities who are already suffering from financial stress, for the reasons I have explained, to meet half the cost of the counselling service that they require. I made the point at the end of my Address in Reply speech that I saw those services as being regrettably necessary and was prepared to support their establishment with a personal contribution of \$1 000. I hope that they are established. I regret that they ever became necessary: they should not have been.

I turn now to another matter which illustrates the Government's stupidity, arrogance and indifference in the way in which it treats people in the isolated communities that I represent. I refer to the Government instrumentality Telecom, which has recently been ripping out public telephone boxes from various locations in rural South Australia. These acts of legalised vandalism by this monopoly owner pose a more serious threat to human health, security and safety than the common vandalism we see inflicted on our public phones by hooligans around our urban streets.

Telecom has a monopoly on telephone services in Australia. It needs to answer a simple basic question. What responsibility does it accept in return for its privileged monopoly status? In the settled areas of Australia, where we already have an infrastructure network of telephone lines, we have been able to get ready access to public phones in the past regardless of whether we happen to be living there or just passing through and need a telephone. Not only local residents but tourists, sightseers and truckies alike travel through these less densely populated but settled areas. They travel these parts, believing they can be secure in the knowledge that there is a phone box somewhere nearby at a major cross-road in our little or not-so-little towns.

That will be a thing of the past if we continue to allow the insensitive bureaucratic Telecom juggernaut to pursue its current policy of pulling out phone boxes wherever it says there is 'insufficient money in the box'. Telecom should remember that it cannot calculate the benefits and the profits just by counting the coins in the box. For instance, reverse charge calls made from these boxes (and I make plenty of them during the course of my work) bring in even more revenue per call, even though there are no coins in the box to indicate that a call has been made. Telecom is making travel through the less densely populated parts of our settled areas quite unsafe by removing the phone boxes. It is unsafe for the travelling public and local residents alike. Local residents will now feel compelled to open their doors to total strangers to let them use the phone. They will feel that they must act as good samaritans, but by doing so they will be placing themselves, their families and personal property at grave risk. There is no way of differentiating between genuine travellers in distress and, say, gaolbird escapees or other people with malevolent intentions. The local householder's dilemma is especially bad at night.

I wonder how the Federal Minister (or you, Mr Deputy Speaker) would feel if he lived next to the road at Maramar or Geranium and if somebody knocked on the door of his home at 2 a.m. whilst he was away from his wife and family. Would he advise his wife to tell them to go away even though they were pleading for help in a distressed tone of voice, whether mock or real? Equally, if one lives in one



of these towns in the settled areas, and the home phone breaks down, where is the nearest public phone then? It will be miles away: not necessarily even in the next town, if Telecom has its way. I think that is a parlous state.

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

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I am pleased to follow my colleague the member for Murray-Mallee, who has drawn to the attention of the House many of the problems faced by those of us who represent large country districts. Our constituents are being disadvantaged daily by the dual actions of two socialist Governments. The people of South Australia have, unfortunately, had to put up with a Labor Government in this State for 14 of the past 17 years, yet the weak excuse is trotted out that few of the problems facing the people of this State ought to be sheeted back to the Minister. Yet members opposite have had control of this State. Unfortunately, in the past few years, they have been in tandem with their colleagues in Canberra. What a scenario! What a great situation faces the people of this State.

We have just witnessed a Federal election campaign and, on the first day after the election, the Labor Government said that it stole all the Liberal Party policies. There was a State election where people were incited to believe that those dreadful Liberals would privatise businesses and that they would tear the shirts off people's backs. What has happened? The Premier now tells us that he will privatise or commercialise the Queen Victoria Hospital. He has implemented staff ceilings even though, as I understand it, the large departments employ a great number of temporary people. It would be interesting to discover how many temporary people are being put on the books. In an attempt to divert the attention of the public from the real issues facing the people of this State, a fear campaign was conducted.

It is about time that this Government faced some reality and showed a bit of courtesy. The member for Goyder drew attention to the number of Ministers who visited his electorate without showing the normal courtesies. In my experience, the Minister of Agriculture is the worst offender. He just goes to the electorate, even when Parliament is sitting, and does not have the courtesy to advise the local member that he is visiting on an official basis. If the Minister wants to play it that way, he will be treated accordingly. He appears to want to rough us up.

Unfortunately, the Minister is a slow learner. Most legislation that he has introduced to Parliament has had a rather rough passage in the other place. He now has two Bills before the House, both of which, I can tell him now, are in for a rough time, because he is not prepared to sit down and consult and use a bit of commonsense. If that is how he wants to conduct matters, I am very happy to accommodate him, because Parliament is a great leveller of arrogant Ministers and that is why we have two Houses of Parliament. It really levels arrogant people and it should bring them back to reality. In this case it appears that it will take a slightly longer time. I am quite sure that the Minister is wasting time in Cabinet and that a number of submissions are being rejected. As a result, I am quite sure also that the Premier will take him aside for counselling and will try to bring him back to reality.

No matter how arrogant a Government is, one of the great hallmarks of a democratic society is that the Government has to accept the will of Parliament. By the time that Parliament has finished educating the Minister this session, perhaps he will be a little more realistic and he will have a better understanding of what is known as the popular will of the people, because that is what has to be faced in Parliament.

