

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 14 March 1989

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act Amendment,
Industrial and Commercial Training Act Amendment,
Market Acts Repeal,
North Haven Trust Act Amendment,
State Transport Authority Act Amendment,
Tertiary Education Act Amendment.

CREDIT UNIONS BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

PETITION: NOARLUNGA-SEAFORD PLAN

A petition signed by 643 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government not to implement option No. 1 of the Noarlunga-Seaford supplementary development plan was presented by the Hon. D.J. Hopgood. Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 183, 187, 198, 201, 210, 213, 244, 245 and 277; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

MARIJUANA CASE

In reply to **Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light)** 29 November.

The **Hon. G.J. CRAFTER**: Independent counsel Michael David QC did agree to the value of the crop for the purposes of the trial as \$2 million. The judge did not consider the question of value to be of critical importance for the trial. The value of the crop varied depending on how it was sold. Those charged here would expect to sell in one hundred pound lots or more at \$1 000 a pound or less. Those at the street end of the chain would sell in one pound lots or less at \$2 000 a pound or more. The estimated yield from the 4 224 plants was 2 000 pounds. Depending on how it was sold, the crop had a value of between something less than \$2 million to something in excess of \$4 million. The lower value was agreed as it more accurately reflected the position of those charged and avoided a costly and time consuming hearing on what was not a critical issue. Malvaso could not have been convicted of both the conspiracy and the substantive offence of producing. The latter was clearly the

more appropriate charge and the Crown agreed to accept a plea to it.

Hon. J.R. CORNWALL

In reply to **Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee)** 8 March.

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: Following appeal, Dr Humble was paid \$52 663, being damages plus interest. At this stage, no demand has been made for payment of legal costs by Dr Humble's or Dr Cornwall's solicitors.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

- By the Minister for the Arts (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—
Riverland Cultural Trust—Report, 1987-88.
- By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—
Environmental Protection Council—Report, 1987-88.
National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972—Regulations—
Park Management.
Planning Act 1982—Regulations—Gawler River Flood
Plain.
- By the Minister of Transport (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—
Local Government Superannuation Board—Report, 1986-
87.
State Transport Authority Superannuation and Pension
Schemes—Report, 1987-88.
- By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—
Companies (Application of Laws) Act 1982—Regula-
tions—Common Fund.
Securities Industry (Application of Laws) Act 1981—
Regulations—Common Fund.
- By the Minister of Health (Hon. F.T. Blevins)—
Commissioners of Charitable Funds—Report, 1987-88.
Central Eyre Peninsula Hospital Inc.—By-laws—Tres-
passing and Traffic.
- By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder)—
Electricity Trust of South Australia Act 1946—Regula-
tions—Vegetation Clearance (Amendment).

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: COMMUNITY HOUSING ASSOCIATIONS

The **Hon. T.H. HEMMING**s (Minister of Housing and Construction): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. T.H. HEMMING**s: Last Thursday during the adjournment debate the member for Hanson made a statement regarding community housing associations, the theme of which was an alleged misuse of public money by such associations. Some of the various specific allegations made by the honourable member were broadcast or published by sections of the news media.

It is essential to the well-being of the State's cooperative housing program that any community concern that may have arisen as a result of these allegations be laid to rest. Some of the claims made by the member for Hanson were also raised by the Hon. T. Griffin in another place and by the member for Light last year. I wish to inform the House that I have now had investigated all of the allegations made by the honourable members that relate to the portfolio of housing.

Following this detailed investigation by the South Australian Housing Trust and the Office of Housing, I am able

to say categorically that the claim of misuse of public money by the Hindmarsh and Port housing associations is untrue. I table for the House a copy of a report based on information supplied by the Housing Trust and the Office of Housing concerning each of the allegations raised by members opposite. I would draw this report to the specific attention of the media in the expectation that they will now broadcast and publish this report's findings in the interest of balanced coverage on this subject.

Because of the number of allegations and the lengthy history of the Government's dealings with the Port Housing Association, I intend not to consume too much time of the House with this statement but let the report speak for itself. However, given the seriousness of some of the allegations made by the member for Hanson last week and subsequently reported by some of the media, I feel it is necessary to answer them at this time.

