

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 9 March 1989

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.P. Trainer)** took the Chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

ASH WEDNESDAY BUSHFIRES

The **Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen)**: I move:

That this House, recognising the plight of the residents of the Stirling District Council area who could face an unacceptable and unfair financial burden and the loss of essential community services, calls on the Government, as a matter of urgency, to accept its responsibility in meeting the relevant liability arising out of the 1980 Ash Wednesday judgment recently handed down.

Many members in this House will be aware of the situation with respect to the first Ash Wednesday fire that occurred nine years two months and one day ago in January 1980. At that time a devastating fire swept through a section of the Stirling District Council bringing significant losses and causing much misery. I will briefly describe the circumstances that led up to the current situation and then seek leave to continue my remarks later; then I will proceed with more up to date matters. First, I will refer to some of the issues that we recognised back in 1980.

In 1980, the Stirling District Council had public risk insurance of \$1 million. Recently there has been some criticism of that council because it did not have a greater public risk insurance policy. Most of us would agree that nine years ago \$1 million was considered a fairly substantial amount, and certainly many other council representatives have told me that they could have been in a similar situation if the same calamity had occurred within their council boundaries because at that stage there was not a great recognition of the need to have a more significant public risk insurance policy. Since that time we have seen a very lengthy and costly exercise.

There were suggestions soon after the fire, and again in more recent times, that the whole issue was far too big for the Stirling council and that the councillors should bow out and hand over the total responsibility to the State Government. The councillors at the time and those appointed since then have determined that that should not be the case, that they should fight the case on behalf of their constituents and the ratepayers that they represent. Since 1980 the litigation costs have been considerable and even today that cost continues to rise. It is mainly because of the litigation costs (and admittedly there were some costs for works to be carried out) that the ratepayers in the Stirling District Council faced a rate increase of about 21.8 per cent over the past 12 months. Of course, much has been said about that already. A number of questions have been asked in this House and a number of statements have been made in this place regarding that increase and its ramifications, so I do not intend to spend a lot of time going into the specific details that relate to that increase.

Suffice to say that considerable difficulties have resulted from that rate increase. One difficulty involved a situation where the community was set against the council—that was certainly the case. It is fair enough to say that a large proportion of the ratepayers became very angry, for one reason or another, at the way the council carried out its responsibilities. Some members of the council now recognise that one of the council's major problems was the lack of appropriate public relations. It is all very well in hindsight to look back, but I think that most people would appreciate that, if the council had gone to the community at a very

early stage and explained the difficult situation that it faced and asked for its advice on what should happen, we would have seen a different situation from the one we are experiencing today.

Since the fire there has been some sympathy for the claims of ratepayers, particularly those recognised by the community as being genuine. There is not the same degree of sympathy for other people who have made claims. In fact, to some extent part of the community has been set against other members of the community, and that is a sad situation.

Another difficulty is that many people believe that the Stirling District Council area is rather affluent. People could be excused for believing that if they have driven into certain sections of that area because it contains some magnificent and very expensive properties. However, at the same time there are people who live in the area who cannot afford this incredible increase in their rates.

Many people have become concerned and angry about the increase in rates. In fact, 1 000 people crammed into the Aldgate Memorial Hall—and many people stood outside—to consider the problems which have arisen from this increase. That meeting saw the birth of the Stirling Ratepayers' Association. Regrettably, in the initial stages, that association advised its members, and ratepayers generally, not to pay their rates. It is fair to say that the association thought this was a genuine way of making the council recognise what it was trying to put before it and the people. I am pleased that recently the association has joined with the council in urging people to pay their rates. However, a large number of people have still not paid their rates, and I suggest that some of those people cannot afford to.

Since I first came into this House I have had the opportunity to represent a wide cross-section of people. I have had the responsibility of representing part of the area which is now the responsibility of the member for Murray-Mallee—Murray Bridge—and I have been fortunate enough to always represent the Mount Barker District Council area. In Murray Bridge and Mount Barker it has always been recognised that there are specific social problems. Both towns have a large population receiving social benefits of one kind or another.

Since I have taken up the responsibility for the Stirling council area, I have seen as many problems in that area that have caused me concern as I saw in both the Murray Bridge and Mount Barker areas. Many people just cannot afford to pay that type of rate increase with which they are faced. As a result of that situation, there has been a considerable amount of fear in the community. Many unfounded rumours have seen the light of day when people have suggested that, if the Government did not take action to assist these people, some ratepayers would be forced to sell their houses in order to pay their rates. An article in the media even suggested that the council would be forced to sell a person's property if that person was not able to pay the rates. Of course, such rumours have engendered a lot of fear and concern in the community, particularly amongst elderly people and young families.

The question has also been raised as to just how many assets the council would have to sell if it were forced to pay the bulk of this quite considerable bill. The Stirling council has its own peculiar problems. The council has the highest rainfall in the State. The terrain is such that road construction, maintenance and other areas require special consideration. Generally, there is a very high community cost, which has to be taken into account when rates are set. Concerns have been expressed that the council might have to sell off its assets which are heavily patronised, such as

ovals, halls, etc. Such suggestions have caused considerable concern to the ratepayers.

That is part of the background. I think it is important that we now look at the position of the Government. Prior to the judgment that was handed down on 3 November, it was quite obvious that the Government was prepared to wait and see what would happen and I think that that was fair enough. The majority of ratepayers were prepared to await the outcome of the judgment and then consider what specific action would have to be taken. The Government made statements about its responsibility in this matter. In fact, on the day that the judgment was handed down (3 November) I asked a question of the Premier who replied:

The implications of the judgment and the costs that would be levied on the council and its ratepayers are great, and it is something that has caused the Government, as an observer of that situation, considerable concern. I cannot say at this stage what action the Government would take in relation to its own instrumentalities . . .

Over a period of time a number of questions have been asked about what action the Government proposed to take in regard to its own instrumentalities and the costs that have been incurred by those instrumentalities on the people of Stirling. The Premier continued:

. . . but certainly, insofar as the ratepayers of Stirling are concerned, the Government has offered at various stages to provide advice to the council to assist it through such a crisis if it eventuated. We are not accepting financial responsibility, nor would it be appropriate to do so in the circumstances.

That set the pattern. Since that time both the Premier and the Minister of Local Government have continued to indicate that they would not be prepared to provide funding.

The judgment found that the council was negligent. Since that time the Minister has spoken about the need for local government independence. On a number of occasions she indicated that, if councils had a financial problem, they should not have to run to the State Government.

I cannot see the difference between a situation where the State Government can run cap in hand to the Federal Government when it needs assistance—as was the case after the 1983 Ash Wednesday bushfires when, as a result of the damage caused to the Woods and Forests Department properties in the South-East of the State, it successfully gained \$11 million from the Federal Government—and the situation facing the Stirling council, which has approached the State Government and asked for financial assistance.

The Minister and the Premier have talked about not wanting to set a precedent. The precedent was set in principle in Salisbury in 1977—and there have been other examples—when a number of houses were badly damaged as a result of flooding. Within two days the then Deputy Premier made an announcement through the media that the Government would be prepared to stand the cost for the damage that was caused to those places. The only difference that I can see—admittedly, there is a financial difference—is that that was a Labor Government relating to a Labor electorate. Now we have a Labor Government facing a situation involving a Liberal electorate. Certainly, that is the feeling of the majority of people in my electorate.

In addition, Stirling residents have been angered by the special payments made by the Government in respect of the legal costs associated with the case involving Dr Cornwall. The Government has also made money available for costs of sporting and cultural activities and so on. Therefore, it is understandable that my constituents should be concerned.

In November the Minister handed down a long-awaited package. The key features included financial responsibility for the damages payment being shared between the Stirling council and the wider community; Stirling ratepayers not

being required to pay any rate increases beyond the 1988-89 level to fund their portion of the burden; and a series of Government initiatives designed to facilitate the availability of funds, speed the settlement process and prevent a similar situation ever recurring.

We are certainly aware of the results of that package. Local government has made clear that it does not want to be part of it. Admittedly, the package could be used as a basis for further negotiation, and that is probably what has happened. However, local government has made clear that it does not accept that package. Only last month, the Executive Officer of the Local Government Association, Jim Hullick, in one of the association's publications, under the heading 'Stirling', stated:

The Government's plan to fund the Stirling council has been rejected out of hand by councils and the community generally. Sadly though, the Government's attitude towards councils is hard to ignore. I understand that Cabinet, for example, believes councils are financially in a better position to pay the bill than the Government itself. It believes that our moral obligation is greater than theirs. I am sure that this is an exaggeration of the real situation. But even if it's partially true, then it's a worry . . .

The Government's inappropriate approach has triggered off all kinds of negative attitudes and the gulf between the State and councils has widened. This makes it much harder to get to the real solutions. The fundamental question is how does a Council with a limited revenue raising capacity pay off a debt of many millions of dollars? The answer is that it's not possible without placing an intolerable burden on the residents of Stirling.

That is how all the people in my electorate and Stirling council ratepayers see the situation. Publicly, the Minister has continued to say that the Government will not pay one cent of the bill. She made that clear in a statement that she made only a few weeks ago.

So, where are we now? The situation drags on some nine years later and claims for damage are still being received. Up until last week claims were received—nine years and 15 days later. The Minister's promises, made as part of the package, are not coming to fruition. We have heard much about the need for a fast track action with the cases before the court. A question asked of the Minister in another place soon after the package was brought down made quite clear that the Minister did not have much of an idea about how it would work. Local government has not accepted that it should pay across the State for this problem. Cases are still to go before the court, although many of the claims are now recognised as being totally acceptable. A committee is slowly determining what the council can be expected to pay. Personally I believe that it is the responsibility of the council to pay something towards the overall cost, but the rest of the financial burden remains a huge question at this stage.

There is fear, uncertainty, mistrust, frustration and anger amongst ratepayers within the Stirling council area. In two months time we have council elections. The possibility exists that we will see an entirely new council in the Stirling district, and I would be concerned if that happened. Some very good candidates have indicated that they will be nominating. However, I will be particularly concerned, under these circumstances, to see a brand new council as it would not be aware of all the negotiations that have taken place up to this point. I doubt that a new council could do very much better than the present council. A number of present councillors have indicated that they may not be renominating. Many have indicated that they are fed up to the back teeth with the whole situation, and that is understandable. After all, they are volunteers and are to be commended for the enormous amount of commitment they have shown to the council through this sad saga.

The only solution is for the Government to recognise the calamity as a communal responsibility, hence the motion before the House. The whole sorry saga cannot go on as it

is and it is important that the Government recognise its responsibility. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

WHEAT INDUSTRY DEREGULATION

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That in the opinion of this House the Minister of Agriculture should support the stand taken by the New South Wales and Queensland Ministers of Agriculture not to pass complementary State legislation which would allow the Federal Minister for Primary Industry to commence deregulation of the wheat industry in Australia.

The nation has been well served by the wheat farmers of this country. They have had little support or assistance from Government but have had the best system of marketing anywhere in the world. We have been the envy of wheat-growers around the world because we have had a wheat marketing situation that has brought stability to the industry, guaranteed a return to the growers, and allowed the Australian Wheat Board to dispose of the crop.

The Wheat Board has been able to place that crop on the world market and guarantee supply and quality. This has meant that Australia has been in the unique situation of being able to dispose of the overwhelming majority of that crop on an annual basis.

The Kerin proposals, as they have been outlined, will do nothing for the wheatgrowers of this country—absolutely nothing. If the deregulation of the financial markets is to be taken as the yardstick, this proposed deregulation will wreak havoc and disaster on the wheat industry. The nation has been held to ransom by international financiers and bankers. The rural industry is suffering, farmers are about to be thrown off their farms and people evicted from their homes because they cannot meet the disgracefully high interest rates, yet the Commonwealth Government's answer to solving the problems in the wheat industry is to throw the baby out with the bath water. If there is ever a time when Australia needs stability and commonsense it is now. One of the greatest industries in this country and, on many occasions, the second most productive industry as far as export income is concerned—the wheat industry—is now being subjected to proposals that bear no reality to commonsense.

Of the people who are promoting these proposals, I would say that very few have ever had wheat dust on them, know the difference between wheat and barley, driven a header, or been involved in planting wheat. Yet, they have now become the instant experts on the wheat industry. These people are attempting to inflict, on an industry that has done nothing but good for Australia, a set of circumstances that will make it very difficult for many wheat producers, particularly those in the marginal areas of Australia. Yet, come hell or high water, Mr Kerin and his advisers appear not to want to understand the dismay of people in rural areas of Australia. Wheatgrowers will not accept these new proposals.

They realise that there is nothing in it for them. They have seen the example of the deregulation of the financial markets, where people are being skinned on a daily basis. We had the spectacle of the Premier going to Canberra on behalf of South Australia, and he took a feather duster with him. We do not want the Minister of Agriculture to do the same thing; we want him to stand up and be counted, and support South Australia.

I will refer to a number of newspaper articles that clearly indicate the views of the wheatgrowers of this country. Through bitter experience they have battled to remain via-

ble. One of the reasons why many of them have survived is that they have had a system of marketing that has allowed them some security to continue to produce with confidence. If Mr Kerin is permitted to deregulate sections of the domestic market, I predict that this will be only the first step. If he gets his foot in the door it will be only a matter of time before those same proponents will want to deregulate the export market.

That will result in the wheatgrowers of Australia being screwed and their necks wrung like chickens. That is what occurred with the deregulation of the financial markets in this country. Why should we follow this nonsensical economic philosophy that is put forward by people who have been at universities or colleges of advanced education for too long? It may be all right in theory, but in reality it is a nonsense.

I am not one of those people who supports deregulation for the sake of deregulation. One cannot compare smaller government and getting rid of bureaucracy with deregulation. It is a nonsense argument, and people have been attempting to confuse the community and the wheatgrowers. Those of us with some knowledge of these areas and who represent wheatgrowers are appalled that the Commonwealth Government is continuing to follow this deregulation line in relation to this most important industry. There is nothing in it for the average Australian. If there was to be some long-term, substantial benefit there might be some sense to it.

There is no benefit whatsoever for the nation as a whole. It is an academic argument based on the most shallow premise and it cannot be substantiated by practical reality or commonsense. Where does the South Australian Government stand? Why has not the South Australian Minister of Agriculture supported Mr Armstrong in New South Wales and the Queensland Government? He had the opportunity to tell Mr Kerin to take his proposal back to Canberra and rethink it, because the overwhelming majority of people in the wheat industry want nothing to do with it.

Much reference has been made to the findings of the royal commission, but those findings were not aimed at South Australia, which has the best grain handling system in the world. We should not be doing anything to interfere with it, or to allow manipulators to get hold of it. That argument does not hold water. I could talk about the findings of the Royal Commission for hours, because they are not relevant to South Australia. However, I wish to refer now to headlines and press articles that appeared in rural papers around Australia. I refer to the *Weekly Times* of 15 February, as follows:

Agriculture Ministers from Queensland and NSW told the meeting they would not pass complementary legislation to support intra-state operation of the Australian Wheat Board (AWB). Their decision means the AWB would have no mandate to buy wheat from one part of either State and sell it to another, unlike private traders.

That is made very clear. Again, I refer to the *Weekly Times* of 1 March and the heading 'It's "no" to wheat plan'. Further, I refer to the following *On the Land* report of 2 March, as follows:

WA anger setback for Kerin wheat plan: Angry Western Australian farmers hope to start a national campaign to defeat Federal Government plans to deregulate wheat marketing. Delegates to this week's annual conference of the WA Farmers Federation decided to tell Primary Industries Minister, John Kerin, to keep his hands off much of the present wheat marketing system. Their decision (expected to be endorsed by a meeting of Victorian farmers in three weeks) is a setback for Mr Kerin who wants his wheat deregulation package in place by 30 June.

I now turn to *On the Land* of 16 February, as follows:

'Thumbs down' to Kerin Wheat Plan. Cabinet approval for the fund came only days after the NSW and Queensland Government gave the 'thumbs down'.