There are a number of matters that are of concern to my electorate. Basically, it is a mining and agricultural electorate—those industries which laid the foundations for and built this nation will continue to build it if they are given a fair and reasonable go. They will not be able to survive if they are burdened with unnecessary taxes or charges, or if they have foolish conditions imposed on them. Like the electorate of the member for Murray-Mallee, my electorate has suffered greatly because of the actions of the Native Vegetation Authority. There has been a great deal of publicity and fanfare as to how this organisation will operate, but in my view it is a quite undemocratic organisation and Parliament should be careful when it sets up these statutory organisations that they not put into effect the normal rules that could apply in courts. These organisations treat people who go before them with discourtesy and arrogance. Members of the legal profession have expressed concern to me in this regard.

Recently, a constituent of mine went before the authority. I made a written submission on his behalf and the authority treated it as a joke. If that is how it wants to treat matters, the time has arrived when Parliament should start dealing with people. I look forward to the next occasion on which I appear before that authority, because it is outrageous and disgraceful that it should treat good hardworking and loyal South Australian citizens, who are only trying to maintain their viability, in such a highhanded manner. I do not believe that these people should be treated in such a cavalier fashion.

It has been brought to my attention that some of the authority's decisions have not contained one ounce of commonsense and it is about time that the Minister, who unfortunately does not know, does not understand or does not care, took some firm action in relation to these people. The problem is that the authority comprises two rural people who have an understanding of the situation; two people who represent the conservation groups in this community, and some of their comments have been quite unrealistic and outrageous, and a Chairman who does not know whether or not he should fall off the barbed wire fence. I am absolutely sick and tired of the situation in relation to my constituents.

Today I spoke to another of my constituents about a further problem. What is happening is ridiculous. It appears that credence is given to what officers of the Department of Environment and Planning have to say, and I believe that that is wrong. All evidence should be judged equally. Conciliators have now been appointed. I thought that that was to be an effective method of solving these disputes. However, three of my constituents have vigorously complained about that scheme.

So, I am far from satisfied with what has taken place. I call on the Minister to ensure that that organisation will operate effectively; otherwise, he may as well get rid of the whole thing, because it is a waste of people's time appearing before it. If the organisation continues as it is, this Parliament should carry a motion of no-confidence in its administration.

The second matter that concerns me is that the farming community, because of the nature of its operations, must tow machinery such as field bins across and up and down dirt and bitumen roads. Unfortunately, certain Government officials have taken it on themselves to enforce the law in an unrealistic and harsh manner. I suggest to those who are responsible for administering these laws that they should look closely at some of their decisions. It would be unfortunate if some of the individuals who enforce these laws had their names read out in this House, but it is getting



very close to that. People are being told that, if they tow field bins across a road, they must have safety chains attached, even though the bins are not made with such chains. This is a ludicrous and ridiculous suggestion. These people who drive up and down in white motor vehicles should realise that commonsense must prevail. If it does not, people are entitled to representation by the Parliamentarians whom they elect.

*The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** Yes, all that sort of nonsense. One constituent complained to me that after towing an electric welder he was summonsed to appear in court. Another person was told that he must not cross the road at night with his air seeder or he would be fined and that he had to have a vehicle each side of the road with two-way radios and flashing lights. These farmers are trying to make a living in marginal agricultural country. Another of my constituents was told that, if he towed his air seeder, he had to have safety chains attached. However, if one does not have a large rubber clamp it is probably not possible to do it. The Minister should have discussions with his officers about these matters. Within a couple of days I will have documents about these matters in my possession, and I will have no hesitation in asking questions of the Minister, who will have his senior officers assisting him during the Estimates Committees. I will also read these documents. Commonsense should prevail in these matters. It should not be necessary for members of Parliament to stand in this place and complain.

I am concerned about what will happen at harvest time on Upper Eyre Peninsula. The way in which some of these officers are carrying on is crazy, and action will be taken at a parliamentary level if commonsense does not prevail. If people drive vehicles and the brakes are not working they deserve to have the full force of the law brought down on them. However, in relation to minor matters such as indicator lights not working, people should be given a warning and told to get it fixed within a week.

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

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** Service under this Government is on the skids. Caring has gone out the window, and transport is probably the best example of that, as we have seen during the past few days. We have seen the STA debacles, involving the increase in fares, the taking of seats out of the back of buses so that more people can stand up, and other matters. Yesterday, it was the Motor Registration Division. Let us look at one of the most ridiculous situations that has occurred in this State for a long time. Yesterday, I received a telephone call from a very concerned professional driving instructor who lives in the Gawler district and who was informed by the Motor Registration Division officials that the office at Nuriootpa would definitely close on 28 August.

However, he was assured that testing for motor vehicle licences would continue locally. Today he was informed that this decision had been reversed. Within 24 hours that decision had been stood on its head. Licence testing, which until now has been conducted in the Barossa Valley and Gawler districts, will now be conducted at Elizabeth. What an amazingly stupid decision. Why should the people of Gawler and the Barossa Valley travel a further 15 to 40 kilometres to obtain their licence? City folks certainly do not have to do that. With the suggestion today that the Tranmere depot might be closed, who jumped up and made a song and dance about that? It was one of the members opposite, but they do not care about the people in the country at all.