Last week the member for Hanson claimed that a luxury-type property had been bought by the Hindmarsh Housing Association. He also suggested that two public servants and a 'senior' social worker residing in Hindmarsh Housing Association properties were in breach of guidelines for the cooperative housing program. A third allegation implied that the trust had spent an inappropriate amount of funds on a cooperative house at Brompton. All of these allegations and others were claimed by the member for Hanson to have resulted from 'detailed research on this matter' by the Liberal Party. The following responses make a mockery of this claim and expose the transparency of the honourable member's allegations. I draw the attention of the House to the following answers:

- The so-called luxury property alleged to have been bought by the Hindmarsh Housing Association is in fact a multiple unit property.
- It contains four three-bedroom separate dwellings which provide homes for about a dozen people, of whom half are children.
- This property did cost approximately \$264 000, but the average cost of each unit is \$66 000—quite a good buy for that location.

The implication that high-income people are paying inappropriately low rents in the Hindmarsh Housing Association is based on the claim that two public servants and a senior social worker are residents of that association. The facts are that, although there are two public servants living in the association's properties, one of them is a low-income clerical officer and the other a moderate income clerical officer. The social worker is not a public servant, and is not a senior social worker. This person also pays a market rent.

The property that is the subject of the allegation suggesting inappropriately high expenditure on a house at Brompton is, in fact, not even a cooperative property. It belongs to the Housing Trust and is rented to a trust tenant. However, the member for Hanson's claim that the trust spent \$100 000 on extensions to this property is false. The trust, in fact, has spent \$36 146 on renovating this property, which was built in 1866. I believe these answers and all other responses contained in the report which I tabled today confirm the integrity of the cooperative housing program.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: HOSPITAL SECURITY

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Last week, the Deputy Opposition Leader asked what action the Government was

taking about a report on security at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Flinders Medical Centre. In June last year, the South Australian Health Commission established a hospital security working party to oversee a review of security at these three hospitals.

The working party, comprising union representatives and senior officers from the South Australian Health Commission and the three hospitals concerned, assessed project proposals from various security firms and individuals. Arrangements were subsequently made for the review to be carried out by Mr Rodney Gibb, an officer seconded from the Department of TAFE, over a period of three months from 12 September.

On 19 December, Mr Gibb submitted his final report to the hospital security working party. In the interests of staff and patient safety and property security, distribution of the report was limited to members of the committee. By publicly disclosing the report, the Opposition is defeating this purpose. On 25 January this year the hospital security working party forwarded Mr Gibb's report to the Health Commission with its recommendations.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: We didn't even know there was a report.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Quite right. I will read it again: on 25 January this year, the hospital security working party forwarded Mr Gibb's report to the Health Commission with its recommendations. Just over a week later, the Health Commission approved the provision of \$80 000 in the current financial year to be used for improvements in the areas identified by Mr Gibb as requiring immediate attention. They included masterkey locking systems, staff identification cards and cash receiving and banking procedures.

In the following week, on 10 February, the Health Commission approved funding for a security consultant to work with, and provide more detailed advice to, the three hospitals in determining their security priorities and developing their security upgrade programs. The Health Commission also agreed to consider contributing to major items of security expenditure at the hospitals as a part of the normal budget process.

The Royal Adelaide Hospital, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Flinders Medical Centre are presently in the process of each selecting a senior officer to address the security issues raised in the report. These officers, whose positions will be funded by the Health Commission, will be responsible for determining priorities and developing programs to upgrade security in consultation with management, staff and union representatives.

This whole exercise to review and upgrade hospital security is a credit to the South Australian Health Commission, the representatives of the unions and hospitals involved in the working party and the author of the report. They have all approached this task responsibly and promptly. In contrast, the Opposition and its Deputy Leader have not been responsible. For nothing more than political capital, the Opposition, by disclosing this report, has knowingly made our hospitals, their patients and their staff vulnerable.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is good government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

QUESTION TIME

AMBULANCE DISPUTE

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I ask the Minister of Labour: in view of the Minister of Health's appeals to

private employers to assist in ensuring that volunteers are available to maintain an ambulance service in the current St John dispute, will the State Government reciprocate by giving paid time off to public servants who are St John volunteers and, if not, why not?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the honourable Deputy Leader for his question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I'm sorry, the Leader. I advise him that it is the Government's intention that any of its employees who volunteer to provide services during the current dispute will be given leave without pay. Any leave they take will be annual leave and not special leave with pay because they will be volunteers. I point out that the service is being manned by volunteers at the moment. I also think that the Deputy Leader—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the House to try to resist making the inevitable remarks. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: —knows that the service presently being provided is adequate. It is providing the transport needs of sick and injured people in South Australia. We hope that the paid employees return to work as soon as possible, but in the meantime we are committed to providing a service for the people of South Australia—and that is being provided very well at the moment.