Unfortunately, we have heard nothing from the South Australian Minister about this latest action by New South Wales and Queensland. We have been waiting to hear from the Minister, who is supposed to speak for the industry in this State. When he goes to the Agricultural Council he is supposed to put forward the views that will assist and enhance the South Australian industry. It is unfortunate that the Minister was found wanting. The editorial of *On the Land* of 16 February states:

Armstrong was right. Ian Armstrong, as the NSW Minister for Agriculture and Rural Affairs, was acting responsibly in refusing to go along with his Federal counterpart's plans for wheat marketing changes at last Friday's Australian Agricultural Council meeting. One can sympathise with Primary Industries and Energy Minister John Kerin, who has thought through the proposed changes and is convinced that they are for the long-term good of the industry. After nearly six years in what must be one of the most thankless jobs in Canberra, he is obviously tiring of being frustrated . . .

He may be frustrated, but he has no right to take that frustration out on the wheat industry. South Australians should be fully aware of the value of the wheat industry to this State. In 1983-84, the gross value of wheat production was \$466 million, and in 1984-85 it was \$374 million. Few industries in this State can produce such figures. I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* a table indicating the gross value of the principal crops in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: I have the honourable member's usual assurance as to the statistical nature of the material?

Mr GUNN: Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

Gross Value of Principal Crops, South Australia					
Commodity	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85
	\$'000				
Cereals:					
Wheat	253 599	296 453	120 849	466 138	374 040
Barley	165 418	168 727	98 132	273 466	249 179
Oats	14 039	11 687	9 571	21 536	14 433
Rye	949	1 501	1 075	1 794	967
Crops for hay	6 423	13 038	15 483	16 487	12 204
Lupins for grain	2 964	2 508	1 612	3 810	3 181
Rapeseed	2 352	1 700	727	1 113	1 843
Sunflower	1 490	1 014	200	912	1 425
Field peas	7 513	7 919	5 798	11 605	11 437
Orchard and berry fruit:					
Citrus	33 693	35 889	33 536	38 612	45 672
Apples	12 426	13 029	12 335	14 063	20 143
Apricots	11 207	13 643	13 104	12 498	14 590

Mr GUNN: I indicate that on a national basis in 1985-86 about 16 million tonnes of wheat was produced in Australia. The overall value of that to the nation cannot be underestimated. It is not only the direct value to those involved but the value to all other associated groups and industries. If the Federal Government's proposal is put into operation one starts down the rocky road of destabilising the industry. It will affect not only the wheat farmer, his family and dependants but also those smaller rural towns and communities that are now under such pressure. It will affect the people involved in the machinery industry and those who service it. The sorry tale of woe will continue if the Government is allowed to take this action.

This Parliament would not be acting in the best interests of the people of this State, and the nation, if we allow the Minister of Agriculture to be in any doubt as to where we stand. I therefore urge him, in the strongest possible fashion, to tell Mr Kerin that we do not want to be associated with his ill conceived proposals. I also issue a call to every Federal member of Parliament in South Australia to oppose the proposals strongly, unless they meet the wishes of the wheat industry of this country and the wheat-growers of South Australia, otherwise they will be acting contrary to

the best interests of the people of this State. I therefore urge all members to support this motion strongly as it is essential that we leave no stone unturned to protect one of the oldest industries in South Australia.

It is all right looking over the hill to endeavour to establish new industries, but one cannot afford to neglect established, effective and efficient industries which have been the backbone of the economy of this State. If one starts looking for rainbows and neglecting the established industries a disastrous situation will develop in South Australia. That will benefit no-one. Therefore, I urge all members, particularly the Minister of Agriculture, to support their colleagues in New South Wales and Queensland. I am disappointed to learn that the new Minister of Agriculture in Victoria is still unsure of himself. I sincerely hope that the Western Australian Government will come to its senses in relation to this matter and support the lead taken by New South Wales and Queensland; that is essential. In view of the time constraints, I will not proceed except to conclude my remarks by quoting a press statement relating to Mr Kerin on 10 February, as follows:

Federal Primary Industries and Energy Minister, John Kerin, said today he was disappointed that the New South Wales and Queensland Governments would not pass complementary legislation . . .

I am amazed that he would be disappointed. Anyone would know that any Minister of Agriculture in this country who supported his proposals would be acting contrary to the best interests of the agricultural constituency. For Mr Kerin to be amazed proves to me that he is completely out of touch with practical agriculture.

Mr Tyler: What about the Liberal Party policy?

Mr GUNN: The honourable member knows nothing about wheat. From day one, the Liberal Party in this State has made its position very clear. We do not need the assistance of the temporary member for Fisher.

Mr Rann interjecting:

Mr GUNN: And the manipulator from wherever—the poison pen of the Labor Party. This industry is so important that we must not allow people to manipulate the facts. The Liberal Party makes no apology for supporting orderly marketing of primary products in this country. The Liberal Party in this State has a history of supporting orderly marketing and it will continue to do so. I look forward to the unqualified support of all members opposite for this motion because, if they do not support it, they will again have sold South Australia out. We have had the disgraceful spectacle of the Premier going to Canberra with a feather duster to deal with interest rates. Perhaps he will for once stand up for South Australia and support people who want to farm their enterprises productively so that they can employ people and do something for South Australia.

Let the honourable member guffaw as much as he likes. We know that his Leader went to Canberra with a feather duster. We are trying to prevent his other colleague (the Minister of Agriculture) from buying another box of feather dusters because, in dealing with the Commonwealth Government, they have shown no courage whatsoever. They have let South Australia down, and we are trying to prevent South Australians from being let down again. I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* a set of figures showing the amount of wheat sown in Australia and the number of tonnes produced on an annual basis.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member give the usual assurance?

Mr GUNN: Yes, I do.

Leave granted.

Wheat for Grain: Area and Production, by State

Season	N.S.W.	Vic.	Qld	S.A.	W.A.	Tas.	Aust.
Area ('000 hectares)							
1980-81	3 345	1 431	727	1 445	4 333	2	11 283
1981-82	3 600	1 322	941	1 427	4 927	1	11 885
1982-83	3 162	1 327	767	1 398	4 865	1	11 250
1983-84	3 999	1 614	1 006	1 564	4 746	2	12 931
1984-85	3 603	1 523	921	1 378	4 652	2	12 078
1985-86	3 663	1 508	973	1 443	4 148	2	11 736
Production ('000 tonnes)							
1980-81	2 865	2 538	485	1 650	3 315	3	10 856
1981-82	5 910	2 467	1 482	1 695	4 083	2	16 360
1982-83	1 499	394	754	692	5 534	1	8 876
1983-84	8 961	3 971	1 922	2 843	4 316	3	22 016
1984-85	5 805	2 666	1 579	2 031	6 580	4	10 666
1985-86	5 916	2 250	1 691	1 944	4 362	4	16 167

Mr GUNN: I commend the motion to the House and look forward to the support of all members.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I have much pleasure in seconding this motion because it follows a resolution I put before this Chamber late last year. It draws the attention of this House to the crisis situation which could well occur if the Kerin proposal goes ahead. It is very interesting to note that so far not one State Minister—Liberal, Labor or National Party—has agreed with the Kerin proposal. John Kerin, the Federal Minister for Primary Industry, so far is out on a limb without the backing and support of even one of his own Party's State Ministers.

What Mr Kerin is doing is seriously jeopardising the future of the Australian wheat industry by threatening not to replace the wheat legislation if, in fact, he cannot get the backing. The Federal Minister is trying to blackmail the States into backing his legislation by saying 'If you don't do that, I will allow the sunset clause to apply to the normal legislation, and after 30 June there will be no Australian Wheat Board.' That is totally irresponsible. I have never heard of any Minister—State or Federal—who has ever been so irresponsible. That action is something which I can neither understand nor agree with.

Quite frankly, the Commonwealth Minister, who is prepared to place at risk the future of a prime export industry which last year earned for Australia over \$2 million of foreign income, should be sacked. It is an unbelievable attitude for him to adopt. Mr Kerin has become irrational and petulant because he failed to receive support at the last meeting of the Australian Agricultural Council, held on 10 February, for his controversial wheat marketing plan. The Kerin proposal requires the States to agree to complementary legislation but, as I have said, no State has given an assurance that it will pass such legislation.

More importantly, the two major wheat producing States (New South Wales and Queensland), have told Mr Kerin that they will not pass such legislation. This effectively torpedoed the plan, but the Minister responded by saying that if that is the position he will allow the sunset clause to apply to existing legislation from 1 July, which means that the Australian Wheat Board would cease to exist. Under those circumstances, Australian wheat exports would be thrown open to the vagaries of corrupt international marketing practices against which they would be unlikely to compete successfully.

The Australian Wheat Board monopoly on exports has been spectacularly successful in the face of the ever-increasing war over subsidies (notably between the US and the EEC), in wheat trading. Despite these problems, the board has been successful in marketing all of Australia's available export wheat, which averages 80 per cent of each year's total crop. By his cavalier attitude, Mr Kerin is threatening

the future and the livelihood of Australia's 42 500 wheat growers. He is also threatening a grave upset in our foreign trading capacity which would seriously impact on the national economy and, therefore, on the lives of every man, woman and child in this country.

Time is running out for Mr Kerin. He must stop his political posturing and present new legislation which is in the interests of the continued viability of the Australian wheat industry, having the support of growers, the Grain Council of Australia and the State Government.

The Minister has not done that and it is interesting, as I have pointed out, that no State Minister of Agriculture has offered him support. South Australia has become the victim of the royal commission report into the grain industry because it has been the most efficient. In an endeavour to bolster up or restructure the grain industry, South Australia is paying the penalty for other States' inadequacies, and I take umbrage at that. If every other State had been as well organised in bulk handling and grain marketing, such a royal commission would not have been necessary. In an attempt to get some stability back into the marketing systems of other States, South Australia has had to pay the penalty, and I do not believe that we should accept that penalty.

Grain producers in this State have been responsible in their bulk handling arrangements. The State Government has not contributed money into the silo system. The farmers have been responsible for that at their own expense. One need only look at other industries across the State to see how self-supporting they have been, and I am sure that our graingrowers can hold their head high because every silo around the countryside is a monument to the farmers' self-determination. Cooperative Bulk Handling has put signs on the silos to the effect that they have been built and are proudly owned by the farmers of South Australia—not, I could add, by the taxpayers of South Australia.

In speaking to this motion, the member for Eyre called on all South Australian members of Federal Parliament to strongly oppose the deregulation proposals in the Kerin plan. I go one step further: I believe that every member of Parliament, State or Federal, irrespective of political Party, should be asked to declare where he or she stands on this issue. I support totally the actions of the member for Eyre because he has made patently clear where he stands. He represents a wheatgrowing area and, as he said in this place on a previous occasion, he is the only significant wheat-grower in this House. I take exception to that a little, because I also grow wheat, but not over the same acreage as that of the member for Eyre.

Those of us involved in the industry know and understand the difficulties. I know of only two members who have made a declaration as to where they stand: the member for Eyre and the member for Boothby (Mr Steele Hall), who also represents a graingrowing area. People outside could not care less but they want to put a finger in the pie and manipulate an industry outside their direct domain. It would be very nice if we, as graingrowers, wanted to get involved in industries outside our domain. We would be told to pull our head in, to get back in our box and stay involved in those areas in which we have a concern.

We are concerned about this matter and the State should recognise that. Much has been said in the graingrowing areas about the lack of Government support. To highlight this fact, I point out that 5 or 6 per cent of the total voting population is involved in primary industries. That group provides almost 50 per cent of our export earnings. To put it another way, primary producers are endeavouring to play their part in creating export income but the rest of the

community, all 95 per cent of it, is primarily responsible for creating the adverse balance of payments situation.

We must look very carefully at this. The Government of the day must consider very carefully where it stands on this issue, because it is indeed very serious. If grain growers are wiped out, our balance of trade figures will go right out the window. This would be totally untenable and we would be a bankrupt nation almost overnight.

In conclusion, I again indicate my full support for the member for Eyre's motion. I call on all members of Parliament, of all political persuasions, to make a public declaration of where they stand. I notice that there is quite some controversy in relation to the Federal coalition. I have been involved in many of the discussions that have taken place, particularly within the National Party. I am up to date with what has been going on in some of the joint Party meetings. If the Kerin proposal is not defeated, there will be very serious ramifications for the grain industry.

I urge members to contact some of the older people within their constituencies, those people who were involved in the very early days of the grain industry. Every one of them will say that in no circumstances should the Australian Wheat Board be done away with as the sole marketing authority. If we go back to the old trading days we will find at the silos three, four, five or six potential exporters bartering along the queue. In the old days, this involved wagons loaded with bags of grain, but it would similarly apply with the silos. Potential exporters would be bartering along the queue and offering the highest price. That was when people got into trouble, when there was no security over what happened. It was one of the contributing factors that led to so many of the downfalls at the time of the Great Depression. It would simply set the stage for a complete upheaval in the total Australian economy. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

YOUTH REPORT

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That this House notes with concern the findings of the Marion, Brighton and Glenelg Community Health Needs Assessment 'Youth Report' which was publicly released on 1 March 1989, and condemns the economic and social policies of the State and Federal Governments which have been responsible for startling inequalities in health and lifestyles amongst young people as well as low income families in the western and south-western suburbs of Adelaide.

While waiting for the opportunity to speak to this motion, I went through some press cuttings and some letters to the Editor of the *Advertiser*, and I want to commence my remarks by referring to a letter to the Editor that appeared in the *Advertiser* of 1 March. It is headed 'New wave of street kids being prepared' and is signed by Graham Wade, Superintendent of Westcare, Adelaide. It is a lengthy letter, but I shall read only a few paragraphs:

As a major Christian mission, Westcare has been working among the homeless for more than 75 years. In the early 70s we began to notice the growing problem of youth homelessness and about 10 years ago we commenced an emergency shelter in the city. The average age has been falling and our youngest resident has been aged 13.

Each day we face families which show signs of pressure and incipient disintegration. We could use funds and workers which would be used to tackle the basic issues of family breakdown. Failing living standards hurt the poor families more, and the homeless young people are some of the first to suffer the problems of hopelessness, leaving home and family only to find that the modern disease of selfishness also exists on the streets.

The youth report, which has been tabled in the public arena, highlights some of the failures of Labor's social justice

policies. It also picks up the symptoms of what was set in train in the 1972-75 era when Whitlam and Lionel Murphy set in train a new social era in this country. Many of these problems with homeless youth and the breakdown of the family unit can be historically attributed to the efforts of Lionel Murphy, Gough Whitlam and the Cabinet of that time. They set in train certain social directions which I do not think we will ever see absolutely stamped out in our lifetime.

I congratulate the authors of the youth report. It is a particularly good document. It was written by Chris Gallus and a project team who spent considerable months researching it. They have summarised what they see as the main problems confronting youth in the district. They have also put up some suggestions as to what should be done in that area. Not all of the report is bleak news. In fact, it highlights some excellent programs that have been undertaken in the area. It talks about some of the present facilities in the Brighton, Marion and Glenelg areas but highlights the fact that they are clustered towards the beach and the northern end of the electorate. The report also mentions a summer project of the Exodus church, the Buzz bus at Glenelg and the very successful Marion youth project, which is sponsored by Westfield Marion, Marion council and the Health Commission. The report does not mention, but I acknowledge, the work of the local member for Hayward in this area and the subsequent stage 2 of the project, which is the permanent establishment of a bus to be used as a drop-in centre. We should look at many aspects of the report which the Government could take up and try to do something about.

In the chapter on health, the report indicates that young people report far more illnesses than older residents. This is symptomatic of a feeling of hopelessness amongst them, a feeling of inadequacy, a feeling that they are appealing for help, and they can perhaps appeal for it by reporting sick, whereas older members of the community bear their cross and do not report sick quite as often.

A couple of points should be noted concerning the drug issue. Alcohol emerged as a major concern of social workers, police, parents and many of the young people. Social workers report that the drinking age amongst young people is now as low as 12 or 13. A result of drinking by people of that age is an increase in the amount of vandalism and fighting in the area. Another alarming factor is that young people, particularly in the 18 to 23 age group, openly admit that they go on drinking binges purely to get drunk.

There has also been a marked increase in the drinking of spirits by young people. It is reported that 47 per cent of young people—and I imagine that is in the 18 to 23 year category—prefer spirits. That is an enormously high percentage. Young people are shying away from light alcohol beer. Only 6 per cent of those who responded to this survey drink light beer. The reason given is that they prefer stronger alcohol so that they can get drunk—that is a terrible indictment.