The Government is fully conditioned towards providing services in the city. Why should country people be penalised? The reason given for this ill-conceived decision is that apparently the new budget of the Motor Registration Division has been reduced so drastically that no money is left to allow licence testing officers to travel to the areas referred to. Just over three weeks ago the Government increased motor registration fees by 16 per cent. That will bring in an extra \$10 million, which will go directly to the Motor Registration Division, yet the Government maintains that it does not have any money left. That is absolute nonsense. Also, the Government talks about the \$200 million that will be cut from Federal allocations—what a lot of nonsense that is, too. To make this matter even worse, I have been informed that three officers live in the Barossa Valley district. They will have to travel to Elizabeth every day, so how much money will really be saved? These people who normally do the test actually live in the Barossa Valley. Other important issues are involved as well. The driving instructor to whom I referred made the following comment in a letter to me:

I have been running a successful driving school in the Gawler area for the past 10 years. My business caters for learners in cars, trucks, semitrailers and buses. The changes in the testing arena will greatly affect my business, as learners will not be prepared to pay the travelling cost to Elizabeth. In most cases the extra travelling time would amount to 45 to 60 minutes, costing the consumer \$25 for a car or \$35 extra for a semitrailer.

The Government is always talking about small business, but what does it do? It implements things that will put small business out of the arena. Let us consider how much this extra cost will be for the average country person in the Gawler and Barossa area who wishes to sit for the test. Invariably, the test vehicle is owned by the instructor—and let us think about that. Most of the younger people who go down for the test do not have their own car; they will have to use the instructor's car, which will be tied up for at least an extra hour in travelling time. This will cost each person an extra \$25 to get their licence. A person who happens to be learning in a semitrailer, perhaps with a view to doing some constructive work in order to get off the dole, will have to pay an extra \$35.

**Mr Gunn:** Out of the unemployment benefit.

**Mr INGERSON:** As the honourable member says, out of the unemployment benefit. It is even worse if one considers the semitrailer driver. The current cost for the test is \$77. That is made up of \$24 for the test and \$53 for the hire vehicle. Now, because of this stupid decision, it will cost \$112. A young person going for his semitrailer licence will have to fork out \$112 just because he happens to live in the Barossa Valley. Imagine the extra burden of cost in relation to a person living past Nuriootpa: instead of costing \$35 extra it could cost \$70 extra for a person to get a licence and become productive.

It would appear that the Bannon Government could not care less, and here is an example of that. Why should the Government worry about a few disadvantaged country people? This amounts to simply another mistake in the seemingly endless series of mistakes that have been made by the Minister of Transport. What an appalling record of bungling. Let me remind Parliament of just a few instances that have occurred in the past few weeks.

The Minister of Transport said recently that drivers licence fees would rise by 10 per cent, and I emphasise that. In fact, the increase was 16 per cent—not 10 per cent. The Minister called it 'rounding up': I call it the great con. Who backed down on the unions when Cabinet, Parliament and our State wanted a show of strength—the Minister of Transport. It is the same Minister who did not care about the

public and who increased bus, tram and train fares by an outrageous 25 per cent. The House should bear in mind that this increase is over four times Mr Keating's CPI increase of 6 per cent. Can members believe that this is the same Minister who said at the last election that increases in transport fares would not exceed the CPI? Here we have a Minister of Transport who is having a little fiddle with the truth. Finally, this is the same Minister who has presided over the biggest cash shortfall that the STA has ever known. I return now to the important issue of licence testing in the Barossa Valley and Gawler areas. Why cannot the testing be conducted at local police stations, as it has been done in the past?

All we need to have is a room in a police station. We have three resident officers who can do the test in the Barossa Valley. Surely, the public can go and arrange for a test in their local police station and sit down and have it done. Why can that not be done now? The bureaucracy has decided to move the test to Elizabeth. Let us scrap that and get back to a position of common sense. The cost would be negligible because there is no cost to the Government to hire a room on which it is already paying rent. Sure, it is the Government's responsibility to contain costs in the Motor Registration Division, but let us not be too stupid about specific decisions. The Government ought to think before it acts. It should not penalise the young. Let us look at the position of the young and the unemployed who will now have to pay out at least \$25 more per hour to hire a vehicle just to get their licence. As I said, if one is learning to become a productive operator of a semitrailer in the community it will cost at least \$70 more an hour.

One area about which I have not talked involves elderly people and this Government, as it has shown today, does not care about the elderly. As the House would know, elderly people in any country town are quite capable of passing any drivers test for the aged, but they do have difficulty if they have to go out of the area that they commonly know. Yet here we have a Government saying to people in Tanunda and Nuriootpa who have to do the age test that they must drive through the main street of Gawler and drive down to Elizabeth to pass the test there. Some of the people I am talking about have not left the Barossa Valley for 25 years, yet here we have the Government saying that it will send these old people down to Elizabeth to do their test. It is absolute nonsense and it is certainly something that the Government should be doing something about.

As was said today, are we going to close the Kadina agency? Are we going to close the agency at Port Augusta? I have been advised that Port Augusta has the lowest rate of transactions per day—156. Why did the Government not close Port Augusta when it closed Nuriootpa? Is it because the Minister lives there? What about Kadina, which has fewer transactions per day than Nuriootpa. Why did the Government not close Kadina? Why has it not done something about Port Lincoln, which has only 20 more transactions? Why has the Government singled out Nuriootpa, where there is a significant number of elderly people in the area? Why has that been done? Any small business that had over 200 customers a day would be happy to stay open. This is the Government which in 1975, with the Hon. Mr Virgo as Minister, said that the best thing it could do was to extend this whole operation through country areas.