ANSTEY HILL RESERVE

Ms GAYLER (Newland): Is the Minister for Environment and Planning aware of a recent bid by a private developer to subdivide hills face land which is part of the Anstey Hill Reserve in Tea Tree Gully and, if so, will the Minister say whether the National Parks and Wildlife Service has made a decision on that developer's proposition?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: From memory it was proposed that a piece of land be made available to that developer to produce 10 or 11 allotments. That proposal has been rejected. The area is hills face zoned and is proposed to be transferred under the National Parks and Wildlife Act. Members may be a little surprised that this land is not already part of the reserve system because it has been a Government reserve for some time. However, a survey is proceeding to define its boundaries. Once those boundaries have been defined, the area will be declared a recreation reserve under the National Parks and Wildlife Act. In all of this the service has worked closely with a group known as the Friends of Anstey Park which I believe has enthusiastically supported the decision which has been made.

AMBULANCE DISPUTE

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Does the Minister of Labour consider that any volunteer who takes the place of a stood down paid employee during the ambulance dispute is a scab, which is the description used by union officials?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order. The honourable Minister has been asked a question.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I now call on the Minister to reply and I call on the Leader of the Opposition to cease interjecting.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the Deputy Leader for his question and advise him that these people are volunteers and, as such, are providing an essential service for the people of South Australia. We consider them to be exactly what they are—volunteers.

TAFE SECURITY

Mrs APPLEBY (Hayward): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education inform the House of his response to public statements regarding security at technical and further education colleges? This morning the media carried reports of a statement by the Opposition education spokesman claiming that there were security problems in TAFE and alleging a lack of action by the Government.

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: I noticed the comments by the Hon. Mr Lucas in another place and I might say that I am appalled by them. The honourable member has attempted to create a front page advertisement spelling out to potential thieves what he alleges are the vulnerable parts in the TAFE system. He has attempted to say to prospective thieves in South Australia, 'Have you thought about the weakness in the TAFE college in relation to this?' Frankly, if he were serious about his responsibilities in this matter—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. L.M.F. ARNOLD: —he would have approached the Government and asked what it was doing in relation to this report; he would have found that we have already done a significant amount. But what I find is this absolutely irresponsible behaviour, in identifying this matter through the media, he is putting at risk assets paid for by the community and worked for by TAFE lecturers and staff in our colleges. The reality is that, in his attempt to do such a disreputable act as he has done (and as he did last week in relation to the Health Commission in his attempt to create insecurity in our system), he has also got his data wrong.

In his dramatic press release, which this morning was sent to the radio stations, he identified that he has this leaked document, as though it were a crisis situation and something had just recently dropped off the back of a truck. The reality is that, on 14 November 1986, which is a year or two ago, in a public document the Auditor-General identified that some issues needed to be addressed. Unlike the Hon. Mr Lucas in another place, he did not identify the particular areas which he thought were most vulnerable. That report resulted in the Department of TAFE appointing Rodney Gibb to undertake a consultancy over an 18-month period (indeed, I note that he has recently undertaken some work for the Health Commission also) to identify what should be done about these matters. It is his report to which the Hon. Mr Lucas referred. That report was completed in March 1988 and was circulated to college principals at that time. So much for a leaked report! It was sent to the very people to whom it ought to have been sent and it has been worked on since that time.

During that time significant efforts have been made to address what were seen to be certain shortcomings in particular areas in what is a very large system. That has resulted in the expenditure of considerable amounts of money, which the Opposition could have asked about in a more responsible forum during the Estimates Committees last year, but it chose not to do that.

The reality is that as a result of that report we have done a number of things. Unlike the Hon. Mr Lucas, I am not prepared to call the shots and to spell out to potential

thieves in our community where they could go for easy pickings. I am not prepared to say what upgrading of security we have undertaken, but I can assure members that we have done significant things and, if members opposite intend to follow the lead of the Hon. Mr Lucas in another place and look for easy pickings, they will be caught short, because we will be ready to catch them out. I call on the Hon. Mr Lucas to behave more responsibly in relation to a community resource. Surely we want it to be protected and not put at risk.

AMBULANCE DISPUTE

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): My question is directed to the Minister of Labour. Is the use of essential services legislation one option that the Government will consider to ensure that an ambulance service can be maintained in this current St John dispute?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The Government will consider all options at the appropriate time.