People as young as 12 or 13 years of age have been observed in the streets swigging alcohol out of bottles wrapped in brown paper bags. This raises the point of how these young people get alcohol. The survey indicates that many of them either go into shops or hotels or get friends to procure it. Many of us would be aware of the sale of alcohol to under-age people in the district and I think that the Government should have a close look at cracking down on this aspect. The report states:

However, youth workers in the Marion-Brighton-Glenelg areas have reported that when young people are drunk they tend to commit anti-social acts which get them into trouble with the rest of the community. Further, although heavy drinking may be a

transient behaviour for many young people, others will become addicted to alcohol. A particular concern of youth workers is that some young people are using alcohol as a way of escaping from other problems, such as unemployment, failing at school or an unsatisfactory home life. For some it has been a way of dealing with shyness.

The report also refers to other drugs, such as marijuana and tablets. It states that, on the whole, young people shy off heroin—a very pleasing fact. However, those young people of, say, 15 years of age go to these places purely to get hold of marijuana and tablets. As a community we should be aware that we have a drug subculture which preys on young people who hang around car parks and sideshow areas. This practice has been allowed to develop. I do not understand why a Government which has been in power for as long as this one has allowed drugs to be sold openly in shopping centres and sideshow areas and on jetties in the western and south-western suburbs.

Another aspect of the report which is worth noting comes under the heading 'Nowhere to go'. Young people congregate because they have nowhere to go. The overwhelming response from a group of year 9 to 11 Marion High School students to a question about young people's needs was that young people in the areas mentioned need a place to go. I think this reply by a year 10 student puts the students' point of view:

I think we should have an area where all us teenagers should hang out between 12 and 18 years old.

They were asked what they wanted, and they said that they wanted a youth centre, a drop-in centre, a place to hang out, a place within walking distance, a non-alcoholic teenage pub (a pub with no beer). One student counsellor attributed problems in his local area to a lack of recreational facilities for young people in that area. That counsellor stated:

A lot of the vandalism and breaking and entering in the Mitchell Park area is due to boredom.

The report further states:

A community worker attributed problems in Hallett Cove to the lack of recreational facilities for young people in the southern area. 'Kids steal at Hallett Cove—they've nothing else to do.' A Marion school counsellor said that the students from his school needed a place for weekends and after school. Ideally such a place would have 'booth sitting facilities ... a milk bar food/drink facility ... indoor games, i.e. pin-ball, darts, table tennis, video games ...'

The common thread in this report is that young people who have been turned out of home, or who have left home for one reason or another, end up on the streets with nothing to do, and thus they get into trouble.

The meeting places appear to be around the Marion shopping centre, the Glenelg foreshore and the Brighton jetty. Once again, when they were interviewed at these various places, they said the same thing: 'We have got nowhere else to go. We have to do something. We go out to meet friends.' I will not continue to name these places, because I do not want to give them publicity. They said that they go to these places to buy marijuana, to smoke, to drink and to shop. The report continues:

Young people at Brighton jetty said they were there:

- 'to hang out'
- 'to meet friends'
- 'to waste time'
- 'to get out of the house'
- 'for rest and relaxation'
- 'for fishing'.

They sit around the jetty. One worker stated:

'They don't hang around the streets because it's such a nice place to go. Would you hang around on the street if you had somewhere else to go?'

Once again, there is this common thread of bored youth with nothing to do with their time; they are influenced by

those in the drug subculture or those who have a criminal intent and then they get themselves into trouble.

We have an obligation to create places for these young people. The Labor Party has been in office for 20 of the past 25 years but I have yet to see it address this major problem. In Glenelg we set up a bus. And the member for Hayward attempted to do something about the problem. There are these isolated occasions where individual members attempt to solve the problem and I imagine that other members of this House have tried to do something in their own area, but it is a global problem which has to be tackled by the Government. It just cannot be left as it stands now.

The parents have the same attitude as the young people. They also feel that there are too few places for young people to go. The report states:

Half the parents of young people 12-18 years of age (52 per cent) thought that boredom was a problem for youth in the area, while over a third (39 per cent) thought that not having anywhere to go for entertainment was a problem for young people and a fifth (21 per cent) thought that not having anywhere to go for recreation or sport was a problem. Not surprisingly, parents from the fringe suburbs of Hallett Cove, Sheidow Park and Trott Park were more inclined to agree that boredom was a problem for youth in the area (62 per cent), as was having nowhere to go for recreation or sport (50 per cent), and having nowhere to go for entertainment (69 per cent).

When we plan future developments (and the Government is already talking about a major housing development at Seaford) we must take these things into account. When a major suburb is planned, we must ask what the young people will do and how we will provide recreation or entertainment for them. We will forever have these youth problems, which Lionel Murphy imposed upon us years ago. When we plan our cities, we must take these problems into account.

Earlier, I mentioned homeless youth. There is an excellent section in the report on homeless people and it makes a couple of highlights:

These young people, most of whom do not have any money, need somewhere to live.

We have to accept that, although we may not approve of the fact that young people are on the streets and the reasons why they have left home—perhaps the intolerance of parents or of young people to each other—they are out there and they have no money in their pockets. The report continues:

Young people who turn up at Department for Community Welfare are referred to hostels in the area. However, this type of accommodation, although partly Government funded, is church based and is frequently not acceptable to young people because of its authoritarian structure.

It is a problem that the Government has to pick up in future.

Young people have problems with transport. Many of them do not have the money to buy motor cars. They have to rely on buses. They live in areas where there are infrequent bus services at weekends, so they cannot get to the organised facilities in the district. Therefore, they go to the local shopping centres where they hang around and invariably end up in trouble.

The report's summary causes deep despondency for those who have read it. It says that young people are bored and lack proper places to meet, many are unemployed, and they are not wanted at home. They are the product of Lionel Murphy and the Family Court Act and the social trends which were set running throughout the country in the 1970s and the high divorce rate and its consequences. Some lack direction and a sense of purpose. Many have dropped out of school early and are suffering for it. They are less healthy than middle and aged residents. They have to compete for sparse youth accommodation. They are under constant pres-

sure from the drug subculture and they suffer from a lack of access both to cars and to public transport and they have to congregate where they can within walking distance of their homes or wherever they are.

What joy can they expect from a Hawke-Keating Labor Government which has been charting this course for the past six years nationally—indeed, in South Australia, for 20 of the past 25 years? What hope have they got of beating the unemployment queues? What hope have they got when the normal aspirations of Australian family life are slipping further away from most low to middle income families, from where this group comes?

Let us dwell for a moment on the global situation in which young people are trying to establish themselves in life in Australia. Labor's legacy to Australia is demonstrated in its effect on the younger generation. We are in hock to the rest of the world, and we have a younger generation which is trying to become established in a country of high unemployment, spiralling interest rates, falling living standards and record taxation. Labor has mortgaged this country and its future through sheer mismanagement. Australia's debt has more than trebled in six years from \$24 billion under Malcolm Fraser in June 1982 to \$121 billion in September 1988. We are now firmly in the hands of foreign bankers, and young people are trying to get established in life.

During Labor's rule and its much flaunted social justice policy, an extra 700 000 Australians have slipped below the poverty line since 1983. Some 2.6 million—an eighth of the population—are living in poverty, and we say that there has to be hope for our youth. The expectation of the 'roof over your head' has slipped beyond the reach of about 100 000 people, with more than 60 000 living on the verge of homelessness and 40 000 sleeping in refuges, emergency accommodation or in the open. The percentages appear in the report. Australia now has a permanent under class. We had the middle class once and we had the upper classes. However, we now have a permanent under class of 600 000 unemployed people, of whom 100 000 are teenagers. The percentages of those are also reflected in the report.

Real disposable income fell in Australia last year for the first time in 30 years. Rent and home loan repayments absorb more of the family income than ever before, with about 30 per cent of the family income now being used up in home loan costs. That is the environment that young people are facing—no wonder they are despondent. The top 10 per cent of income earners now receive 28.4 per cent of all income in Australia while the middle income earner has gone backwards. Under Hawke the rich have got richer and more people are now joining the ranks of the poor. Is it any wonder that the family units that we are trying to preserve are facing such enormous pressure, particularly in the lower income areas. Family pressures are breaking up those families and young people are out on the streets, as detailed in the report.

Australia now has one of the worst consumer debt bankruptcy rates in the world with businesses folding at a rate under Labor never experienced before in the Commonwealth. Following on from that is unemployment for young people. Australia is becoming the land of shattered dreams and abandoned hopes for the young and middle aged. Young people are coming on and it is reflected in their eyes and minds that they feel they are entering a community without hope.

The youth report mentioned in my motion highlights a new generation coming on who have only known Labor Governments. Many who go to the polls this year are only teenagers and have never experienced anything else. They

have never experienced the security of Liberal Governments in the past.

Members interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: Members opposite laugh, but in the days of Malcolm Fraser and before, none of the facts and figures that I have mentioned over the past two or three minutes applied. We had a land of security and safety in bringing up families, safety in income so that one could plan for the future and safety to provide a roof over one's head. One could plan and say to children that for the next 20 or 30 years you can look forward to security of tenure over your lifestyle and homes, your income and your retirement. You cannot now plan for your retirement or for the immediate future. Everyone in this country is living day to day.

Members opposite laugh because they think that things are getting better. This country is on the bones of its tail, as a result of the consistent policies of Labor Administrations. Members opposite in their cloistered outlook do not realise that the public have woken up to them. Hawke is finished, and members opposite know that. Also, State Labor Governments are in diabolical trouble because of their long-term economic policies. However, do not let me digress.

We are talking about the impact of these policies on youth and why certain matters have been recorded in this report on the west and south-western suburbs. It is patently obvious that we have problems in the west and south-western suburbs, which started back in 1972 to 1975 and have increased ever since. Such problems can be attributed to the economic policies and the social justice policies of the socialist administrations. I commend the report to honourable members. If honourable members read it, they will see a summary on a large section of the Adelaide community. That summary will give them an idea of the problems confronting youth. This objective report, which is well written and easy to read and understand, contains many graphs and statistics. It also summarises the feeling of hopelessness and the lack of sense of direction confronting young people who have the misfortune of being outside the loving care of a family group.

Labor Governments should watch that they are not causing a continuous turnover in that group in the community by creating further disastrous economic conditions that force more and more young people out of homes, cause more families to break down, and create more problems in the community. Community workers and local members, with all the good will in the world, cannot handle this on their own. They need help from both the State and the Federal Governments. They need State and Federal Governments that have the right legislation and political philosophy to solve the economic ills of this country, which will certainly not be solved by either the Bannion or the Hawke Government.

Mrs APPLEBY secured the adjournment of the debate.

HOUSING

Mr TYLER (Fisher): I move:

That this House congratulates the Premier on representing the housing concerns of South Australian families to the Federal Government, particularly the need for the Federal Government to offer young home buyers tangible assistance to meet their mortgage repayments and, further, that this House acknowledges that initiatives over the past six years by the State Government have enabled the housing needs of tens of thousands of South Australian families to be met.

The Federal Government confined the agenda of last Friday's Premiers' housing summit to land supply and zoning matters. While I believe that these matters are important, it should be pointed out that in South Australia the land

release and planning system works extremely well. Housing problems in South Australia are not in the supply of land or its cost but in the cost of money to private purchasers—the young families who are waiting to get into their first home.

With that in mind the Premier attended the conference last Friday and insisted that interest rate protection be included on the agenda. I congratulate him on that initiative. I know that he is personally very concerned about that, and it is good to know that we have a Premier in South Australia who is prepared to go in and bat for young families.

Members interjecting:

Mr TYLER: It is interesting to hear members opposite laugh. At least we, on this side of the House, have a strong and very effective leader. The Leader of members opposite is known around this State as the Clayton's Leader—the leader you have when you don't have a leader. Only one person in this country thinks that the Leader of the Opposition is any good, and that is the Leader himself, and I think at times even he has doubts about it. Let us not hear any more nonsense from members opposite about who can best represent the needs of South Australians at the Federal level. There is no doubt that the Premier of this State has a proven track record in that regard, as he showed again just last Friday.

Mr Lewis: He didn't put interest rates on the agenda.

Mr TYLER: I refer the honourable member to the *Week-end Australian* of 4 March and 5 March. An article written by the economics writer, Robert Hadler, states:

Contrary to expectations it was senior Labor—not Coalition—Premiers who led a revolt against the Federal Government's high interest rate policy, calling for more spending on housing services and assistance for first home buyers.

Perhaps if the honourable member did a little more research, instead of coming into the House, spouting—

The Hon. R.G. Payne: And bellowing.

Mr TYLER:—and bellowing, as my colleague says, he might actually know something. In excess of 90 per cent of the people in my electorate are purchasing their home. Over 5 000 of those families have moved into the district in the past two to three years and have deregulated loans. They are really feeling the pinch because of the current high interest rates.

Although I understand the economic theory being practised by the Federal Government now, it is important to bear in mind that at the other end of the scale people are paying the price because of the poor balance of payments, the recent surge in the CPI and the overheating of the housing market, particularly in the Eastern States. The people who are being asked to pay are young home buyers. Frankly, it is not fair, and I believe that the Federal Government needs to offer some tangible assistance to help those young people keep alive their dream of owning their own home.

One of the propositions that I put forward last week was the possibility of reintroducing tax rebates for first home buyers. Such a scheme could operate for the first five years of a mortgage and be restricted to first home buyers. Obviously, there would be some means testing involved, but this assistance would apply to the interest portion of the mortgage. In the early years, young people are paying mainly interest and not much principal. Such a scheme would be of enormous help. Such a scheme operated in the early 1970s and many people of my generation appreciated the assistance of tax rebates.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr TYLER: In fact, it was introduced by the Whitlam Government in 1974-75 and abolished by the Fraser Gov-

ernment in the late 1970s, about 1978. However, if tax rebates cannot be applied, I would like to hear from the Federal Government other ways in which it can assist young people in maintaining their mortgage payments. Interestingly, some groups in our community can claim payments as a tax deduction. For example, businesses and investors can negatively gear property, yet it seems that home buyers are at a disadvantage. Therefore, I ask the Federal Government to consider this matter and determine other tangible ways in which it can help young home buyers.

Certainly, I welcome the fact that the Commonwealth at the Premiers' Conference agreed to look at the possibility of improving the situation, including its first home owners scheme. I also understand that the Commonwealth also indicated its willingness to look at further submissions to ease housing repayments for low and middle income earners. On 31 January this year the Federal Treasurer, in announcing the summit, stated:

On the question of supply there is obviously not significant property or land available in our major cities to meet the demand.

Certainly, that statement is true of Sydney and, to a lesser extent, Melbourne; it is probably true in respect of Queensland. It is true that there is overheating in the Eastern States in the housing area, but it is not true that there is the same situation in Adelaide. If we look at allotment prices on the urban fringe, we see that they have remained stable in money terms since 1985, at an average price of \$28 000.

Across the metropolitan area average prices range from \$20 000 in Salisbury, Munno Para and Noarlunga to the low \$30 000 mark in Golden Grove and Happy Valley. The South Australian Government has taken action to maintain land supply, including the release of broadacre land by the South Australian Urban Lands Trust. Regional aspects need to be considered, as the Premier stressed to the Federal Government at the Premiers' Conference. It is no good the Federal Treasurer's referring in a general way to our housing problems, because those problems differ from State to State.

The enormous advantage in South Australia results from two major factors: planning and public housing. In the planning area, the mechanism established through the Metropolitan Development Program brings together population forecasting, land monitoring infrastructure provisions, and land release. This program coordinates the planning and provision of services to new residential areas of metropolitan Adelaide. It is prepared each year for the following five-year period. It essentially represents the short-term planning position within the framework of the longer-term strategy for Adelaide's metropolitan growth and development.

The second factor is the area of public housing. South Australia has always had a strong public housing program, which started back in the Playford days and which has been continued by successive Governments right through to the present day. This has resulted in 10 per cent of South Australia's housing stock being public housing, compared with 5 per cent elsewhere. South Australia has long regarded its investment in public housing as central to its overall economic development, so that even in times of budgetary constraints, as we have now, public housing is given a high priority.