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

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** The decision of the Government to withdraw country payroll tax rebates has

the potential of costing Riverland people \$1.5 million. That will be finally determined by the amount that industries within the Riverland are able to get back from the proposed new scheme that the Government is advancing, but it will certainly be nothing like \$1.5 million. That is a direct loss to the people of that community. Certainly, \$1 million of that \$1.5 million is paid back to cooperatives in the area and, as members all know, growers receive only what is left after the running costs of the cooperatives have been settled.

So, we have potentially \$1 million from the cooperatives that will not flow into the pockets of the growers, and thus back into the community generally. This is at a time when the Federal Government has applied a 20 per cent tax on wine and a 10 per cent tax on citrus, and both of those industries now are in dire straits. This, on top of it, will be devastating for that area. I refer now, to a news item from the *Advertiser* of Thursday 23 July 1987, which states:

The Riverland's largest fruit processor says the abolition of the country payroll tax rebate scheme will cost it about \$250 000. The chief executive of Berrivale Orchards, Mr Peter Wood, said yesterday the South Australian Government's decision could not have come at a worse time for the citrus industry. It was still reeling from the effects of sales tax on fruit juices and fruit juice drinks imposed in August—

referring to the last August budget. Certainly the industry is reeling from that impost, which has cost the citrus industry something like \$33 million; \$33 million taken out of the industry that can no longer flow back to the growers. What they are now receiving per tonne of oranges in many instances is way below the cost of production, because the Federal Government has taken half the potential return to the growers.

Now we have the State Government stepping in and removing the payroll tax rebate which effectively extracts from that area and from the people a further \$1.5 million. It is about time that the Government really woke up and had a look at itself and conscientiously looked at what it is doing to the people of South Australia, particularly the country people. There is no way on earth that industries can continue to survive or people can have a reasonable standard of living with the tax burden that is being put on them by both State and Federal Labor Governments.

Recently I had the opportunity to travel through the Pitjantjatjara lands and we visited Indulkana, Ernabella and Amata. In so doing, we had the opportunity to talk with the police aids who are being trained by officers of the Police Department to carry out the role of assistant police officers at those various centres. I must say that the aids are doing a remarkably good job. The risk is that the Government has stated that, after the end of this year, it will be withdrawing the police officers from these centres. If that occurs, the whole training program will collapse in a big heap.

The Aboriginal police aids with whom we had discussions are keen on the work they are doing, but they certainly want the backup and support of the Police Department. If the police officers are withdrawn to Marla and do not have an effective presence on the various centres such as Ernabella, Indulkana and Amata, there is no way that that system that has been put into effect by the Government will survive. Every police aid with whom we spoke urged us to do everything we could to convince the Government to allow the police officers to stay with them and support them in their work. I believe that ought to be done and it will be a disaster if they are withdrawn.

I was delighted to see that the police aids are magnificently presented in their uniforms every morning. The police station, the office from which they operate, is immaculate and it is a pleasure to see the training program proceeding.

As they explained to me and the group travelling with me, if those officers are withdrawn, there will be a collapse of the system.

*Ms Gayler interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Chaffey has the floor.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** I support police aids doing that work and they certainly want the support of senior police officers to assist them in that capacity. It is a matter of understanding the tribal situation that exists within Aboriginal communities and how difficult it would be for police aids to maintain that position without the backup of police officers. One must really make a study of the matter to appreciate the problems that confront police aids. They are keen to continue with their work but they know in their own mind that, if support from the Police Department is removed, the likelihood of their being able to carry out their duties effectively will diminish greatly, and I am sure that that would be the case. They have urged us strongly to do all that we can to see that that assistance and backup remains. I hope to goodness that, for the sake of a few police officers across the Pitjantjatjara lands, the Government will see fit to maintain those police officers on those lands.

Since my last visit to the area, I have noticed a definite improvement. Petrol sniffing and other related problems have diminished and, if police presence is withdrawn, there could be a return to some of the problems that existed previously, and that would be a tragedy. I commend the Government for the decision that it has taken in endeavouring to establish the police aid scheme throughout the lands. As I said, it would be an absolute tragedy if it were to walk away from it at this time.

The other matter that I mention concerns the reduction of police presence in country towns at night. I have received a copy of a letter sent by a constituent of mine in Renmark to the Commissioner of Police. The letter possibly could more appropriately have been sent to the Minister, because he controls police numbers. In this instance my constituent forwarded the letter to the Police Commissioner, although I recognise that the Commissioner only has the number of officers that the Government allocates to his department. The letter reads:

I have conducted a small business in Renmark for 12 years and during that time our premises has been broken into on three occasions. We fitted an audible alarm system with microwave detector and window tapes in 1978. At 4.00 a.m. on Monday 3 August, I was telephoned by the local milkman who had heard our alarm ringing, and noticed that my front window had been smashed. The alarm was loud enough to hear whilst he was driving past. The Renmark Police Station is opposite my shop, less than 200 metres away. I understand that several officers reside at the headquarters on Ral Ral Avenue. I have no complaint against those officers, or any local police officers.