SAILBOARDING

Mr De LAINE (Price): Can the Minister of Marine tell the House whether it would be possible to introduce regulations to overcome problems associated with sailboarding along the coast? Following a claim that so far this summer more than 500 people have had to be rescued along the coast between Goolwa and Outer Harbor, police and volunteer rescue groups are calling for safety regulations relating to sailboarding. A spokesman from the South Australian Sea Rescue Squadron said that sailboarders are a constant problem, mainly because there are no rules to govern the sport. It has been stated that inexperience is the main problem, followed by solo sailboarding and people not wearing life jackets.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the honourable member for Price for his question. This is a matter which does cause some concern to the public of South Australia. There is no doubt that the increase in popularity of sailboards has resulted in some increase in problems relating to safety for the people who are using those boards. The most commonly reported problems are: operating without wearing an approved buoyancy vest; operating too close to swimmers; or being caught in off-shore winds and being unable to return. I have read reports where sailboard operators, particularly inexperienced ones, have not known how to turn the board around and get back to shore. There are regulations—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I would have thought that the member for Murray-Mallee, who is an expert in this matter apparently, would be able to ask the questions, instead of someone else. There are already regulations that prescribe the safety equipment that must be worn or carried and, in the case of sailboards, the regulations provide that an approved buoyancy garment must be worn at all times and that during the hours of darkness a waterproof torch or lantern must be carried.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: That just shows the intelligence of some members opposite, who think that one can use a hurricane lamp at sea on a sailboard. I would have thought that they would keep up with the modern development technology—particularly as I know that some of them watch television and would have seen the Dolphin

Lamps that still discharge light when they are under water. We have no plans at this stage to regulate further to require board riders to undertake training. The Yachting Association of South Australia does operate a training scheme for people who are new to sailboarding. I would urge every person who is considering purchasing or has just purchased a sailboard, or who is not sure how to operate their sailboard, to enrol in such a course. It is very important for them to do that, because every time they go out to sea and they are caught out there someone has to go out and rescue them, and that means that those people who are doing the rescuing are at times placed in danger.

AMBULANCE DISPUTE

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): Why has the Minister of Labour refused equivocally to support the Minister of Health in his handling of the St John Ambulance dispute?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: In answer to a previous question, the Minister failed to support the use of essential services legislation. His specific wording was, 'We will look at everything.' In doing so the Minister failed to support the statements made yesterday by the Minister of Health, who said that if St John could not continue to cope in the current dispute the Government would have to consider what other options are available, including the essential services legislation. So, will the Minister say whether he will look at the essential services legislation?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I now know why the member for Mitcham, the ex-shadow Minister of Labour, is really the ex-shadow; he could not understand what I said. In answer to the previous question, I said that we would look at every option—and that is what we intend to do.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Elizabeth.

HOUSING TRUST HOME PURCHASE

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction examine the conditions under which Housing Trust houses are sold to tenants to ensure that the requirement for tenants to have a \$500 deposit does not deprive tenants of limited means of the opportunity to purchase their home from the trust? Many low income tenants are able to qualify for the first home owners scheme subsidy, the stamp duty exemption and a State Bank concessional mortgage. If they complete the sale within a reasonable period, the trust administration fee is also waived.

The first home owners grant enables them to meet the bank's requirements for a loan and their weekly income is adequate to meet the mortgage repayments and ongoing expenses. However, some families who have raised the matter with me, especially those with children, are unable to save the necessary cash deposit and, accordingly, they are denied the opportunity to purchase the home from the trust even though they would be able to meet the mortgage repayments.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the honourable member for his question. I applaud his support for the Housing Trust sales program, especially as it relates to areas such as that which he represents. The question posed by

the honourable member is a complex one. The desirability of requiring home buyers to have a deposit is not only an economic question but also a philosophical one. The question applies to all would-be home buyers whether or not they are public housing tenants. Some authorities argue that requiring a \$500 deposit from trust tenants is necessary because the saving of such a deposit gives an indication of a commitment to succeed as a home buyer. Some people (and I presume that this includes the member for Elizabeth) tend to believe that a deposit, no matter how small, is an impediment to the purchaser. At my request the Housing Trust will soon begin a review of its house sales program to date. This review will consider the complexities and impact of the trust sales program on the public housing stock, the housing industry, and the State economy.

However, it will also consider such issues as tenants' incomes and ability to purchase, including whether the \$500 deposit can be dispensed with in the case of double unit dwellings. I should point out, however, that removal of the deposit will not completely alleviate the need for an up front contribution by prospective buyers. Fees for loan applications, charged by lenders, together with other lending charges result in at least \$500 having to be paid by the buyer, independent of any deposit. I thank the honourable member for his question, and I will let him have a reply as soon as I receive a report from the trust.