While I understand the motives of the Federal Government in wanting to dispose of land, that approach is not appropriate to South Australia. For instance, amongst other matters the Federal Government has been talking about zoning and planning changes. That would mean cutting some of the red tape—some of the regulations—in the housing area.

This has already been acted upon here in South Australia. A joint venture for more affordable housing was undertaken in my electorate at Aberfoyle Park. This pilot program involved State, Commonwealth and industry and was designed to promote cost savings in the housing area.

It is estimated that savings of about 24 per cent were available through the smaller allotment sizes and innovative design. Reduction in allotment sizes contributed to half the savings, and the more economical way in which the servicing was provided supplied the other half. These services were achieved without any significant loss in amenity or utility, and the estate was sold in record time. In fact, many allotments were sold before the estate was opened by the then Federal Minister for Housing, Stuart West. Our own Minister was also in attendance at that time. There is a very high level of community acceptance. It was a pilot program, and has now been extended to other parts of South Australia.

The South Australian Government has shown a strong and consistent commitment to housing in the past five years. By October 1988 the South Australian Housing Trust had 60 899 rented properties: more than one in 10 properties in South Australia and almost double the proportion for Australia as a whole, which averaged out to 5.3 per cent. The building and house purchase program will complete 2 070 units in 1988-89. From 1983 to 1988, 11 350 new Housing Trust properties were completed and 2 420 bought. In all, with conversions included, almost 14 000 properties were added to the public housing stock—14 000 more houses. That is about the size of my electorate. Since 1983, 57 000 new tenants have been housed. Of these 8 651 were housed last financial year—a record for recent years.

The Government has strongly supported the development of housing cooperatives—housing groups with high levels of tenant involvement. By 30 June 1988 cooperatives had been funded to acquire or build 874 properties, with a further expansion of 321 planned for this financial year. A major review is now underway with detailed consultation with the various interested community groups.

The Government has ensured that trust tenants have rents that are affordable, while better off tenants are making a larger contribution. Rents were increased by 5 per cent in February 1988 and 12 per cent in August 1988. It is intended during 1989-90 to keep any rent increases within the CPI. The composition of Housing Trust tenants is changing. An increasing proportion of accommodation is being allocated to the most disadvantaged members of the community. Of all tenants, 67 per cent are paying reduced rents because of low incomes, and the proportion among new tenants has risen to 73.5 per cent.

The Housing Trust has boosted its acquisition and building program in the inner metropolitan area. This year should see the trust stock in the inner metropolitan area increase by 520 through acquisitions. In June 1988 the Housing Trust waiting list stood at 44 430, a reduction of 7 000 from the previous year. The rate of new applications is gradually reducing from 16 340 in 1987-88 to 5 305 for the first four months of this financial year, an annual equivalent of 15 915.

By contrast, Liberal housing policies have recently been seen in operation in other States. It is interesting that after the Premiers' Conference we heard the New South Wales Premier (Mr Greiner) squeal like a stuck pig, but in New South Wales his Government has recently announced rent rises of the order of 50 per cent for tenants on full rents.

Similarly, Queensland and Tasmania have set rent levels according to income, so that tenants in equivalent properties on average weekly earnings pay half as much again as in South Australia. It is interesting that in New South Wales

the Government is selling off key inner city housing sites acquired for low cost rental housing, and is forcing the public tenants out into the urban fringe areas.

The New South Wales Government has also announced the withdrawal of funds from a large number of community housing groups who have been working effectively in that State to increase housing choices and services for disadvantaged people. In Victoria and Western Australia the Liberal election platforms included a proposal to sell public housing at discounts. It was the same tired old policy that the Opposition Leader here in this State took to the people at the most recent election. It would seem that the Liberals around Australia have not learned, because in those States, as was the case here in South Australia, the Liberal Party was rejected by the electorate.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Second-hand and second-rate!

Mr TYLER: The Minister says 'Second-hand and second-rate.' That just about sums up the Liberal Party, not only in South Australia but around this nation. In closing, I believe that the Premier should be congratulated for the way in which he has articulated the concerns and the interests of South Australians. He has done it very effectively in the past, and he did it again at the Premiers' Conference on Friday. The South Australian effort in the past six years in the area of housing has been extremely effective and outstanding. One only has to look at my electorate where there are now about 26 000 people—a growth rate of some 40 per cent over the past five years. That is young people in their homes, many of them in their first homes. All we need now is for the Federal Government to offer some tangible assistance to help those young families stay in their homes. They are struggling to pay off their mortgages, and I urge the Federal Government to get behind the call from the South Australian Premier and give those young families a go by offering some tangible assistance.

Mr DUGAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

DOVER GARDENS PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mrs APPLEBY (Hayward): I move:

That in the opinion of the House the member for Coles' question of Thursday 23 February 1989 relating to the marijuana crop at Dover Gardens Primary School and the reports on the issue by some sections of the media were deliberately couched in such a way as to misrepresent the facts and, further, the House demands an apology from the member for Coles to the Dover Gardens Primary School community for the resulting consequences.

I move this motion at the request of the community which I represent and to place on record some facts relevant to the outrageous intent of the question asked by the member for Coles on Thursday 23 February. While it is appreciated that the question was carefully worded, there is no doubt that the intent of that question has enraged the Dover Gardens Primary School community and adjacent school communities.

If the honourable member had a genuine concern or interest in the outcome of the events that occurred on 19 October 1988, she would have included in her explanation the facts rather than creating the perception that the issue was a continuing matter and that, somehow or other, she had stumbled onto it. This would have given her five minutes of glory—a consequence. Not only has the member for Coles been irresponsible but some sections of the media, particularly a journalist from the *Australian* who developed a fantasy story with the same outrageous overtones, have also been irresponsible.

At the request of the school community, I will place on record the events that occurred on 19 October 1988. As a conclusion to the redevelopment of the Dover Gardens Primary School, Sacon workers climbed onto the roof of the canteen to install the upgraded security alarm system. These workers found on the roof four pots of seedlings, a bag of potting soil, a quantity of fertiliser and some watering apparatus. The police were immediately called, took possession of these items and gave a receipt for them, as is the usual practice.

At the same time, the bough of a tree overhanging the roof of the canteen was removed, thus cutting off access to the roof except, perhaps, by a ladder. As far as the school community was concerned, the matter was in the hands of the police. It was not deemed at any time to be a matter that the school community should publicise externally as this might have alarmed the person or persons responsible for the items on the canteen roof.

Parents who have approached me since the revelations of the member for Coles in the House have expressed great concern and, at their request, I will place on the record some of the letters that I have received. The first letter from which I will read came from two parents of children attending the school, and it states:

As parents of children attending the Dover Gardens Primary School and having had a close association with the school and its development over the past nine years, we were appalled by Ms Jennifer Cashmore's slandering of the school's good name in Parliament on Thursday 23 February. For the sake of cheap political point scoring, Ms Cashmore made statements which were basically incorrect. No parent had expressed concern to the school council or the Principal over the discovery of the marijuana plants on the school canteen roof and at no stage (as suggested in the *Australian* 24 February 1989) had there been any suggestion that staff or students were involved in the growing of the plants.

The matter had been appropriately dealt with by the police on 19 October 1988 when the plants were first discovered. The police removed the plants from the canteen roof and it then became a police matter. It is a pity that Ms Cashmore had not verified this story with the Principal and the council before choosing to name the school so scurrilously under the privilege of Parliament. The actions of this self-righteous lady, in fact, had the opposite effect to her pious intentions—the publicity which her question aroused has had an extremely unsettling effect on the children whom she was purporting to protect, as it aroused an unhealthy interest in the whole issue of drugs and drug taking. The Principal had made a point of playing down the incident in October 1988 to prevent just such an effect.

We have worked long and hard as parents in the school community to build the school's good name, which Ms Cashmore so cheaply abused.

As a consequence of Ms Cashmore's actions, parents intending to enrol their children at the school have thought twice about doing so. Parents, teachers and children have had to endure unsavoury and derisive comments from the community about 'pot growing' at Dover Gardens Primary School. The blame for this must lie with Ms Cashmore.

We demand, therefore, a public apology from Ms Cashmore so that the school's good reputation can be restored and the efforts of parents, teachers and children in providing a quality education at Dover Gardens Primary School be recognised. Unless the good lady can find more important issues than this to raise in Parliament, we would question her worth as a politician.

That letter is signed by two parents of students at the school. I have another letter, which I also wish to place on record. It is as follows:

Dear Mrs Appleby,

As you are well aware, an inaccurate statement was made in Parliament on Thursday last by Ms Cashmore concerning marijuana plants being found at Dover Gardens Primary School. The statement was made, I am sure, to promote personal interest and embarrass the Government. It has also led to widespread denigration of both the school's hitherto respected name and the total school community. The subsequent inferences of involvement of teachers and students is abominable.

I add, that when interviewed by an ABC reporter . . . he restated a question about student involvement. He seemed incapable of accepting that students who leave the school at 12 years of age

would be most unlikely to have the physical strength or knowledge to establish the area. It would be appreciated if the facts could be placed before the Parliament and an apology sought from Ms Cashmore.

Possibly her . . . [journalistic influence] . . . has caused her to adopt the stance of 'never let the truth ruin a good story'. I hope that when made aware of the facts and effect of her statement she will have the good grace to apologise.

Finally, the last letter (of a batch of many that I have received) to which I will refer now, states:

Dear Mrs Appleby,

I am writing this letter to you as a concerned resident of the Hayward electorate, and also as the parent of two children who attend the Dover Gardens Primary School, Folkestone Road, Dover Gardens.

I am concerned over the actions of the Opposition in relation to comments made by Jennifer Cashmore in the House of Assembly on Thursday 23.2.89. The comments relating to the growing of Indian hemp on the roof of the canteen were not only five months old but were not a true representation of the facts, and it is obvious that the Opposition was attempting to embarrass the Government, at the expense of our school's hard-earned reputation.

As you are well aware, our school, under the leadership of Mr Jim Bell, has improved out of sight over the past couple of years, and then, at the whim of an obviously undisciplined group of politicians, this good reputation is ruined, and again the hard work will have to be done all again.

Mr Lewis: She's a member of your sub-branch, is she?

Mrs APPLEBY: I would suggest that the honourable member listen. The letter continues:

Surely, any good politician would research a subject correctly prior to making a statement in such a manner, and not just rely on information from nearby residents who have ulterior motives for having it done in this manner. I must add that I have always voted Liberal, but I am surely tempted to change if this irresponsible behaviour continues.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mrs APPLEBY: The letter continues:

I will also be writing to Ms Cashmore and Mr Olsen, voicing my disapproval of the actions on 23.2.89.

Rather than continuing to yell, the member for Mitcham should perhaps read the letter that has gone to the Opposition. I do not need to belabour the point about the concern that has been expressed by parents, as has now been recorded. I pay tribute to the high involvement of the parents and staff at the Dover Gardens Primary School and, in particular, their total commitment on behalf of their children. They work and participate actively with the staff in support of quality education for their children. They are continually involved in ensuring that the school environment is a happy, secure and responsive place for the well-being of the children. Their work in developing innovative quality programs and projects for the education of their children has gained much respect from the department and the community.

Also relevant to this is the fact that a past student of Dover Gardens Primary School, who now lives in Alice Springs, phoned to say how upset she was to read the article in the *Australian* of Friday 24 February and could not believe the article without checking the situation for herself. This has led to her adding her total support to the school community. I will quote the article referred to.

Mr Lewis: You're reading this. Every word you are saying, you're reading.

Mrs APPLEBY: Continue, it is keeping you occupied.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs APPLEBY: The article is headed, 'Drugs grown at school' and is written by a journalist, Matthew Warren. It is a small article and I will quote it all, as follows:

The Bannock Government is investigating the discovery of a \$36 000 marijuana crop found growing on the roof of a suburban Adelaide primary school canteen.

The find was revealed yesterday in State Parliament by Opposition frontbencher Ms Jennifer Cashmore after parents expressed

their concern to her over the discovery of the three dozen marijuana plants.

She said that judging from the development of the plants at the Dover Gardens Primary School it appeared they had been growing during the final school term last year and over the summer holidays.

It is understood some students saw the plants and thought someone was growing tomatoes there.

Ms Cashmore said the area where the plants were growing had limited access, suggesting the growers may be employees of the school.

The Deputy Premier and Minister for Emergency Services, Mr Hopgood, said he would investigate the matter.

The Deputy Premier has investigated the matter at my request and I have received a letter which I will read into the record.

Mr Lewis: Your request? You didn't ask for anything. The member for Coles asked the question.

Mrs APPLEBY: I would suggest that the member for Murray-Mallee might find something else to do with his time other than interject. This is the letter from the Deputy Premier:

Dear Ms Appleby,

In response to your request yesterday about the incident at Dover Gardens Primary School last October the following comments from the report of the Commissioner of Police may be of assistance.

On 19 October 1988 four pots containing 34 Indian hemp seedlings ranging from 3 cm to 15 cm in height were located on the Dover Gardens Primary School canteen roof by workmen installing security equipment. Potting soil, fertiliser and a watering tray were also found on the roof. Extensive inquiries by police have so far failed to reveal the identity of the person or persons responsible for growing the plants.

The building design and geographical features of the location provided an ideally sheltered growing area which was obscured from the view of school staff, students and the public. The only easy access to the roof was by way of an overhanging bough of a nearby tree. The tree has since been trimmed to prevent access to the roof by this route.

The letter is signed 'Hon. Don Hopgood'. Two things occur to any responsible person: did Matthew Warren write his article from the member for Coles' press release and, if so, with whom did he check the facts? It was definitely not the Acting Principal or the Acting Deputy Principal of the school, and definitely not the school council, the parents and friends association, the department or any person connected with the school.

Matthew Warren's article states that several children thought that someone was growing tomato plants. As the height of the average child under 12 years of age would preclude them from viewing beyond the roof surround of the building in question, that is a ridiculous accusation to make. I have placed on record the report which I requested from the Deputy Premier, so I will leave that point to the interpretation of the responsible people. In conclusion, and on behalf of the Dover Gardens Primary School community, I demand an apology from the member for Coles and ask the House to support this community, which was so wrongfully exploited.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. D.C. Wotton): Order!

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): What a lot of bollocks; what a lot of drivel we have just heard! The member for Hayward, who has just put this proposition before us, has failed on two important principles. For instance, just because a crop of marijuana worth \$10 or \$10 million is found to be growing at Murray Bridge, does that mean that the people of Murray Bridge are considered by the rest of the community at large to be less worthy the next day than they were the day before they heard about it? Just because something happens in a given location, does it mean that that location suffers as a consequence? If that is the case, we

must not ever reveal the location in which nefarious activities are undertaken.

The Dover Gardens Primary School has not suffered one jot—other than as a result of the paranoia whipped up by the member for Hayward. The regrettable aspect of her remarks is that by imputing to the member for Coles an improper motive that she intended some injury to the school, the member for Hayward deliberately misleads people associated with that school into that mistaken belief. Never at any time in her life would the member for Coles contemplate such a mischief in respect of the Dover Gardens Primary School or any other primary school or institution.

In asking the question the member for Coles of necessity had to identify specifically the particular incident to which she was referring. The honourable member acknowledged that plants were growing in pots on the canteen roof. In fact, *Cannabis sativa* was growing on the roof. One is not permitted to grow that plant in South Australia—it is forbidden. The member for Coles had to identify the location when seeking information from the Minister. If the member for Hayward had done something before, one would understand the indignation she expressed. Further, the member for Hayward did not respond to my albeit admittedly out of order interjection in which I asked her to indicate the date on which she approached the Minister about the matter—and the Minister has never said anything about it.

It is a serious matter when these things occur on public property, particularly schoolyards. Somebody, more particularly than in any other circumstance, needs to be taken to task over this matter. How is it that this can be allowed to occur on school grounds? This is the outrage which the member for Coles expressed on behalf of all members of Parliament, I hope, but obviously the Government does not want to be associated with it.

Mr Robertson: It is a deliberate slur, and you know it.

Mr LEWIS: In no way was it a deliberate slur on the school or anyone associated with it, so far as the Opposition is aware. It was a deliberate attempt on our part to expose what was going on on Government property in a school in South Australia.