However, the fact that our police station is unmanned throughout most of the night/morning, is ludicrous. Opposite the Renmark station will soon be a total of 40 to 50 small businesses, all within the one block and all within earshot. Recently, other premises along Ral Ral Avenue were burgled, namely Clark's Liquorland, Rosenthal Motors and Webb's Electrical. Two weeks ago, one of my senior assistants had her husband's vehicle vandalised, whilst it was parked immediately outside the Renmark Police Station at midnight. It is understood his vehicle was mistaken for that of a police officer.

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

**Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria):** Although I appreciate the monthly financial statements on Consolidated Account that we in this place receive regularly, I find that it is becoming increasingly difficult to assess the financial position of the State from those statements. It is interesting to note that

we will not find out the true financial position of the State as at 30 June until the budget is brought down and the Auditor-General's Report is received in a couple of weeks time. The figures for the 12 months to April, if extrapolated, would show a deficit of \$10 million, but the May figures showed a completely different picture: a deficit of \$70 million.

The only item which was performing better than the estimate was the royalties from minerals. In any State budget \$70 million can be a severe shortfall. The excess in payments over receipts until the end of May was more than \$127 million, but of course the capital return from SAFA (South Australian Financing Authority), although not shown, revealed a deficit of \$134 million.

As the Leader said earlier in the day, it is becoming increasingly difficult to find out anything that is going with SAFA, it is becoming increasingly difficult to find out whether SAFA is going to cough up the money to help balance the budget or how much it is liable to cough up, because very little has been divulged during the year. I know that the Leader is going to pursue the matter vigorously in the Estimates Committees to find out what is going on with the moneys that come into this State budget from SAFA.

We understand that the nation, and this State, are facing very severe financial difficulties and all of us, including the Government, will have to cut our budgets quite stringently and make some very strong economic decisions. However, the Federal ALP seems to have taken more of a leaf out of the Liberal Party's privatisation book that was so cynically criticised before the last State election. We have members of the PSA saying that we were going to tear the shirts off people's backs, and all that rubbish. If the policies that were espoused at the last State election had been implemented two to three years ago, when we said they should have been, the financial situation in this State would be much better today. In fact, the problem is that the people in Government have a great amount of difficulty in facing the financial realities of the world, and that situation will continue while members of Government and Ministers are diametrically opposed to the policies that would improve the financial situation of this State.

I would like to pursue the question that was asked by the Leader earlier this week, when he addressed his question to the Premier on the attitude to privatisation of the Minister of Labour. He said:

Does the Premier support the attitude of the Minister of Labour or the attitude of the Prime Minister?

It was interesting to hear the Premier's reply. He said:

I have not seen any official statement by Mr Hawke on behalf of his Government, although I have read media speculation and a comment by Mr Hawke that he was pleased to see this debate proceeding.

He goes on:

But we have just had the benefit of the Minister explaining his views to us very coherently and sensibly. If one reads in full the speech made by the Hon. Frank Blevins one will see that it expresses the views of this Government on this issue.

When we look back at what the Minister of Labour really believes we will find that it will be impossible to get the economic situation of this State under control because, in his maiden speech, he said:

I am a dedicated socialist, who takes every opportunity to promote the principles and ideals of democratic socialism.

He then went on to say:

The sooner capitalism is relegated to the history books the better off mankind will be.

How can any Government face the economic realities when members in that Government are dragging this State down

to that level? It is absolutely impossible. That speech was made 12 years ago, and the Minister of Labour has not altered his opinions one iota during that time, although the present Prime Minister has faced the realities of life, he is introducing all these policies on privatisation, and Mr Keating is introducing policies on privatisation. It is too late, but better late than never. However, the Minister of Labour will never introduce anything that may lower taxes in this State or that may make us more competitive with other States.

However, it was also interesting to note what happened when this dedicated socialist recently went to the Public Service Association. He said that he wanted to extend the Government's ownership of natural resources—a direction that the rest of the world has abandoned quite rapidly. In fact, Australia is even lagging behind the rest of the world in relation to privatisation. However, the Minister of Labour and many of his cohorts opposite are still trying to drag down this country by not facing the economic reality of what is going on. Until we can find some politicians who are prepared to face that economic reality, I think that this nation and this State cannot move forward.

We do have some things going for us in this State, but unless we can exploit them South Australia will not go ahead and we will continue to lose our way. South Australia was once a leading State in relation to growth rate, expansion, its low taxes and its low costs. However, today, unfortunately, we are no longer in that advantageous position. We all know that South Australia has experienced the lowest increase in retail sales growth compared with the rest of Australia; we all know that new motor vehicle registrations in this State are the second lowest compared with the rest of Australia; and we all know that bankruptcies in this State are the highest compared with the rest of Australia. During this debate—

**The Hon. P.B. Arnold:** Not a bad track record!

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** No, not a bad track record. During this debate many other areas have been very adequately covered by other members on this side of the House. The problems that we face are dramatic and they require dramatic action. If we do not do that, it will be impossible for us to lift ourselves out of the gutter. It is very interesting to sit here and listen to the drivel from Government members who talk up this State day after day, week after week. They say what a fantastic position we are in, but they do not face reality or look at the figures, which speak for themselves. One thing is absolutely clear: if the Government continues to follow the political beliefs of the Minister of Labour, this State will never recover from its economic ills and it will never get back to where it should be, to the position we enjoyed in the past. That is just one of the diseases in this State with which I wanted to deal.