FIRE SERVICE LEVY

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Will the Minister of Emergency Services confirm that the Government has received proposals to impose a fire service levy on all property holders in South Australia which would, among other things, cost the owners of the average price house in Adelaide almost \$80 a year, and will he say when the Government will make a final decision on this matter?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I assure the honourable member and the House that the Government is entertaining no such proposition. True, from time to time calculations are made and I do not doubt that the honourable member could sit down with a calculator and make the calculations as well as anyone else.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am generous, as usual, with all members. The question is: if everyone was forced to insure, how much would those who do not now insure have to pay and how much less would those who currently insure have to pay? No decision has to be made: the Government is not proceeding to change the basis of funding of the fire services.

SPORTING FACILITIES

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): Will the Minister of Transport ask his colleague the Minister of Local Government whether or not an imbalance exists between local government investment in sporting facilities primarily used by males as against those used by females? In the October/November 1988 edition of the Local Government Association's publication *Council and Community*, the Director of Administration and Finance of the Noarlunga council (Mr John Comrie) states that compared to traditional male sports such as football and cricket, which tend to require large areas of open space, 'female sports such as netball or senior citizens recreational pursuits such as lawn bowls are

usually not assisted by councils to anywhere near the same extent'.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question and I am certain that my colleague will be only too anxious to provide an appropriate reply.

MARINELAND

Mr BECKER (Hanson): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning give an absolute guarantee that the dolphins and other wildlife at Marineland will not have to be destroyed as the ultimate price of union interference in the Marineland redevelopment? There are currently six dolphins, 13 sea lions and four fur seals whose future is uncertain because of the Government's decision not to proceed with plans to redevelop Marineland. Three of the dolphins are more than 23 years old. Two have sight problems and already are possibly blind. They also exhibit behavioural problems with the three younger dolphins, all of which were born in captivity.

I am advised that, when the younger dolphins recently were introduced to sand and gravel of the type they would be likely to experience if relocated to Victor Harbor, as has been proposed, they ingested large quantities which caused gastric impaction. In the case of the sea lions, one is an epileptic and on constant medication; two have deformed jaws, which would prevent them from obtaining food for themselves, as has one of the fur seals; one has a cardio-respiratory problem which would affect its ability to dive; and one is an unweaned pup.

I have been further advised that, while it is cruel to continue to hold these animals in the current conditions at Marineland which have deteriorated because of the prolonged union bans on redevelopment work, it would be more cruel still to relocate them to conditions with which they have no familiarity whatsoever. As a result, those associated with the continuing care of these animals are now worried that the Government finally may be forced to have them destroyed because it will be impossible to find another location in which their survival could be guaranteed.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I congratulate the honourable member on being more restrained in this House than he was in talking to the journalist, Mr Paul Makin, this morning, when I understand he told Mr Makin, probably for the delectation of Mr Makin's television audience this evening or some time later this week, that 'the Government was virtually murdering the dolphins at Marineland'.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Mr Makin interviewed me and relayed the same story to me as has been relayed to the House by the honourable member. Because Mr Makin had given me no prior warning of the very specific nature of the allegations he was making, I merely had to say, 'I am not aware of any of this and I will get a very detailed report on it.' I have that detailed report and, therefore, am in a position to respond in some detail to the honourable member, and I think I should. The short answer to the question is that of course the Government would not be prepared either to see these animals released to the wild or to have them put down. Every effort will be made to find appropriate environments in which they can be placed. That may include the wild watch proposition at Encounter Bay if that is a goer.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: We have said to these people that they will have to satisfy us as to a management plan, as to veterinary care and all that sort of thing. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition may well be right—it may be a totally inappropriate environment in which to release those animals. We will know that and we will therefore be in a position to make a decision. However, saving that, there are dolphin areas in other States, there are zoos, and there are other appropriate places where these animals may be put. I do not know whether the honourable member wants to volunteer his home swimming pool for one or two of the smaller ones.

These animals often have come to Marineland in a less than perfect condition, and it is not always possible at Marineland to completely redress that problem. The report I was given at 2 o'clock this afternoon states, first, that the dolphins are all healthy and suffer no injuries. As to the sea lions, one sustained a broken lower jaw a long time ago and it never properly healed. Another one has part of a jaw missing (I understand that that happened prior to its being accepted at Marineland); one has a current wound which is healing under veterinary care; and one is epileptic and has been so for a long time (it averages once a year having some sort of fit and is under veterinary care with tablet treatment). So far as the Cetacea is concerned, I am assured that that is the extent of the list of illnesses and injuries, something quite different from that which has been put before this Chamber by the honourable member. If he has more detailed information which is attributable to somebody, he ought to make it available.