Mrs Appleby interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I dare say. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[*Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.*]

PETITION: HOUSING INTEREST RATES

A petition signed by 400 residents of South Australia praying that the House take action to persuade the Federal Government to amend economic policy to reduce housing interest rates was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

PETITION: KADINA DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE OFFICE

A petition signed by 1 277 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to appoint an agronomist, a livestock officer, and a soils officer to the Kadina District Office of the Department of Agriculture was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: AIDS

The Hon F.T. BLEVINS (Minister of Health): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: The South Australian Branch of the Australian Medical Association has joined its national body in calling for a tightening of AIDS policy. These doctors say they are concerned that the AIDS virus can live outside the body for up to a week, and that this may pose risk to medical staff. The Federal Vice-President of the AMA (Mr Bruce Shephard) is actually quoted as saying that the virus can 'even be inhaled through a surgeon's mask'.

I should have thought that any doctor, besides the Vice-President of the AMA, would know that you cannot catch AIDS by breathing! HIV infection in the natural order of things is a sexually transmitted disease. Studies on the transmission of the virus in the domestic setting show that only the sexual partner is at risk. There is no evidence of casual transmission to other members of the household.

In the medical setting, the risk to health care workers involves needle stick injury or exposure to infected fluids, primarily blood. There are very clear international guidelines for health workers about blood and body fluid precautions that they must take for their own safety. The focus of these precautions is not as the AMA is advocating, on the disease state and the patient affected, but on identifying the body substance of risk and the necessary procedures to deal with it. By following these guidelines, the risk of transmission of the virus to staff or patients is negligible.

Of the few health care workers around the world who have been infected with the virus, either through needle stick or exposure to body fluids, the patient is already known to be HIV positive. So, knowing a patient's HIV status does not reduce the risk of infection. The key is to take the appropriate precautions. The AMA says that its latest concerns are based on a revelation that the AIDS virus can live outside the human body for up to a week. Its fears about this again seem based on misunderstanding.

Survival of the virus in the environment is not synonymous with infection. The virus needs to have a mechanism to get into the body from the environment and in sufficient numbers to cause infection. There is no evidence that such a mechanism exists. The South Australian President of the AMA (Mr Peter Joseph) is reported as saying that doctors cannot understand why this disease is being treated as a social problem. The fact is that all STD's are treated as social problems because they are related to human behaviour. Traditional public health measures are not ignored but viewed in the light of what is appropriate for the 1980s and of our better understanding of disease transmission.

QUESTION TIME

HOSPITAL SECURITY

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Can the Minister of Health say what action the Government is taking following a report commissioned by the Health Commission that has identified 'glaring deficiencies' in security at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Flinders Medical Centre?

This report has been in the Government's hands since December, and it contains some alarming statements, such as little being done to protect hospital staff involved in cash and drug handling; nurses facing difficulty in coping with

drunken, aggressive, and violent visitors, and enforcement of no smoking policies in wards; no effective policing or enforcement of the use of identification cards for security purposes; and ineffective reporting of the cost to hospitals of theft. The report also contains a graphic illustration of this lax security at our major hospitals.

The consultant who prepared it decided to test suggestions that the key system at Queen Elizabeth Hospital was capable of being compromised through unauthorised cutting of keys by outside key cutting services and locksmiths. He describes what he did as follows:

In order to test the accuracy of this belief a great grand master key was provided to me for this purpose. Within one hour of being provided with the key I had sufficient unauthorised keys to enable me to have the same degree of access as that of the great grand master key. Admittedly, I needed 12 keys to duplicate the access of the great grand master key but, as the keys and the cylinder are clearly identified as to the broach used, this posed no practical difficulty at all.

Accompanied by Mr Eric Hill, a hospital administrative officer, I was able to unlock the stores area, which is regarded as a prime, high risk area within the hospital. The same was true of many areas that were tested. As a result of this exercise, the present key system in use can only be considered as suspect.

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: This report has not been drawn to my attention, but—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: I will obtain a report and on Tuesday bring back a reply.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: You can have mine.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition knows that displays of documents are completely out of order.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: He can have mine.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: I thank the Deputy Leader for his generosity, but I can assure him that I will have access to a copy.

Mr Gunn interjecting:

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: Pardon?

Mr Gunn interjecting:

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: Not for one minute would I think so. The problem of security is not unique to hospitals; the problem of security in this place would at times make members weep. I had a very brief conversation about security with the Administrator of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, who drew this matter to my attention.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: Everybody wants to be a star. There is no doubt that the Royal Adelaide Hospital was not built with security in mind and, from time to time, disturbed people, who seem to get some kind of a kick out of it, wander around hospitals. The security system at the Royal Adelaide Hospital is as effective as one can make security. A number of security officers are employed and they make every attempt to keep undesirable people out of the grounds of the hospital and, even worse, from ward or public areas of the hospital.

Security is difficult in hospitals when they were not built as armed camps. It would not be difficult to get keys for rooms in this Parliament. I am sure that all members from time to time feel very vulnerable here, but I believe that our hospitals should be as secure as we can reasonably make them in order to ensure the safety of the employees and patients. Over this weekend I will give the report the attention it deserves, and on Tuesday I will inform the honourable member about security and what action has been taken,

because after these problems have been identified I am sure that some action would have been taken.

SPECIAL TRANSPORT

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Mitcham): Will the Minister of Transport say whether any preliminary work has been done on the further development of transport for the handicapped and frail aged in our community, such as the Access Cab scheme? In the Fielding Report issued yesterday under the heading 'Short-term action', recommendation 10 suggests that the Access Cab scheme should continue, and the Minister has indicated that that recommendation is accepted. Recommendation 11 points out that to increase availability of transport of this nature to those in need of it, especially during peak hours, additional vehicles should be designed like a mini-bus with wheelchair lifts and tie-down places rather than like taxis. The latter aspect is worthy of serious consideration on the part of the Government to ascertain whether that additional service can be provided for those in need in the community.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I congratulate the honourable member for his continued interest in the well-being of those people in the community who look to members of Parliament to protect their rights and to accommodate their needs. The Access Cab system in South Australia has been an outstanding success. When it was introduced I gave an undertaking to the people of South Australia that after it had been in operation for some 12 months we would have it independently reviewed. That review process has been completed and the report is with me for my consideration and for the consideration of Cabinet.

Part of the report suggests that the Government should coordinate the mini-bus services available in South Australia, so that we get the best advantage from them in the Access Cab scheme. Everyone knows that there is a private operator in South Australia who provides a very important and necessary service, but there are also mini-buses controlled by the Health Commission, the Education Department, and so on. The recommendation is that we should better coordinate all these services—a recommendation worthy of support. Professor Fielding in his report said that it was not appropriate or economically justifiable to convert existing public transport buses to accommodate wheelchairs for people who are frail aged or wheelchair bound. The better way of accommodating these people, particularly in peak periods, is to provide mini-buses and to encourage them to share rides, thereby reducing the fare.

We have accepted that recommendation, and it will be fed into the review that has just been completed of the Access Cab scheme. The Access Cab scheme has been one of the most outstanding successes in which Governments have been involved in recent years. I have not done many things that have resulted in a flood of congratulatory letters. Greater availability of cabs will improve the service and people who have been housebound for many years, possibly for a lifetime, now have access to community facilities and can go into the City of Adelaide to see things that they hitherto could only hope to see on the television screen. That has been of enormous advantage to them and gives them independence from family and friends, which is important to all people in the community not least the elderly, frail aged, and handicapped. It has been a success. We will continue to improve the system and fine-tune it where necessary. We are always prepared to listen to constructive criticism and advice. We have had some from Professor Fielding, and it will be fed into the decision-

making process on what we should do with Access Cabs in future.

LOSSES IN PUBLIC HOSPITALS

The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE (Coles): Notwithstanding that the Minister of Health has not seen a report which has been available to him since December, will he advise the House whether the Government is satisfied with procedures followed by public hospitals for identifying losses—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Premier to order and I particularly ask him not to encourage the Leader of the Opposition to interject in view of the number of times that the Leader of the Opposition has been reprimanded by the Chair for interjecting.

The Hon. J.L. CASHMORE:—caused by theft and, if not, what action will be taken to improve those procedures? I ask this question in view of the comments in the consultant's report referred to in the previous Opposition question. The comments suggest that the cost of the theft to hospitals is, in fact, concealed. I refer to the following extract from the report:

Another large area of loss potential could be attributed to stock shrinkage or, more correctly, staff pilferage.

It used to be called stealing. The report continues:

The actual loss in dollar terms is generally not known as there appears to be little or no reporting and consolidation of this statistic in the hospitals. These losses are probably concealed and replacements funded through increased operating costs and lost in the inflation factor which has become an accepted way of life in our society today.

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: There is a sense of *deja vu* creeping in here. Is it a sausage day today? I can remember the member for Hanson and, I think, the member for Alexandra, if my memory serves me correctly, and the Hon. Martin Cameron in another place who had a huge 'scandal' going many years ago involving the Public Accounts Committee—there was some monumental stealing of sausages within the health system. My memory does not serve me well enough to know what happened in that situation.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: The members resigned over sausages? Well, I think that was just before an election.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: The honourable lady persists in interjecting. I did not interject when she was making her explanation and I would appreciate it if she gave me the same courtesy. If she does not I am equally happy to respond to her interjections, but you, Mr Speaker would not permit that.

An honourable member: What about answering the question?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: I have every intention of doing so. I would be very surprised—in fact, I would be astonished—if within our hospital system, as within any other workplace in South Australia and, indeed, Australia, there was no pilfering. I would be absolutely staggered if, out of the 25 000 or so employees, some did not pinch something from time to time. My guess is that the management of BHP in this State would express exactly the same view—out of its 5 000 employees there was no-one who was a little bit errant, shall we say, and pinched a spanner or whatever.

In general, whilst not being aware of too many instances, I assume it goes on, the same as I assume it goes on in every workplace. However, I do not know about the procedures within the public hospitals to identify or record any pilfering, or whatever financial arrangements are made to

make good any losses incurred through pilfering. I will find out for the honourable lady just what the individual hospitals and health units do. I remind the honourable lady that there are about 187, but I will attempt to find out what they all do.

In the public hospital system, as with other areas in the Public Service, if anyone is found committing an illegal act or if there is any evidence to indicate that an illegal act has taken place, that fact is immediately reported to the police. In addition, if anyone in the public hospital system or the rest of the Public Service is aware of any criminal activity, that person has an obligation to report it to the police. I will not permit excuses for anyone who does not do that.

At the risk of pre-empting the next question, I indicate that I know of a couple of cases before the courts at the moment involving people who have been charged with stealing from the hospital system. However inadequate the procedures may be, in that particular instance they appear to be adequate because the people have been apprehended and are before the courts. I will not go into the specific details of those allegations and charges and people are free to find out and print what they wish within the law. I stress that, if anyone—including members opposite—has any information that would assist the police in identifying people engaged in criminal activity, they have an obligation to take that information to the police.

SEWER ODOURS

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): Will the Minister of Water Resources ask the E&WS Department to take immediate and urgent remedial action to eliminate what has been described as 'obnoxious gases emanating from the vent of a concentrated sewer tank'? I have been approached by a large number of residents living in Walkerville and Gilberton, and I understand that my colleague the member for Norwood has been approached by a large number of residents living on the St Peters side of the river, about the obnoxious gases that appear to be emanating from this vent situated near the busway and behind the Shell service station on the corner of Stephen Terrace and Eleventh Avenue.

These people are objecting to what they describe as the sickening malodour that causes residents nausea, headaches, sinusitis and other unpleasanties. They claim that the malodour deprives residents from spending time outdoors, gardening, etc., depending on which way the wind is blowing. They say that repeated calls to the E&WS Department in the city and Marden, while being met with kindness and understanding, have been of little value in having the problem rectified. A number of suggestions have been offered by residents about how the problem could be remedied effectively and economically and a number of these are technical matters relating to the way in which the venting system is organised. These have been brought to my attention and that of the member for Norwood so that some relief can be provided to the people living nearby.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I will desist from making any kind of humorous reference, because this is a serious problem. The unit to which the honourable member refers is a fan station situated on one of the E&WS main trunk sewers. These stations are vital for the safe operation and protection of the sewerage system. However, I recognise that some are causing odour problems. Sewerage systems, particularly large trunk sewers, must be vented to provide a safer working environment for maintenance personnel and to reduce the rate at which concrete sewers and access points may corrode. Corrosion of concrete pipes can cause serious

structural damage and lead to failure, incurring substantial expenditure for the rectification of the problem.

To turn the fan station off would lead to more severe odour problems and cause further problems within the sewerage system. I am aware of the problems of some fan stations on this trunk sewer, from representations made by the member for Peake on behalf of some of his constituents. Although the department has taken some action to endeavour to alleviate the situation at these fan stations, by cleaning the local sewers and finetuning the operation of the system, I have asked for investigations to be instigated into ways of providing long-term remedial measures.

Unfortunately, as an investigation of this nature is very technically complex and is not a routine investigation, it will be some time before a recommended course of action is available for consideration. I am aware of the problems that the honourable member's constituent is facing, and I am sympathetic in this regard. I give the honourable member my assurance that the situation is being thoroughly investigated, in an endeavour to resolve the matter. I will provide a report to the honourable member as soon as the investigation is completed.

COMMUNITY HOUSING ASSOCIATIONS

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction say whether the Government is satisfied that, through the Housing Trust, it has sufficient control over the management of community housing associations, given that these associations will receive an estimated \$7.4 million this financial year in untied Commonwealth grants, administered through the Housing Trust to finance these properties?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the Leader for his question. Before assuring the Leader, the House, and the South Australian community that the Government has confidence in the way that that program is being run, I remind the South Australian community that, under a Liberal Government, the cooperative housing program would be abandoned. I think that ought to be made perfectly clear. It is pertinent to remind the House that the housing cooperative program was established by the previous Liberal Administration. I would like to place on record my thanks to the Hon. Murray Hill (who at one time during his career as a Minister in a Liberal Government was I think quite unfairly tarnished for his development activities), because I think he was far ahead of his time in regard to cooperative housing programs in this State.

It is fair to say that one of the major benefits of the housing cooperative program is that it has the ability of channelling private funds into the lower income housing area. Some \$49 million in loans has been allocated from private lenders since the commencement of the program. I think it is there that the Leader is, in effect, raising doubts: that the subsidy to low income people of \$7.4 million, from untied grants fund, administered by the trust, is therefore wrong. I will prove to the House the positive aspects—although I will not prove it to the Leader, because he has received some information that, because there is a subsidy paid by the South Australian Housing Trust to low income people, that is therefore wrong. The philosophy of the Liberal Party is that one does not put funds—from either the Federal Government or the State Government—into low income housing. The Liberal Party does not agree with that.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: In fact, members of the Liberal Party have virtually said that they would abolish

the housing program, because they would abolish the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement if they gained office nationally. That is a fact. The member for Hanson can shake his head over and over again, but that is the case. As at 30 June 1988, there was a total of 43 housing associations approved under the program. Those associations had a stock of about 1 000 dwellings, which would house in excess of 3 000 people.

This is one of the main planks of this Government's housing program. Because we are talking about a subsidy of \$7.4 million, which was raised in the Auditor-General's Report, the Leader now asks whether we have full confidence in the way that this subsidy is being policed, and my reply is 'Yes'. I am working on the assumption that the Leader does not know anything about all the questions he asks—he just gets the question put in front of him and reads it out. The people responsible for writing the question may not have been able to do it properly, and I understand that there was a full-scale press briefing to the effect that the Opposition intended to put me on the spot today about the cooperative program.

The figure of \$7.4 million was mentioned in the Auditor-General's Report, together with the statement that a working party had been set up to review the whole of the cooperative program. If the Leader had followed my movements last year he would know that I undertook an overseas study tour and produced a report dealing with the cooperative programs in North America and the United Kingdom. He would also be aware, if he read my report, that the working party, with the Auditor-General's Department officers involved, has considered drafting amendments to the agreements signed between the Housing Association and the South Australian Housing Trust. It is looking at that area of concern mentioned in the Auditor-General's Report and will work on developing effective mechanisms for intervention.