In the minute left to me I will deal very briefly with another staggering cost blowout in this State, and that is the cost blowout of the ASER project. When ASER was first proposed it was supposed to cost \$160 million; the current estimate is that it will cost \$350 million. Whether or not we like it, the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust will bear much of that cost. At the end of the day much of that cost will be borne by the taxpayers of this State. It is about time that this Government realised that that is a typical example of what happens when governments interfere with what should be rightly done by private enterprise.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

## ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology):** I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** I would like to continue the comments I made earlier this evening in relation to the Motor Registration Division. First, I would like to ask a few questions about the real savings. What will we really save by closing the office at Nuriootpa and, perhaps, several other offices in country areas? I seek leave of the House to have a document incorporated in *Hansard*.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Can you assure me that it is purely statistical?

**Mr INGERSON:** Yes, it is.

Leave granted.

Daily average cash rings processed by country agencies of Motor Registration Division—

Port Augusta .....	156
Kadina .....	205
Nuriootpa .....	209
Port Lincoln .....	221
Port Pirie .....	262
Berri .....	278
Murray Bridge .....	306
Mount Gambier .....	466

**Mr INGERSON:** The cash rings are the actual cash transactions which take place in all these country agencies. It makes very interesting reading because, as I said earlier, Port Augusta has 156 transactions a day, and that is the lowest number of transactions per day by 50. Nuriootpa—the first agency to be closed—is third on that list. It is interesting to note the comparison between that and Tranmere, which has 629 transactions per day. It surprises me a little that earlier today an honourable member was so concerned about Tranmere when, obviously, it is such a significantly large division in any case. One of the issues in relation to the closing of these divisions is that those 209 cash transactions mean that 209 people, in essence, are coming into the agency in these country towns every single day. As I said before, any small business in any area which had 209 people going through its front door per day would consider that it had a very significant number of transactions.

For all agencies of the division the salaries and wages cost is \$4.8 million a year and the operating cost \$5 million a year. In the country, in those eight agencies, the total wage bill is \$1 million. Where will the saving occur? We all know that under this Government the four people at Nuriootpa will be redeployed. There will be no saving at all in salaries and wages. The only saving will be the rental and the few desks at Nuriootpa. But we are taking out of a district a very significant service which is required in such an area. Let me come again to the—

*The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:*

**Mr INGERSON:** Perhaps that is a question: why has it not gone from the Minister's area when there are only 156 transactions a day at Port Augusta but 209 a day at Nuriootpa? Let us look again at the major problem in Nuriootpa, namely, the situation relating to aged people. We all know the situation with most aged people in country areas; they know their district, their town and their roads very well as they use only those roads. They go up and down them and go to town to shop. They do not go to Gawler or Elizabeth; they do not drive down the main

highway. They do have the fear or concern involved in having to go down those main roads. Yet here we are asking them, in the test that they have to do once a year when over 70 years of age, to go into an area that they would normally not travel through. We could simply ask the police to put a room aside at the station so that three testing officers could do the test in their area. It does not seem to be a difficult task or request for this Government to take up. What is the true saving? What are we really saving by introducing this measure in country areas?

What will be next? Is it going to be Port Lincoln or Berri? We heard today that Berri will face a cutback in its hospital area and development. Will there also be a cutback in services in relation to motor vehicles? It is interesting to note that only back in 1975 when Mr Virgo was Minister of Transport he considered it necessary to decentralise the Motor Registration Division to country areas.

Another area of concern was referred to in the Estimates Committees last year, namely, the need for the Motor Registration Division to expand its agencies, to ensure that it improved its income through agency money from ETSA, the E&WS Department and other Government departments. What will happen if we cut out all country agencies? Where will the division get the money that it says it needs to run services? More importantly, if the income in the Motor Registration Division goes down, less money will be available for roads. Again the major sufferer in the whole roads area will be the people in country areas.

The other matter to which I will refer briefly is the failure of this Government to come to grips with problems in the sporting area, and in particular I refer to the entertainment centre or a similar complex in which basketball could be played in this city. People are now booking out all matches of the Thirty Sixers 20 minutes after they go on sale and last night many people could not see the international match between Russia and Australia because we do not have a facility in this State that is good enough or big enough to cater for the demand. We have heard promises over the last four years that I have been in this Parliament regarding an entertainment centre or a centre in which sport could be played. We have built a magnificent Convention Centre next door, but it simply caters for 2 500 people. We have the Apollo Stadium catering for just over 3 000 people and beyond that we have nothing.

Upon looking at promises made over the past four years, we see that an entertainment or sporting complex has been promised by this Government on five separate occasions, but nothing has happened. Last night it was interesting to talk to the officials of the Basketball Association of South Australia Inc. and note that they were saying that what we really need is a medium priced sporting stadium to cater for the South Australian public. We do not need a \$60 million complex: what we need is a complex that will cater adequately for a crowd of 6 000 to 10 000 people, a stadium which could simply and easily be built for \$15 million to \$20 million.