This morning Mr Makin gave me a handwritten note with no signature on the bottom—it could have been anyone's handwriting. That is just not good enough. If people have allegations they should come forward, identify themselves and identify the allegations. I am giving a response that I am prepared to attribute to the officers advising me on this matter. As far as I am aware, that is a response that can be relied upon.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Hanson and the honourable Minister of Community Welfare to order. The honourable member for Adelaide.

FRUIT-FLY

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): Is the Minister of Agriculture satisfied with the existing procedures relating to fruit-fly regulations followed by domestic and interstate aircraft arriving in South Australia? A constituent rang me last week not long after she had returned from Darwin (she had returned from Darwin following the return on separate flights of two other family members). She was surprised that no announcement was made prior to the aircraft arriving in Adelaide that it was an offence to bring fruit into South Australia.

My constituent also made the point that a large number of people in Darwin had travelled with caravans from Queensland, and these people were then catching flights to Adelaide. Given that there has been a substantial outbreak of fruit-fly in Queensland and a number of fruit-fly eradication programs are operating in the metropolitan area, my constituent made the point that warnings should be issued to people arriving in South Australia.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question and for drawing the matter to my attention and to the attention of the House. Over the years numerous concerned members in the community raised the issue—

whether in relation to bus transport or air transport—of the need for constant reminders, particularly to visitors to this State that we are fruit-fly free and that we want to maintain that status to protect our \$300 million horticultural industry.

The process has been one of cooperation with the major airlines. We have had the airlines' support through announcements being made on flights arriving in South Australia. In fact, when returning from Canberra last week I noticed that the chief cabin attendant gave a reminder over the intercom to all passengers to deposit any fruit that they were carrying in the receptacles provided at the terminals. I was travelling on an Ansett flight, but I recall that Australian Airlines conveys the same message. So, we do have the cooperation of the airlines.

It is very important to reinforce that message, so I will seek a further statement. I suppose it is probably reasonable to say that the chance of infection being conveyed from a Darwin flight is a lot less than from a flight direct from the eastern States or Western Australia. Certainly the environmental conditions in the eastern seaboard States of Australia at the moment are very suitable for the spread of fruit-fly. Infestation is obviously quite real in the eastern States of Australia, and that is why we are seeing outbreaks here. In Payneham last week we recorded our seventh outbreak of fruit-fly. However, this is not the worst situation that we have confronted. The former Minister of Agriculture will recall that in 1981-82 we had nine outbreaks in the metropolitan area alone.

So we do have outbreaks of this scale. I will again seek the cooperation of the airlines. I am sure I will get that cooperation, as they have been very cooperative in the past. I think the airlines can be forgiven for this lapse on a Darwin flight because, of course, the horticultural industry in the Northern Territory is not very large and a threat from the Northern Territory is quite minimal. Of course, people do transfer across the border from Queensland and that is relevant. I will take up that matter. I thank the honourable member for raising the issue because, of course, there are many horticulturalists in this State and people who depend on our fruit-fly free status being maintained so that we can protect our horticultural industry.

RAH CAR PARK

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I ask the Premier: Has the Government made an offer to the Adelaide City Council to purchase for \$2.2 million the Vaughan Place site for a car park for the Royal Adelaide Hospital, which the Government originally planned to lease from the council for a peppercorn rental? If so, is this purchase to be funded from the health budget and will it increase the cost of using the car park when it is finally built?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: First, let me remind the House of the situation relating to the RAH car park. Unlike the Liberal Party policy, which is to build on the parklands, the Government has decided that it is not appropriate to do so and that future generations would not thank us for placing a building on those parklands. I will ask the member—

The Hon. J.L. Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The member for Coles interjects. I ask her: does she support the Government's or the Opposition's policy?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would be most interested to hear the answer. Do you support us?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Heysen to order. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: She does not need to interject, just nod. Do you support our policy or that of the Opposition?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Well, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There is quite a degree—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call to order the Leader, the Deputy Leader, the member for Mitcham, the member for Coles and anyone else who wants to take it upon himself to interject. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Deputy is getting ready to say something.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Premier to resume his seat. Not only can members not debate, I ask them not to bait other members, either. Is the honourable member for Davenport taking a point of order?

Mr S.G. EVANS: Yes, Sir. You reprimanded other members but three times the Premier referred to the member for Coles as 'she', and I believe that to be inappropriate.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order and ask the Premier not to respond to interjections nor to encourage interjections. If he does refer to members opposite, he should refer to them as 'the honourable member'.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I apologise for the transgression. I certainly do not want to encourage the member for Coles to do other than nod her head when I say—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition. The Premier will resume his seat. The Leader must surely be aware that the Chair has needed to call the House to order two or three times in the past few minutes. The Chair is determined that the House will maintain a reasonable air of decorum and the efforts of the Leader are not helping in that respect. If he continues in this regard, he will be named. The honourable Deputy Leader has a point of order.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Standing Order 154 states:

No member shall digress from the subject matter of any question under discussion.