The Government has full confidence in this program, and believes it is a subsidy well spent. There are over 1 000 properties which house over 3 000 people who would otherwise have to go into the private sector for their accommodation needs or put their names on the Housing Trust waiting list. I look forward to the next question from the next member of the Opposition to enlarge on my answer to the Leader.

GAS GUNS

Mr TYLER (Fisher): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning investigate the possibility of limiting the use of gas guns to frighten birds away from crops, particularly when they are used in residential areas?

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

Mr TYLER: I know that you are not interested in the well-being of my constituents, but I am, and I would like to explain the question to the Minister.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Fisher can not refer to members opposite as 'you'. The honourable member for Fisher.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Victoria should contain himself. The honourable member for Fisher.

Mr TYLER: Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I accept your ruling, but I was provoked by the member for Light.

Members interjecting:

Mr TYLER: I know that Opposition members are not interested, but if they would quieten down for a moment I would like to explain the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order and I ask all members to extend a reasonable degree of courtesy to a fellow member. The honourable member for Fisher.

Mr TYLER: I have been approached by many residents who live near a winery at Flagstaff Hill and who are becoming extremely distressed by the continual and frequent use of gas guns at the winery. In recent weeks the guns have been let off every five minutes. Residents tell me that it is like a shotgun being let off outside your back door every five minutes for many hours each day. This situation is particularly disturbing for shift workers, babies and family pets.

Residents assure me that they very much appreciate the need to protect crops and for that reason have been reluctant to take any action. However, this problem has been recurring now for several years and residents believe that a balance is required between the needs of the winery and those of nearby residents.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I will refer the matter to the Noise Control Branch of my department. It occurs to me that, if the guns are going off every five minutes, the novelty will wear off quickly and I do not know whether that frequency of explosion will ultimately have the effect sought. I am not aware of any specific regulations that can be brought to bear on this problem, but perhaps some conciliation and mitigation in which my officers could be involved would go one way to solving it. I recall facing this problem in earlier days around Reynella when I was the member for that area, and it is typical of these fringe parts of the metropolitan area where housing has intruded into what was once an area given over almost completely to horticultural or viticultural activity. I guess that is a further reason for limiting the outward expansion of metropolitan Adelaide, something to which this Government is committed.

The SPEAKER: Order! In view of the subject matter, it is probably appropriate that the Minister should be pursuing a report.

HOUSING ASSOCIATION REPORTS

Mr BECKER (Hanson): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction say why publicly funded housing associations are failing to fulfil their financial reporting obligations? The Housing Trust is represented on the boards of management of these associations supposedly to ensure that they abide by the conditions under which they are publicly funded. These associations are required by the Incorporation of Associations Act to provide an annual, audited financial statement to the Corporate Affairs Commission. However, a check of Corporate Affairs' records shows that this requirement is not being followed. For example, two of the largest community housing organisations are the Hindmarsh Housing Association and the Port Housing Association. They would receive at least \$400 000 a year in public money to finance their properties, yet no financial records are publicly available to show that they are entitled to this level of funding.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the member for Hanson for his question. It is good to see him back dealing with housing problems. Obviously, however, he was not listening to what I said in my reply to his Leader's question. I said that, as a result of the Auditor-General's Report and the concerns of my department, which were acknowledged by the Auditor-General in that report (and I suggest that the honourable member read the report), a working party had been set up with which the Auditor-General's department was involved.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The member for Light should sit quietly. If you are No. 3 I will answer your question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The working party, with which the Auditor-General is involved, has drafted amendments to the agreement and has considered concerns moved in the Auditor-General's Report, which specifically picks up the concerns referred to by the member for Hanson, such as the provision of reports into the appropriate authority. I remind the honourable member, however, that we are not talking about criminal activities: I am talking about responsible organisations. I therefore suggest that, if the honourable member is casting aspersions on the credibility of the two organisations he referred to in the explanation to his question (as to whether they are trying to cheat or beat the system by channelling surplus money, if any, to other areas), he should say so outside the House so that those organisations may have a chance to take the appropriate action.

WEST LAKES POLLUTION

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Deputy Premier request Department of Environment and Planning officers to contact local West Lakes residents who are complaining of a 'strange white mist' and chemical-type smells which are reportedly permeating the West Lakes area and which have been reported as having sparked 'health fears' amongst those residents? In an article in the *Portside Messenger* a West Lakes resident, Margaret Johnson, yesterday expressed concerns that foul smells are causing headaches and nausea amongst local residents. The article states:

A strange white 'mist' and chemical-type smell have sparked health fears among West Lakes residents . . . they are often woken during the early hours by a strong 'chemical-type' smell.

But more disturbing to them are the 'violent' headaches and nausea which the smell seems to cause . . . 'We like to leave our windows open at night, but the smell comes in and after that we get these awful headaches and feel sick'.

'It's been happening about two or three times a week and I feel ill all day, or up until lunchtime.' . . . 'Last week it was really putrid and we lost sleep over it . . .'

The article goes on to say that some residents are considering moving out of the area. It also mentions that there are residents who suffer with sinus problems and who sometimes wake up because they can hardly breathe. Will the Minister instigate urgent investigations into this matter?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The short answer is 'Yes'. It may be that some of the extraordinary meteorological conditions of the past fortnight have had something to do with all this. I am aware that over the past week or so a couple of complaints have been made to the Air Pollution Control Branch. I will ask those people to expedite whatever work is already being done about that. It hardly needs to be stated that, where people exhibit certain physical symptoms, they should check with their general practitioner to establish that some other problem does not exist.

AIDS INFORMATION COMMITTEE

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Will the Minister of Health support the establishment of an all-Party AIDS information committee of State Parliament to receive information and allow informed discussion on the problem of AIDS to ensure that, wherever possible, there is a bipartisan approach by Parliament? Will the Minister ask the committee to consider, as its first task, whether current

guidelines should be revised in order to enable medical practitioners and all other workers in the health sector to be provided, on request, with information about HIV positive people or risk groups?

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: It is a novel approach. At first glance I cannot see anything to commend it, but I will certainly give the matter some thought. It is unlikely that any information would be peculiar to South Australia. I am not quite sure what kind of committee the honourable member had in mind; it was not clear from his question whether it should be a parliamentary committee—

The Hon. H. Allison: Bipartisan.

The Hon. F.T. BLEVINS: A parliamentary committee similar to a select committee or some other standing committee of the Parliament. At first glance it does not have anything to commend it, but I will consider it further. I do not think that there is anything peculiar to South Australia about AIDS. A number of national committees is already inquiring into research, treatment, methods of education, etc.

I do not think that a South Australian parliamentary committee would have anything to add to the debate. If the honourable member has any further justification for his suggestion, I will treat it seriously, because I believe that, in a number of these health issues, it should not be difficult to obtain a bipartisan policy. We can have our ideological differences about financing health. However, some of these matters do not relate to questions of ideology; rather, they are matters of fact which need assessing and then information should be given to the community. I believe that there is a sufficient number of national committees performing those tasks without our adding to the list. However, I will talk to the honourable member privately and further consider the matter.

SCHOOL CLASSROOM AIR-CONDITIONING

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): Will the Minister of Education give immediate consideration to the installation of air-conditioning in classrooms at the Largs North Primary School? The current run of hot weather—

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: That is exactly the sort of attitude that has brought this question to mind. The current run of hot weather has brought to a head the intolerable conditions for students and staff at this school. The roof of the school is of galvanised iron and of a very low profile. Consequently, the limited air space heats up and retains the heat, making the temperature in the classrooms unbearable. Parents have been so concerned about classroom conditions that they have taken their children out of classes and kept them away from school. It has been suggested in certain quarters that the school should instal air-conditioning at its own expense, but after an expense of \$10 000 in the last 12 months for the purchase of computing equipment, it is not in a position to do so. All other primary schools in the area are at least partly air-conditioned and I request the same consideration for the Largs North Primary School.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I am sure that all honourable members have had similar requests from schools and other institutions in their electorates during this heat wave. I pay tribute to the school communities, teachers, students and parents who have had a lot to put up with in maintaining school programs during such an intense period of heat in South Australia. There are, of course, students in many schools in remote areas of the State who have to endure this degree of heat for a much greater part of the year. I

have had representations from the Largs North Primary School and a number of sources in the local community and have read the press that has emanated from the school's representations.

The Education Department does not provide air-conditioning as a standard requirement in our schools in the metropolitan area of Adelaide. However, as the honourable member has said, the Adelaide area of the department has a policy of assisting schools with the provision of air conditioning. That has been a successful program whereby the department is able to provide some funding and the school community also provides some funding where that is seen as the highest priority for that school community.

As the honourable member stated, the parent body and school community of the Largs North Primary School obviously saw other equipment for the school as a higher priority. I acknowledge that those decisions are often difficult to make. However, I understand that the school council has said that it has some \$800 that it can expend on air-conditioning for a double-storey building particularly affected in hot weather. However, the department estimates that the cost of installing effective air-conditioning in that building would be in the vicinity of \$20 000 to \$25 000, so there is a substantial shortfall. Obviously the department and the school community will continue discussions to ascertain whether agreement can be reached and further funding raised. I understand that there may be some alternative means of providing a cooler working environment for teachers and students in that school and such alternative measures will be similarly pursued.

POLICE RETIREMENTS

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Has the Minister of Emergency Services been advised of a current or impending higher than normal rate of resignations and retirements from the Police Force? The Opposition has been informed that up to 90 officers, with some nine or 10 at superintendent rank or above, have either left or notified their intention to leave the force ahead of their expected separation date and that this is directly related to concerns that legislation to update the Police Pension Act is being delayed.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: No, I have not been made aware of that but I will check out the matter very carefully indeed. Obviously, the matter of amendments to the Police Pension Act must go through all the proper channels. The Police Pension Act was trailblazing legislation in its time. It was the first example where the Parliament built in cost of living adjustments and that sort of thing—in the early years of the 1970s, when inflation was running at a reasonably high level. Equity between these people and other employees in the public sector must also be considered. However, I will get that information and bring back a report for the honourable member.

ANZAC FRIGATE PROGRAM

Mr RANN (Briggs): Will the Minister for State Development and Technology advise the House on the anticipated benefits to our local defence, electronics and engineering industries of South Australia's participation in the \$5.5 billion Anzac frigate program involving the construction of eight frigates for the Royal Australian Navy and up to four frigates for the Royal New Zealand Navy?

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: I can advise that South Australia is well placed to benefit through whoever wins

the frigate contract. It must be noted that this is a very significant contract; in fact, it is larger than the submarine project. Tenders from the two consortia bidding for the contract to build the frigates, Australian Warship Systems (AWS) and AMEC Consolidated (AMECON)—

The Hon. T. Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: Well, the member for Alexandra seems to want to nitpick: he is obviously following the lead of the Deputy Leader and the member for Mitcham who, as I recall, during the 1987 Estimates Committees, pooh-pooed the idea that we had any chance of winning the submarine contract. Obviously, the member for Alexandra is following that same lead of constantly knocking any proposition.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: Well, go back to the 1987 Estimates Committees and recall the comments made by honourable members opposite. Both consortia have asked a number of South Australian firms to quote for subcontract work on the ships and their sub-systems. Therefore, whichever tenderer is selected by the Federal Government, South Australian firms are well placed to win substantial work from the project. This applies particularly to the electronics, data systems and metal fabrication sectors.

Indeed, I remind the House of the statement made by the Premier in recent weeks about Philips Electronikindustri AB (PEAB) and Computer Sciences of Australia (CSA) teaming to work on a command and control system in Adelaide if their bid is successful. That is a clear example of the benefits of the frigate project to South Australia. The Department of State Development and Technology is maintaining close contact with both consortia and with the Department of Defence. South Australian firms will be well placed. However, they cannot expect that these subcontracts will simply be theirs for the picking. They must provide quality tenders based on the best that they can offer. We expect a decision on the contract by September 1989.

POLICE PENSION FUND

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Is the Minister of Emergency Services aware of any financial difficulties for the Police Pension Fund and, if so, what are they? I ask this question in view of information put to the Opposition that there is 'a hunt' to locate a \$4.5 million deficit in the fund.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I will get the information for the honourable member.

HOUSING TRUST STOCK

Mr De LAINE (Price): My question is directed to the Minister of Housing and Construction. What are the criteria used by the Housing Trust to determine the type, condition and location of private dwellings when purchasing established homes for trust stock? The Housing Trust owns quite a large number of private dwellings in my electorate. These dwellings are located in a wide variety of areas and consist of a wide range of homes in terms of age, size and style. Constituents have asked me how the trust selects the properties that it acquires.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The honourable member's question highlights one aspect of the trust program that has been very well received because it not only meets the Government's social mix policy but also provides an alternative to the public perception of what trust housing is all about.

The Housing Trust's Purchased House Program commenced in 1973 and, to date, a total of 6 784 existing dwellings have been purchased. Of this number, approximately 75 per cent are located in the central metropolitan area, reflecting the trust's priority on purchasing units in this area, where there is greatest demand.

Purchases are predominantly two-bedroom houses, including units on strata title, and large three-bedroom housing which has the potential for redevelopment. The purchase program is ideally suited to broadening the distribution of trust stock without producing concentrations of public housing in any single location. This strategy also supports the Government's policy of urban consolidation and has the potential of providing infill sites capable of producing hundreds of units of accommodation within the central metropolitan area each year.

The trust purchases housing at the lower end of the market, with the all-up capital cost of two and three-bedroom accommodation generally restricted to \$75 000 and \$85 000 respectively (the all-up capital cost includes purchase price and agent fees, upgrading costs and administrative costs). As the condition of each house can vary considerably, care is taken in assessing the extent of necessary upgrading to bring dwellings up to an acceptable rental standard. The cost of upgrading is taken into consideration when making an offer to purchase. The purchase of established houses is a valuable and cost effective adjunct to the new construction program in areas where vacant land is scarce and consequently in high demand and expensive. The Government will continue to support the South Australian Housing Trust's purchase program as an important adjunct to the new construction program.

WUDINNA AREA SCHOOL

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): Will the Minister of Education say when it is expected that redevelopment work will be undertaken at the Wudinna Area School? For more than 20 years the Wudinna Area School has been promised total redevelopment. Many requests for minor works have been refused on the basis that the Wudinna Area School is to be totally redeveloped. More recently, and as a result of the rural crisis and the inability of parents to fund students for senior secondary studies in Adelaide or elsewhere, there is now a record number of year 12 students at the school.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I am sorry that I did not have advance notice of the honourable member's interest because I could have obtained some more up-to-date information. I understand that some work is being undertaken or is due to be undertaken at the school, and that some further improvements are to be made. I have received representations on this matter for some time. I am delighted that many more young people in the rural areas of South Australia want to stay on until year 12. That is a challenge that the Education Department must meet. Every young person has the fundamental right to complete 12 years of formal education. In the past, it has been difficult for some young people in the more remote areas of the State to achieve that goal. This matter is receiving very active attention from the Education Department and I know that work is to be undertaken at the Wudinna school, so I will obtain details for the honourable member.

WEED CONTROL

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): Is the Minister for Environment and Planning aware of an article in the *Farmer and*

Stockowner of 21 September last year suggesting that two district councils on Eyre Peninsula have found that using native vegetation is an economical way of controlling roadside weeds? The article quoted Mr Bill Hitchcock, the Eyre Peninsula representative on the South Australian Animal and Plant Control Commission, who expressed the hope that:

... this environmentally attractive technique would provide a long-term solution to weed control, reducing the need for annual spraying campaigns.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I do not recall seeing the article, but I think I can give a little bit of information, because I have been made aware, by my representative on the Animal and Plant Control Commission, Mr Nicholas Newland, that the commission has been considering for some time the use of the planting of native species as a substitute for spraying. I understand that two trial areas have now been set up, one on Eyre Peninsula and one in the Upper South-East, where trials are being conducted. Should they be successful, then obviously this can be taken up in the extension programs of the Department of Agriculture and, indeed, my own department would be very interested in encouraging the whole concept. There are obvious problems, including cost problems, in having to spray roadside verges to keep down weeds, and there are obvious environmental advantages, as well as economic advantages, in being able to get strong and viable stands of native vegetation that will out-compete the weed species.