**Mr GROOM (Hartley):** One of the benefits of Labor Governments, both State and Federal, is illustrated by a recent Commonwealth Employment Grant to the St Francis parish site on Newton Road, Newton. The local community was informed recently that it would receive a CEP grant of significant proportions—some \$266 000. The local community will contribute \$60 000 to \$70 000 towards the project. The St Francis parish site is a focal point in the community. About nine major cultural events take place annually at this parish site. These are major cultural events attracting 70 000 to 80 000 people annually. Among these

festivals are the following: Our Lady of Montevergine Festival; St. Giorgio Festival; Our Lady Dellarco Festival; Saint Nicola Festival; Saint Rocco Festival; Saint Donato Festival; Saint Giuseppe Festival; and Saint Marco Festival.

This site is very important to the Italian community, as this is one of the largest churches in the Southern Hemisphere, housing an adjacent school and sporting grounds: it is a focal point for the local community. As members would know, the local community in the past three years has seen buildings and structures to the value of \$2 million come to fruition as a result of the skills, time and donations of the local community.

Few communities in South Australia could boast that degree of commitment, or that record. I know that this site is visited by some members opposite, particularly during festivals when they attend as invited guests, and on other occasions. All in all, it has been a magnificent community effort in the past which has been capped off by a CEP grant of significant proportions. Local contribution and commitment is illustrated by the fact that the community will contribute \$60 000 to \$70 000 in addition to the moneys contributed by the State and Federal Governments.

The St Francis group that made the application comprises a group of dedicated people: Mr Di Iulio the project manager; Mr Dewar the Principal of the St Francis School, who was also on the Steering Committee that prepared the application for the grant; Mr Di Fede; Mr Cullen, President of the Parents and Friends Committee; and Mr Prior, who is Chairperson of the school board. All were instrumental in seeing that the application was brought to fruition.

The St Francis site services a number of electorates. Rather than describe the suburbs it serves it is easier to describe the districts that benefit from it. They are: my electorate; the electorate of Todd, which shares a boundary with my electorate at Newton Road; the electorate of Coles; and the electorate of Norwood. Also, it benefits the Federal electorates of Sturt and Makin.

It services a very wide area, and again that is reflected in the number of people who are estimated to use the site annually, which is about 60 000 to 70 000 people, and probably more. The work on the grant will commence some time in October, and it will take until about April to complete. In relation to the employment spin-off benefits, these are quite significant because the area has quite a high rate of unemployment. A total of 18 unemployed people will be employed on the construction that will take place once the project commences in October, and they will be employed over a period of six months.

A number of skilled tradespersons in the area have offered to provide voluntary assistance and training to people who will gain in employment as a consequence of the construction work that is about to take place. Of course, the employment is not limited to only those 18 persons who will be employed for that period of six months. Because of the nature of the site and the significant number of service groups (and I mean that in a commercial sense) that contribute to the site, obviously the number of festivals and the usage of the site will expand. As a consequence, there will be considerable spin-off benefits as far as the local community is concerned.

In relation to new facilities, the work to be undertaken on the site includes the construction of a new adventure playground (and this is in addition to the buildings and structures that are already there). At the back is a large soccer ground which is the site of many community events not only in relation to festivals, but also in relation to other events which occur on a regular basis. Further new facilities to be erected include new terraces and a pergola, paved

terraces, metal verandahs, storage sheds, benches and plant box type seating. Also, an oval irrigation system will be installed, which means that there will be further benefits to the local community, because obviously the oval area will be well maintained. There will also be landscaping in terms of native trees and shrubs.

The site is used not only by the St Francis Church group and the St Francis school but also by a wide number of community groups, which include the St Vincent de Paul Society, Alcoholics Anonymous, the Newton Social Group, a family planning group, and the Italian ethnic schools group. It is used for the skills training program, for evening classes and for ceremonial occasions, as well as by other community organisations and groups that I have not mentioned. It is, therefore, a well used site. The application contained a 75 per cent labour content and, quite clearly, it achieved the criteria on its merits. It is an enormous boost to the surrounding districts. It crosses political boundaries. All Federal and State members of Parliament who serve that area support the CEP grant, including the members for Sturt and Makin. The local community harnesses all the talents that are available.

**Mr S.J. Baker:** Politicians?

**Mr GROOM:** Quite. The politicians worked together in so far as this application was concerned. One important aspect in relation to this local community is that it traverses political boundaries. All members of Parliament in those surrounding districts, be they Federal or State members of Parliament, supported this application. Anybody who has been there recognises the value of that site not only to the local community but also to the whole of South Australia because of the nature of activities such as festivals and cultural events that take place there. It was a well deserved grant and one that received the support of the State and Federal Governments. It is an enormous boost to our local community. All the members of Parliament who serve the area are very pleased by the grant, and it is quite a clear example of the benefits of Federal and State Labor Governments working in cooperation for the benefit of the local community.

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** I will use this opportunity to rebut some of the ridiculous statements and claims that were made yesterday by you, Mr Deputy Speaker, when you asked the Minister of Housing a question in relation to negative gearing, to which the Minister responded. I still have not worked out whether or not it was a Dorothy Dix. It is ironic that someone should pick up a press release in relation to my comments regarding the housing industry and calling on the Government, particularly the Premier, to state where he stands on negative gearing that was printed in only one (and I believe it was only one) or possibly two editions of the *News*. I still issue a challenge to the Premier and his Government to state publicly where they stand in relation to the restoration of negative gearing.