Without reading the rest of that Standing Order, I submit that the Opposition is simply referring to the Premier's digressions, which are designed to bait Opposition members. Under those circumstances—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair does not uphold the point of order.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier may have been out of order in responding to interjections but the original interjections were even more out of order than the response.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The point I am making is that the Premier is digressing from the subject matter of the question. In the process, he is provoking the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sure that the Premier, given an opportunity by the House, will answer the question. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The matter is very much on the question asked by the honourable member. I was pointing out that the Opposition supports a car park on the SAIT site on Frome Road: the Government does not. We have been working to come to an arrangement whereby we can avoid the necessity of

building on that site. There may be some extra cost involved in doing so, but that cost will be accommodated over the period of time under which the car park is financed, because the users of the car park will pay a fee which has been set in order to ensure that, over time, there will be a return of public funds.

The site identified is owned by the Adelaide City Council. The city council, through the then Lord Mayor, Mr Jarvis—and this was subsequently confirmed by the present Lord Mayor, Mr Condous—said that it would make that site available at a peppercorn rental, subject to negotiation, for use as a car park by the RAH. On that basis we have proceeded. Since then, as outlined to the House last week, the Adelaide City Council has said that it did not believe that its peppercorn proposal was appropriate; it wanted to renegotiate the terms and conditions. It wanted an economic return from the site it was offering. So, that completely changed the nature of the negotiations.

In an effort to resolve this matter, a proposal and counter proposals have been put over the past few weeks. One of the options is for the Government to purchase the site from the city council. This would mean that the site would be unencumbered. In fact, the site would be purchased by the hospital but financed under the same financing arrangement, that is, paid for over time by the contributions of users of the car park. This may make a much cleaner transaction and enable us to achieve our objectives more certainly.

Initially, the city council indicated that it was not interested in selling; it was interested only in leasing. It has now said that it would be willing to look at a purchase proposition in the alternative and negotiations are proceeding. As soon as those negotiations are complete, whatever the outcome, it will be made public. Our concern is that the employees of the Royal Adelaide Hospital get an appropriate car park at the earliest opportunity, that it be secure and that it be affordable for them, but not at the expense of the parklands of Adelaide, in which we believe, unlike members opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

DOG TAGS

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Can the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Local Government, inform the House whether any consideration has been given to using an 'ID chip' for identification of dogs instead of the dog tags which are currently being used? Recent press reports have suggested that an 'ID chip' could be implanted in animals and will be used with beef cattle, Japanese Koi fish, goats and pigs as a foolproof way of using electronic identification.

It has been suggested that a foolproof system for identifying pet owners who dump their animals can be achieved by using this device instead of the current method of dog tags for registered dogs. The device can also be used to register cats, a move which could greatly reduce the high incidence of feral cat damage to native wildlife.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will be delighted to refer this question to my colleague the Minister of Local Government. Many years in this place have taught me that when we are legislating or regulating for pets of citizens of South Australia, as in other parts of the world, we have to be reasonably careful and any response given to a question in the House should be well considered. I will ensure that this question receives that due consideration.

RURAL ASSISTANCE

Mr GUNN (Eyre): Is the Minister of Agriculture prepared to review the Government's attitude towards assisting rural producers on Eyre Peninsula now that they are being refused carry-on finance by their financial institutions as this will prevent them from sowing a crop for the 1989-90 season? A number of producers have now been advised by their financial institutions that further finance will not be available to them and that they must place their properties on the market.

The letter from which I am about to quote is a typical example. It has been sent to the owners of a property of 3 500 acres who have been farming that property for four years, three of which have been below average seasons. The letter they have now received from the bank states:

We advise that we are not prepared to lend additional funds this year to enable a cropping program to be undertaken.

It further states:

As the bank cannot see a satisfactory solution to your problems and with your position worsening day by day, we need your cooperation to resolve the position and to put the following arrangements in place.

Those arrangements include: immediate moves to sell the property; a clearing sale of plant and equipment; and, in the event of a property sale not being achieved in the near future, the owners to enter into a sharefarming agreement allowing them to draw a maximum of \$100 a week from livestock management.