MOUNT BARKER ROAD

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I address my question to the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Transport, and in his capacity as the Treasurer. Will the Premier explain to the House the precise situation regarding funding for the realignment of the Mount Barker Road between Crafers and Cross Road? I have been informed, from representations that I have received, that there is much confusion in the community regarding funding for this project. The Minister of Transport has continued to tell this House that the appropriate procedures are being followed to ensure that Commonwealth funding is made available. However, the Minister's Federal colleague, who is actually responsible for providing funds for this project, in a statement made some two weeks ago, said that funding for the project may not be available at all. Because of the need for a firm commitment to be made regarding this project and to ensure that the project is carried out, I seek clarification of this matter.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think this matter received some publicity about two weeks ago, following the statement made by the Federal Minister. I am not sure how to interpret that statement myself, but from what I understand from my colleague the fact is that a considerable sum of money has been allocated and is being spent on the engineering and alignment studies related to the Mount Barker Road upgrade. Certainly, as far as my Government is concerned, we are committed to seeing that project move into construction as soon as possible.

PROSPECT PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr DUGAN (Adelaide): Will the Minister of Education give the House details of the repairs that have been effected at the Prospect Primary School, following a recent fire at the school? Also, has any inconvenience been caused to

students as a result of the building work carried out following that fire?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his interest in this matter. It was a most distressing occurrence for the school. It is at near capacity, and to have a fire of this type occur there was indeed a tragedy for the learning programs in that school. The fire destroyed a single timber building, and a dual timber building was damaged also, but fortunately to a lesser extent. After discussions with the personnel at the school it was decided to demolish the single timber building, and that has since been done. The dual timber building was repaired, and work has begun to rearrange and upgrade existing spaces in other parts of the school. These arrangements were agreed after consultation with the school community. I am advised that these works will be completed by the end of this month.

The school was able to accommodate its enrolment within its facilities, pending the completion of the work, I understand that there has been no noticeable effect on enrolments as a result of the fire. The new work will not only replace the lost accommodation through loss of the building but will be able to cater for the anticipated short-term increases in enrolments in that locality. I want to extend my sympathies to the staff and the students of the Prospect Primary School for the loss of the very valuable materials and equipment which occurred as a result of that fire, and I thank them for the cooperative way that they have coped with the temporary inconvenience that has occurred during this transition period. I also want to thank them for their efforts to ensure the continuity of the school's high quality education programs for the benefit of all students at Prospect Primary School.

COUNTRY BUS SERVICES

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I had hoped to address my question to the Minister of Transport, but in his absence I will direct it to the Premier. Will the Premier say whether the Government will provide assistance for bus services to country areas of South Australia? From Monday 20 March the bus service which services central and southern Yorke Peninsula will be further scaled down so that many towns now served daily will be serviced only three or four times a week—a 50 per cent reduction in service. This will greatly disadvantage those people—particularly young people and the aged—who rely heavily on bus services to Adelaide.

This comes on top of a reduction in services to other country towns on Yorke Peninsula in the past year or two. I wrote to the manager of the bus company concerned regarding this reduction in services, and was informed that, although the Government determines the allocation of bus services and imposes licence fees for the right to operate those services, it makes no financial contribution nor offers any assistance. Yet, subsidies of \$120 million annually go towards the operation of the metropolitan bus services.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have no detailed knowledge of this matter, so I will refer it to my colleague, the Minister of Transport.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act for the

appropriation of money from the consolidated account for the financial year ending 30 June 1990. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to grant supply for the early months of the next financial year. Present indications are that the appropriation authority already granted by Parliament in respect of 1988-89 will be adequate to meet the financial requirements of the Government through to the end of the financial year. The Government will, of course, continue to monitor the situation very closely, but it is unlikely that additional appropriation authority will prove to be necessary.

The 1988-89 budget provided for a net financing requirement of \$226.1 million. While it would not be prudent to make precise forecasts at this stage, I can advise the House of some of the factors which will influence actual outcomes this financial year as compared with the budget estimates.

Recurrent Budget

On the receipts side, there are indications that total receipts may be ahead of budget. Commonwealth general purpose recurrent grants are expected to exceed budget mainly because higher than expected inflation has resulted in a higher indexed level of financial assistance grants. At the May 1988 Premiers' Conference, the Commonwealth agreed to index a base level of financial assistance grants by the actual increase in the consumer price index for the four quarters ending March 1989 over the preceding four quarters. The indexation of Commonwealth funding, however, needs to be viewed in the context of the significant cuts that were made by the Commonwealth in setting the base amount at the time of the 1988 Premiers' Conference.

Specific purpose recurrent funds from the Commonwealth are also expected to be above budget. Budgeted funding levels for specific programs were based on information prior to the release of the Commonwealth budget. Since that time, funding levels have been refined and, in some cases, significantly revised. In most cases, however, these higher funding levels are mirrored by higher payments so that the net improvement to the budget from this source is limited.

Higher than expected receipts from stamp duties, payroll tax, and gambling will be partially offset by lower than expected receipts from registration fees and drivers licences. The improved performance mainly reflects more buoyant economic conditions reflected in employment levels, property market activity and, to a lesser extent, motor vehicle activity.

An important area in which there will be an overall deterioration in receipts is royalties. Delays in the commissioning of the Roxby Downs plant, declining prices for minerals and liquids, and lower mineral production levels will combine to reduce royalty receipts below budget expectations. Overall, however, the expectation is that receipts may exceed the budget estimate.

On the expenditure side, the Government is maintaining its policy of tight control. As I have stressed in this speech for a number of years the need is for restraint and agencies have been given the task of achieving major economies in order to manage within their allocations. In general it is expected that these economies will be achieved. After allowing for variations in Commonwealth funded programs, it is anticipated that there may be some improvement against the budgeted end-of-year result.

It is anticipated that there will be a reduction below the budget amount for the Engineering and Water Supply Department deficit, largely reflecting higher than anticipated revenues from rates and other fees. These savings are offset

by the net impact of increases in interest rates and additional costs associated with increased utilisation of the public health system.

Capital Budget

At this stage it is anticipated that there may be some overall improvement in the budget in relation to capital works. On the receipts side an increase of about \$12 million is expected, mainly because of several large property sales which were not anticipated in the budget. The expenditure side of the capital budget is expected to increase by about \$5 million largely through additional expenditure on property rationalisations including projects such as the relocation from Ru Rua and the development of Goodwood Orphanage.

Overall Budget Result

At this stage of the year, it is expected that the overall outcome on Consolidated Account may show some improvement in relation to the estimate. However, it is too early to estimate how significant any improvement might be. In relation to next year, notwithstanding any improvements in the present year, there is nothing to indicate that the Government will be able to relax its policy of maintaining firm control over expenditures.

Supply Provisions

Turning to the legislation now before us, the Bill provides for the appropriation of \$750 million to enable the Government to continue to provide public services during the early months of 1989-90. In the absence of special arrangements in the form of the Supply Acts, there would be no parliamentary authority for expenditure between the commencement of the new financial year and the date on which assent is given to the main Appropriation Bill. It is customary for the Government to present two Supply Bills each year, the first covering estimated expenditure during July and August and the second covering the remainder of the period prior to the Appropriation Bill becoming law. That practice will be followed again this year.

Members will note that the authority sought this year of \$750 million is about 7 per cent more than the \$700 million sought for the first two months of 1988-89. This is broadly in line with the increases in wages and other costs faced by the Government over the past year, and should be adequate for the two months in question.

Clause 1 is formal: clause 2 provides for the appropriation of up to \$750 million, and imposes limitations on the issue and application of this amount.

Mr OLSEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

AUSTRALIAN AIRLINES (INTRASTATE SERVICES) BILL

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood, for the Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport), obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to enable the operation of air services in South Australia by Australian Airlines Limited or a subsidiary of that company. Read a first time.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: 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

State Governments have jurisdiction over intrastate air transport, but South Australia chooses not to regulate air

services within the State and has maintained a consistent policy of allowing access to any operator wishing to engage in intrastate airline operations. However, provisions of the Commonwealth Constitution prevent Australian Airlines, because it is a Commonwealth instrumentality, from operating intrastate air routes without enabling State legislation.

The effect of this Bill is to enable Australian Airlines and its subsidiaries to operate air services between airports within South Australia, or to enter into operating agreements with intrastate operators. The Bill neither grants any rights or privileges to Australian Airlines that other carriers do not already have, nor does it relinquish jurisdiction over South Australian intrastate services to the Commonwealth.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides that the Act will come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 3 provides that section 54 of the Australian Airlines (Conversion to Public Company) Act 1988 of the Commonwealth is adopted, thereby enabling Australian Airlines and its subsidiaries to operate South Australian intrastate services.

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

BOTANIC GARDENS ACT

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D.J. Hopgood:

That this House resolves to recommend to His Excellency the Governor that, pursuant to sections 13 and 14 of the Botanic Gardens Act 1978, part section 529, hundred of Onkaparinga, be disposed of; and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

(Continued from 23 February. Page 2151.)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): The Opposition supports this motion, which really tidies up some shabby Cabinet and ministerial work that took place in 1984. I rather suspect that the parcel of land in respect of which we are giving the Government the opportunity to sell off has already been occupied by the purchasers, probably for the past four years, because it is clear from the documentation that came before Parliament in a previous session that it was intended that not only the house at Kooroora but also the two parcels of land A and B associated with section 529 in the hundred of Onkaparinga had been intended as part of the sale. In fact, on 19 February 1985 the Minister indicated that on 2 April 1984 Cabinet had approved the disposal of the parcels of land marked A and B on the map and that disposal of the house marked C would complete the rationalisation of the boundary. That was a clear intention that the lot was to go as one.

In his explanation of the motion, the Minister has drawn attention to the fact that the two dockets became separated during their passage through the Minister's office in 1984 and 1985, and it was that problem, and no clear indication of what should have been by the Minister, his staff, or the Cabinet (and I especially point to the Cabinet), that resulted in the error being picked up. We have a situation that there is nothing of great moment in the motion before the House. It fulfils a promise and an indication expressed by the Opposition earlier that it would not stand in the way of this rationalisation and, in the hope that the current residents will continue to occupy their area without difficulty, we support the motion.

It is necessary that this matter lie on the table in another place for some days because it is required that the measure

be on the table of the two Houses for 14 days before it can be finally passed through both Houses. I see no difficulty with the end result being as such. However, I note that my colleague the member for Davenport (the member for Fisher as he was then), when addressing this matter on 20 February 1985 (and I remind members that it came before the House on 19 February and the Opposition was prepared to accept the passage of the measure one day later), said:

I take the opportunity of supporting the motion and putting something to the Minister which needs to be considered when we look at the part of the Botanic Gardens comprising this house and land which is to be annexed off and sold—

it was obvious that the intention had been spelled out even though the documentation did not live up to expectations—as well as a neighbouring piece of land which adjoins that park—the old council quarry alongside the Crafers Primary School. There is no doubt that the old homestead serves little purpose for the Botanic Gardens and it is another worry for those who maintain our Botanic Gardens.

I am not aware whether that further parcel of land has been subsequently addressed by the Government, but there we have from the practical experience of a person living in the area a statement that suggests that rationalisation is still possible in that direction if necessary.

When discussing this matter in another place on 28 March 1985, the Hon. Murray Hill drew to the attention of the Council the fact that a plan of the proposal had not been displayed on any board in the Upper House. Indeed, it may well have been that, if the normal procedure in respect of such parcels of land had been followed and a plan displayed, the error that we are now correcting would have been detected then.

Although not wishing to draw my own activities to the attention of members, I suggest that, if we are to address similar circumstances in future, a plan directly associated with the consideration of such matters in this House should accompany the legislation or motion. Indeed, it was necessary to make representations to the Minister's office subsequent to the moving of this motion in this House before the plan, now displayed to my right, was provided. We can, at our peril, cut corners in such issues and I believe that it behoves all those in ministerial departments to ensure that they fulfil all the obligations in respect of the presentation of a parcel to Parliament, not only concerning those that seem to be most important at the time.

If that is considered to be a shafting of someone in the department, then so be it. However, I draw to the attention of members the fact that Parliament is here to give due and proper consideration to as much information as is necessary to fulfil its obligations in respect of the motion before the House, and without the plan that could not have been the case. The Opposition supports the motion.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I want to provide further background to the questions asked by the Opposition this afternoon about taxpayer-funded community housing associations. There is evidence that some of the public money invested in these associations is being misused and that the Government has failed to take sufficient action to ensure that it can account for their management. The Premier admits that South Australia has a housing crisis.

Low income earners are the most vulnerable in this situation. It is one which demands that the Government takes all necessary action to ensure that public funds allocated to low income earners for housing is fairly and responsibly spent. Measured by these requirements, this Government has failed. Housing associations have mushroomed in recent years. In 1982, one was formed: there are now 40 in South Australia. They are responsible for 840 homes, with many more in the pipeline. The mortgages outstanding on these properties are guaranteed by the taxpayer. At the end of last financial year they totalled \$49.9 million. It is estimated that taxpayer funds amounting to \$7.4 million will be required to service these loans this financial year.

Under the funding scheme, community housing associations borrow money from private lenders to provide housing for people in need. The Housing Trust then subsidises their mortgage repayments by paying the difference between the contributions which the cooperatives raise through their rents and the cost of the loan. Under these arrangements, these associations make only a minimal contribution to the cost of these loans. The selection of tenants is left to the associations, as is the determination of how much tenants are able to pay in rent. The less tenants are liable to contribute, the more taxpayers become liable.

The funds to subsidise loans are provided from untied Commonwealth grants for low income housing, although significant responsibilities are imposed upon the States to ensure that this money is spent properly. In 1985, the Commonwealth also began making grants for administrative and other purposes to local government and housing associations under the Local Government and Community Housing Program. The grants provided so far to South Australia amount to almost \$3 million.

In total, therefore, the amount of taxpayers money invested since 1982 in this form of assistance for low income housing is that \$3 million plus, to the end of last financial year, just over \$15.8 million in acquisition costs, bridging finance interest, mortgage repayments and salary grants—a total of more than \$18 million. In addition, there is the recurrent commitment—currently \$7.45 million per year—which will be required for many years into the future and, in fact, increase if these cooperatives continue to grow and to be funded as they are at present.

On this basis, public investment in these cooperatives over a 20 year period to the time that their loans are repaid would amount to well over \$150 million in current dollars. With such a significant commitment, the Parliament and taxpayers are entitled to assume that the Government has some degree of control over how this money is to be spent, but it does not.

As evidence, I refer first to the Port Housing Association. This cooperative was incorporated early in 1985, following action taken by the Port Unemployed Self Help Incorporated (PUSH), another Government-funded organisation. PUSH will become more relevant to this matter in a moment. The Port Housing Association, soon after its incorporation, received a Commonwealth grant of \$109 000 to help it on its way. A brochure published by the association in 1985 explained how it intended to go about buying houses. It states:

They [referring to members of the association] look in the paper, approach real estate agents and just look out for houses while out walking or on the bus. If someone sees a house, they contact the management committee who refer it to the trust for their approval.

This has been an approach, however unscientific, which has produced spectacular growth in the association's assets. It now has 15 properties which cost almost \$1.4 million. Their purchase price ranged to almost \$250 000. Last financial

year, rent received from these properties amounted to just over \$40 600. The balance of the funds required to service mortgage repayments—almost \$178 500—came from taxpayers.

In April 1988 the Opposition had reason to raise questions in both Houses about alleged improprieties in the spending of this money. These allegations included favoured treatment for some tenants and some rents not meeting Housing Trust requirements that they should contribute 20 per cent of the earnings of all those living at a property. At the same time, questions were asked of the Attorney-General about several members of the committee of management of PUSH, who also were involved with the Port Housing Association. These questions involved convictions which meant those members were in breach of the Associations Incorporation Act.

No answers have been given, even though that matter was again raised by the Opposition in December 1988 after we discovered that prosecutions had been dropped. The Minister of Housing and Construction, in his reply to our original questions, promised an urgent investigation. Almost a year later, Parliament has still not been told about the results of that investigation, but what I can now reveal to the House is that, more than five months before the Minister promised an urgent investigation, he was well aware of serious problems involving the Port Housing Association.