If I take it that the Minister's reply is on behalf of the Government, then the Government would stand condemned for not encouraging the private housing sector. It is ironic that the Premiers of New South Wales and Western Australia have both called on the Prime Minister to reintroduce negative gearing. During the Federal election the Prime Minister finally agreed that he would look at negative gearing, but we have not heard one word. Not one word has been printed anywhere in relation to what the Federal Government is doing about the possible reintroduction of negative gearing.

We certainly have not heard one word about what the Premier of South Australia has to say about it. Anyone who

has studied the housing industry and who is concerned about the provision of affordable housing in South Australia would realise that, apart from the role of the South Australian Housing Trust (which is Government housing), one must have a competing healthy private sector, and that to do that one needs to have some incentive for investment. The loss of negative gearing hit the new housing industry because investors departed as quickly as they came.

It is ironic that you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and the Minister are critical of negative gearing and are calling it a rort when a person who wants to speculate on the share market can negative gear those investments. I should have thought that gambling on the stock exchange was just one of the many ways of gambling that was allowed in this country, particularly in this State. I would have thought, too, that investment in the new housing industry was doing something constructive. It is creating an opportunity for people to rent accommodation that they need in an area in which they would like to reside. The Minister said that negative gearing had been, and indeed was still being, used as a rort, despite the fact that the Federal Treasurer quarantined it in June 1985.

A month after it was abolished one could not say that there had been an impact. One needs at least 12 months to prove statistically that there has been a downturn in the housing industry. We can prove that easily in this State because of figures that have come through from the private sector. We can prove that nationally the Hawke promises in relation to housing have not been honoured. The ALP's housing programs for November 1982 stated:

Labor will lift home building activity to 135 000 starts in its first year, 145 000 in the second year and 160 000 in third and subsequent years... Labor is opposed to deregulation of the financial system.

That promise was broken because we now have foreign banks operating all over the place. Further:

An ALP Government will set up a Department of Housing and Urban and Regional Affairs... An ALP Government will expand and upgrade the supply of public housing, with a goal of doubling, over 10 years, the proportion of total dwelling stock held in a variety of public tenures through State and local initiatives.

In an article entitled 'Housing under Hawke: promise and performance', Chris Paris, who writes for the *Journal of Australian Political Economy*, summed up the Hawke Federal Government situation in relation to housing. I think it is fair to say that this comes to the crux of the problem, namely, the Federal Government's attitude, which affects the State. He states:

Judged on the basis of its own promises and claims of achievements, the housing record of the Hawke Labor Government is not as impressive as its advocates have claimed.

How is that arrived at? I shall refer to several extracts from the report which state clearly what has happened under the Federal Government and describe the impact that that has had on the South Australian Government. First, it states:

A review of homelessness and inadequate housing had been promised before the 1984 election. This was published in August 1985 and indicated massive unmet need and a substantial problem of homelessness (Coopers and Lybrand W.D. Scott, 1985). Other studies have argued that there was a growth in the private rental sector for low income tenants (Paris, 1984, 1985). The rapid growth in housing commencements in 1983-84 has not been sustained and high interest rates have slowed down home purchase.

New Commonwealth tax measures could lead to lower levels of investment in the private rental sector: the combination of the abolition of tax deductibility for negatively geared rental investments and the foreshadowed capital gains tax inspired a press release from the Real Estate Institute of Australia announcing that 'the housing-led recovery is over'.

That was a correct prediction—but, of course, it was not accepted by this Government. It was not accepted by the Minister of Housing and Construction in South Australia,

who is desperately trying to argue that we do not need negative gearing—and so we get a plethora of falsehoods in the statement that was made by the Minister; and then, of course, we get the stupid rhetoric that he often goes on with, involving stories, jokes, and so forth, which typify the type of politician he is: quick on his feet but very slow in doing anything else. Paris also notes in his report:

No new investments made after 17 July 1985 have been able to take advantage of negative gearing (though a modest depreciation allowance was introduced for newly constructed dwellings).

In his conclusion, Paris then states:

In addition, the Government's new tax measures are likely to have adverse effects on the supply of rental housing.

I would say that Paris would not be a conservative. I would not think that, writing in the *Journal of Australian Political Economy*, he would be a member of the Liberal Party, nor do I think that he would favour my side of politics. However, I think he has given a wonderful run down, a good break down and critique, of the achievements of the Hawke Government's policy on housing. It backs up to some degree exactly what I have been saying and what the housing industry, the Real Estate Institute and the investment advisers have been saying for quite some time, namely, that negative gearing and high interest rates and capital gains

tax are the three factors that are impeding progress, development and any chance of recovery in the housing industry.

As you know, Mr Deputy Speaker, every \$1 million spent in new housing creates 63 new jobs. Of course, in South Australia we have seen \$284 million lost in the housing and construction industry in the past two years. That is a \$284 million downturn—and not a word printed anywhere within the media. Some 18 000 job opportunities have been lost in two years, and not a word has been said by this Government as to what has happened. But, of course, one can imagine what would be going on if a Liberal Government were in power. I think that the Government has been covering up the situation. I believe that the Bannon Government has been deliberately falsifying the records and smoothing over and protecting the situation that has really occurred within the housing industry. It has been a huge sham in order to prove what everyone said: that by abolishing negative gearing and by encouraging high interest rates an industry that could create the employment that we need would be killed.

Motion carried.

At 9.5 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 20 August at 11 a.m.