I have in my possession a copy of a letter dated 2 November, 1987, written to the Minister by the association following a meeting between him and association representatives. That letter detailed various problems which had arisen, particularly as a result of the association's continuing link with Port Unemployed Self Help (PUSH). At that time, the co-ordinator of PUSH was a Mr N. Wagner. In this position, he was in receipt of a weekly salary of more than \$400. Mr Wagner lived in a house owned by the association at 797 Torrens Road with a *de facto* and her sister. Their combined salaries totalled \$670 a week, requiring them to pay rental of \$134 according to Housing Trust criteria, but they were paying only \$46 a week.

I am in receipt of more recent information about the activities of Mr Wagner. During last year, his *de facto* moved out of the Torrens Road house but was able, through a vote in which Mr Wagner approved her application, to obtain immediately another association house at 6 Mary Street, Peterhead, despite the fact that the association has considerable demand for its houses. Some people have been waiting several years. Further this opportunity is not available to the more than 43 000 people on the Housing Trust waiting list.

Another association house at 6 Ralph Street, Largs Bay, was allocated last year to a man who claimed to qualify for sole occupancy because he said he had a son by an unmarried mother who would be staying with him at regular intervals. When the fact was established that the man did not have a son, a vote of the association, controlled by Mr Wagner, determined that a brother of Mr Wagner's *de facto* be given shared occupancy to prevent this man from being evicted. However, this arrangement did not last very long. The co-tenant left later owing 10 weeks rent. Another associate of Mr Wagner's last year vacated an association house at 82 Strathfield Terrace, Largs owing seven weeks rent.

The undesirability of Mr Wagner's influence on the Port Housing Association is confirmed by the fact that the Government has now discontinued Community Welfare Department grants to PUSH, no doubt as a result of the Opposition's probing. These grants have totalled almost \$120 000 over the past four years—much of this to pay Mr Wagner's salary. By letter dated 24 January this year, the

Minister of Community Welfare advised that funding of PUSH was being discontinued because:

Internal dissension within the organisation has had a serious deleterious effect on the services and programs of PUSH and because the involvement of the unemployed in the programs has been very low.

In other words, this public money has been largely wasted. It did not get to the people it was meant to help.

The House has not been informed by the Minister of the actions she has belatedly, and perhaps reluctantly, taken despite previous Government assurances that these matters would be reported on to Parliament. The Minister of Housing and Construction still fails to report to the House on Opposition questions about these organisations first raised in April last year and reinforced with further information in December 1988.

I turn now to the Hindmarsh Housing Association, which was one of the first cooperatives formed. It now has 34 properties worth more than \$2.1 million they include a property in Musgrave Avenue, West Hindmarsh, bought in June 1987 for \$264 000—a property rated by the Lands Department as 'luxury'. This again raised the question of whether public funds spent on housing for low income earners could be stretched further by buying more properties of less value.

The Opposition has been told that two of the association's properties are occupied by public servants, while a third is occupied by a senior social worker who has permanent after-hours access to a car provided by the agency for which she works. Are these people really 'low income earners' as required by the guidelines establishing these housing associations?

One problem in seeking further financial information about these associations is that they are not meeting their reporting obligations under the Associations Incorporation Act. This Act requires all incorporated associations with annual gross receipts of more than \$100 000 to lodge an annual audited financial return with the Department of Corporate Affairs. However, Corporate Affairs records show that both the Port Adelaide and Hindmarsh associations have failed to do so, even though their gross receipts would total more than \$200 000 a year. I also understand all property valuations and settlements for community housing associations are handled by one particular real estate company which has earned \$400 000 for this business over the past three years.

Another issue which has arisen during our detailed research of this matter involves Housing Trust expenditure on a property at Brompton rented by an employee of the Community Housing Assistance Service of South Australia.

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

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): I wish to touch on a problem in the electorates of Semaphore and Price in the City of Port Adelaide, namely, the application by local government for dry areas within the council boundary. It applied last year, but there seems to be an inordinate delay in the application of these areas. I ask for some consideration from the Government and the Attorney-General in this matter. In 1985 we passed legislation to provide for dry areas under regulation and, as I understand it, only two major areas have been declared dry areas, namely at Glenelg and Port Augusta out of all the applications put in. Port Adelaide has a valid case for two areas to be declared dry. I have received a letter from the Corporation of the City of Port Adelaide as has my colleague Mr De Laine, the member for Price. That letter states:

Alcohol-free zones—Port Mall and Semaphore foreshore.

They are the two areas to which I refer. The letter continues:

As you are aware council has forwarded an application to the Minister of Consumer Affairs for the Port mall area and the Semaphore foreshore area to be declared an alcohol free zone by the licensed premises division. The application was forwarded by council's solicitors in November 1988. In February 1989 council's solicitors advised council of the current situation which is that the investigation has not yet commenced and our application is only one of a number of applications which have been lodged with the licensed premises division.

That indicates the queue that is apparently forming. The letter continues:

Mr Prior, of the Minister of Consumer Affairs' Office, advised us that their experience to date has been that the declaration of dry areas does not solve the problem, but merely shifts the problem to another area.

In many cases the problem has come from other areas, such as Adelaide, down south, Hindmarsh and other places. People come to the recreation areas of Semaphore and drink on the foreshore. It is all right for them to move their problem down to us, but it is not all right for us to do something about it when we have the problem. That is unfair! I have heard people in this place talk about social justice and equality. What about a little bit for us? The letter continues:

He also advised us that at present there are three applications with the Attorney-General for his comments. He hopes to have some guidelines from the Minister and Cabinet within a few weeks which will enable him to process the other applications for dry areas.

We advised Mr Prior that the council is continuing to receive complaints from residents and beachgoers concerning the behaviour of people affected by alcohol and would like to see the matter resolved as soon as possible. Council at its meeting held on Monday 27 April 1988 resolved that the local members of Parliament—

and the member for Price and I have been contacted—

be approached with reference to alcohol free zones for the purpose of their possible influence . . .

I am using all the influence I can to have the matter considered. I will outline some of the complaints that have been received.

The Port mall area is in my colleague's electorate, but I am sure that he will not take umbrage if I refer to his electorate. To quote a report from the community services officer from the Port Adelaide council:

We write to you to ask your assistance in a problem that is affecting many businesses in the Port Adelaide Central Business District. We are very concerned over the consumption of alcohol in the Quebec mall and surrounding areas. The sight of drunks sprawled over the mall or urinating on plants and in rubbish bins or shouting abuse at passers by does nothing to further shoppers' interest in Port Adelaide.

At a time when Port Adelaide is allegedly moving ahead, surely the abolition of alcohol consumption and loitering in our main shopping complex would further this renaissance of our city. As our shopping mall is only 60 per cent occupied, it does not take much to convince shoppers that West Lakes or Arndale or Super K-mart are more desirable shopping centres.

There was also a recommendation that the application for a dry area be followed up. Also in the file of letters given to me is a copy of a letter from the Port Adelaide traders with many signatories. It refers to problems in the area. Semaphore was part of it and I have a letter from the council asking for that area to be considered, namely, the foreshore. The boundaries as defined by both applications are: at Semaphore—the western boundary of the esplanade to the low watermark at Semaphore, the northern boundary, the prolongation of the northern half of Hall Street to the low watermark, and the southern boundary, the prolongation of the southern half of South Terrace to the low watermark. In Port Adelaide it is from the eastern building alignment of Robe Street and the western building align-

ment of Marryatt Street, and from St Vincent's Street to Cannon Street, Port Adelaide.

This problem is so great that I also have a letter from the Port Adelaide Police Department about the problem. This is not a letter from a trader complaining about minor things but from the police. The inspector in charge at Port Adelaide states:

The consumption of alcohol and the associated behavioural problems within the Port mall area are a source of concern and considerable workload for police.

They could be out doing what police are supposed to do instead of attending to problem areas. The letter continues:

To gain an indication of the degree of demand this area creates for police patrols, the records for the months of May and June (1988) were collated and indicated a daily call for police attendance during that period with a higher arrest/report rate of offenders as a consequence of those calls.

As your local police body we are acutely aware of the disturbances, nuisances and interference with the rights of the public emanating from persons affected by alcohol in the area. In an attempt to alleviate the existing situation I have introduced permanent beat patrols on day and afternoon shifts. This action involves the use of human resources that have been drawn from other areas of commitment.

I am aware that declaration of the mall area as an alcohol free zone will have a displacement effect on the problem, as will the police on the beat initiative, but any such effect will cause relocation to an area more accessible to police and where interference with the public will be less frequent. I support the proposal of council in regard to the area defined in the correspondence . . .

In reference to the Semaphore foreshore the police state:

The problems associated with alcohol abuse on the Semaphore foreshore although a source of police attention are not of the degree of severity of the previously discussed matter. The nuisance caused in the Semaphore area is generally attributed to small minority groups . . .

Mr Tyler interjecting:

MR PETERSON: Here is one of the people who send their problems to Semaphore. He mentions a candidate against me. Let us see what influence he has. Let him fix it. I have not noticed anyone else coming down to fix it or fixing the honourable member's problems. The letter continues:

However, I am aware of the public feeling in relation to interference by alcohol affected people to families and groups endeavouring to enjoy the amenities of the area during the summer period.

This refers to the beach area. It continues:

This awareness, which is shared by patrol officers, necessitates a high police presence in the area concerned, employing police resources that could be used elsewhere . . . The persons who create the nuisance appear to be attracted to the area by the festive atmosphere created by the catering and entertainment venues and therefore a displacement effect should not be experienced by introduction of an alcohol free zone.

The argument against the proposition is that this displaces the problem elsewhere. This letter was from the Chief Inspector of Police at Port Adelaide—the area in which we are spending millions of dollars redeveloping: marine museum and a rail museum. Millions of dollars are being spent to redevelop the area and make it an attractive place. However, the council is not allowed to designate two dry areas, one in the middle of the city and one on the foreshore. The foreshore is used by many families from all over the State who come down on a hot night for recreation and swimming. That area is spoilt by drunks rolling on the grass. It is not spoilt anywhere else. Send your problems to Port Adelaide! Do not worry about us! Don't let us take control! Where is democracy when a council cannot make a decision on the dry areas it wants to establish? Where is the democracy? Why are these decisions coming forward? Why is not the council who has the vested responsibility—

An honourable member: They can do it with by-laws.

Mr PETERSON: They cannot do it with by-laws. Your law will not let that happen—the laws made by this Government will not let it happen!

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

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Following on the speech from the member for Hanson on housing cooperatives, I would like to make a few comments. The property cost the trust \$47 000 in April 1986. Subsequently, the trust spent an amount estimated by one builder at close to \$100 000 on extensions to this property. Now there are plans to spend a further \$8 000 on what is described as a 'coach house'.

The facts I have put before the House today raise serious concerns about allocations of public funds for housing for low income earners. I am not saying that all housing associations should be criticised but, if they are to continue to expand and to offer a fair and important service, the integrity of the majority must not be jeopardised by examples of misuse and abuse of public money by a few. Currently we have a situation for which this Government, and particularly the Minister of Housing and Construction, must take full responsibility. It is a situation in which:

1. Cooperatives receiving public funds totalling hundreds of thousands of dollars a year do not prepare audited financial returns as required by law.
2. The Government has minimal control over the management of properties bought and rented under this scheme; so that it cannot guarantee against misuse and abuse of public money.
3. The Government has no effective way of ensuring that the cooperatives make their own financial contributions to these schemes as required by the Housing Trust.

These are issues which have been concerning the Auditor-General for some time, as shown particularly by comments in his last report to Parliament. The taxpaying public deserves a full explanation from the Minister as to what action the Government intends to take to ensure that funds to provide housing for low income earners get to the people who really need them and are spent properly and responsibly.

In the past fortnight, when the heat has been on, some rather interesting problems have arisen in the STA. First, a signalling system broke down. That system has been down for at least three half days in the past 10 days. Those breakdowns have meant that all trains coming into the metropolitan area, particularly those coming into the Adelaide station, were held up. As a result, there were massive delays both in the morning and in the afternoon. Perhaps that is one of the inefficiencies Mr Fielding talked about.

Many of the Mercedes buses on the O-Bahn have been overheating. Perhaps all our German buses have been geared for the heat of Europe and not for the heat of South Australia. Perhaps that is the same problem that occurred with the Crouzet system when it was first introduced. I understand that, in the past few days, again there have been significant breakdowns in the Crouzet system. That again highlights the problems being experienced by the STA. Perhaps it also highlights very clearly the inefficiency problems.

Let us consider the air-conditioning of buses. Some 50 per cent of buses are not air-conditioned. Why not? We cannot turn on the air-conditioning because we are still frightened of legionnaire's disease. Two years ago we turned off the air-conditioners because there was concern about legionnaire's disease. What has been done about it? Why can we not fix that problem? If we cannot fix that problem, why are we not replacing the air-conditioning systems on

those buses? For two years we have heard nothing from the Minister of Transport about the problems of these buses, yet we are supposed to be encouraging people to use our transport system. If members of Parliament during the past few days had taken the time and effort to travel on buses, they would know why fewer people are using them. It is because we have a massive problem of overheating.

Let us now consider the rail system. Why do we have the red hens on the line in the middle of the day when we have 20 to 30 of the 2 000 and 3 000 series trains sitting in the yard? Why, in the heat of the day when we need air-conditioning, do we have all these trains sitting out there in the middle of the Adelaide yard?

A friend of mine from Salisbury—and the member for Briggs would know about this because I understand my friend rang and told him—came down in the morning on a series of trains—red hens—and it was 'hot as hell'. He said that when he came past the city yards he saw all these 2 000 and 3 000 series trains there and thought that there must be a reason for those air-conditioned trains standing there. When he went back at 4 o'clock, he expected the 2 000 and 3 000 series trains, the air-conditioned cars, to be available. But where were they? They were still in the yard. So, he and the other passengers had to travel to Gawler and Salisbury in hot, non-air-conditioned red hens.

What has happened to our consumer-oriented State Transport Authority? The authority and the Minister do not care about the customers. I have given two examples of air-conditioning being turned off when we have had the worst run of hot weather in this State for some time.

My next point concerns the decision made by the Equal Opportunities Tribunal in Adelaide on 3 February. The tribunal considered an application by the South Australian Tennis Association for an exemption to enable it to organise junior events for boys and girls under 13.

It was a simple, logical application, but it conflicted with the determination of the Equal Opportunity Commissioner. The tribunal noted in its decision that the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity supported the application for exemption, but was clear in her position that section 39 of the Act prohibited the provision of separate competitions for boys and girls 13 years and under.

This saga, supported by the Bannon Government, has been going on for three or four years. It was a joke yesterday when the Minister of Education said that the majority of parents support the legislation. He should also talk to some of the associations and listen to their difficulties. He should speak with the primary school sporting association (SAPSASA) about its difficulties. The final decision on this issue was, as follows:

Tennis is a competitive sporting activity in which the strength, stamina, or physique of the competitor is relevant because whether the game is played by males or females or both together at any age level the physical attributes of the competitor are relevant to the outcome.

Anyone with commonsense in the community knows that. Despite the Government's ridiculous stance, if children under the age of 13 compete against each other, the result will benefit equal opportunity. The only result is that girls miss out. The major thrust of the equal opportunity legislation should be to get more girls to compete, not to guarantee that fewer girls will be involved in competition.

I hope that the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity will accept the tribunal's decision. I also understand that there may be an appeal, which will be interesting. I understand that the Director of Education has advised SAPSASA that this decision is not to be sent to primary school principals. Why is it that primary school principals, who are generally opposed to this equal opportunity push by the Government,

should not know about this landmark decision which affects tennis, athletics, swimming, softball and netball? Anyone who has been involved with those associations would know that they are concerned about the decreasing numbers of girls in competition. Indeed, they want more girls to play in these traditionally female sports.

The Opposition has no objection to boys playing softball or being involved in netball, but to have a competition where girls, in particular, miss out is ridiculous and ludi-

crous. Yesterday the Minister said it had public support. Obviously, he walks around with his head in the sand because nearly every single sporting body I am involved with is concerned and is complaining about this issue. Hopefully, this landmark decision in tennis will now be transferred into some commonsense by the Bannon Government.

Motion carried.

At 3.51 p.m. the House adjourned until 14 March at 2 p.m.