Moves like this have been greeted with alarm on Eyre Peninsula; they will lead to the further break-up of farming communities and forced sales at very low prices because of the current depressed state of the market. Representations have been made to me to seek Government intervention to prevent further tragedies from occurring. Is the Minister aware how many such letters have been sent to producers on Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for raising the matter. I am not aware of the details relating to the person concerned. In relation to the issue of assistance and the constant request for a declaration under the drought agreement between the Federal and State Governments, I restate that any declaration would not help that person or people in similar situations. Bland statements that are made in this Chamber or any other public forum that might give people in those circumstances false hope are the worst kind of cynicism.

I would be happy to look at the circumstances of the person to whom the honourable member referred in terms of his or her relationship with the banks. We have had, and are continuing to have, discussions with the banks about the package which we put forward and some benefits have flowed from those negotiations. Some detail is still being worked out with the banks, but I hope that we can reach a final agreement with all banks. However, that may not be possible. At this stage, one bank has indicated that it will not cooperate in terms of the package. That is unfortunate, and I am disappointed by that. I hope (and I have expressed this hope to the managers at the meetings) that it reviews that decision. However, that has not discouraged us from continuing to negotiate that package.

Even if we had three or four good seasons (which is highly unlikely), the financial situation of some people on Eyre Peninsula is such that I do not believe they could survive now or in the future. It would be unfair and improper of me to suggest that something could be offered to people in those circumstances, because there is not an opportunity. I believe that there are some people, who have been designated by financial institutions, who have not, in my opin-

ion, been given the option to stay on. Through our package and further refinement and review of the packages that we are negotiating with the banks, I believe that we will be able to help some people, but not the majority in circumstances to which the honourable member referred. I believe it would be a good majority, perhaps a majority of those people who had been first cited. Figures have been passed around, but that information is confidential as between the bank and the client.

Our figures relate particularly to Rural Assistance Branch funds as the lender of last resort. We have already assessed those people and we believe that some of those who have been ruled as being non viable in the short-term will have a viability in the longer term. We also believe that we can put together a package that will assist them.

If the honourable member provides me with that information, I will ask the Rural Assistance Manager to review the circumstances as a matter of urgency. I hope that we can come to a much more sensitive arrangement than the sudden letter by post, and that is what we have been impressing on the banks. In some circumstances we may be able to intervene through other agencies to assist and perhaps prevent the sending of such a letter. If the financial situation is beyond help (and such situations do exist on the West Coast), there are better ways in which we as a community can deal with that rather than by a direct, insensitive letter. In our discussions with the banks we have stressed that such an action must be avoided at all costs.

I appreciate how the honourable member feels, with his constituents receiving a letter like that. I understand his concern and I share with him his concern for the way in which it was delivered. If he is prepared to provide me with the necessary information I will be happy to take up the matter.

SAGRIC-SADOL CONSORTIUM

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Spence): Will the Minister of Lands outline to the House details of the success of the international involvement that the Department of Lands has had through the establishment of the Sagric-South Australian Department of Lands consortium? Several successful contracts have already been completed and negotiations with other countries were in progress. I am also aware that the Department of Lands has been endeavouring to improve the financial result of entering into profitable overseas contracts in association with Sagric International Pty Ltd.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. I am pleased to tell him that, since the establishment of a consortium between the Department of Lands and Sagric International, the department has been successfully involved in some 10 international projects, six of which have been completed, while four are currently undergoing completion. Another four projects are presently at the negotiating stage. The successful involvement in the projects to date has led to the department's establishing an international reputation as a provider of quality land management products and services.

As the honourable member has said, most of the initial projects were involved in providing services through the Department of Lands to developing countries and, therefore, the financial rewards to date have been fairly modest. I want to outline to the House details of the first project, which has been one of the most successful and which indeed was undertaken by my colleague the member for Spence when he was Minister of Lands. This project involved the improvement of the national cadastral system in Tunisia,

and the total project was worth some \$400 000. Since that time, the department has been involved in 10 successful projects, and the current ventures are likely to result in higher returns. For example, it is estimated that the Philippines natural resources management project will earn the department about \$750 000 over a three-year period. This amount could indeed be supplemented by any profit that is ultimately earned by the project. The total value of this project is some \$20 million, and the project was commenced on 1 January this year.

I believe this is the way that the Department of Lands will move in the future, through this very successful consortium. I point out to the House that international recognition of the consortium is evidenced by the fact that the consortium has been invited by the United Nations Department for Technical Co-operation and Development to run a conference for delegates from 35 developing countries and for other international experts and Australian delegates. I understand that the tentative date for this conference is early February 1990.

At this stage the consortium is becoming well established in the marketing of land-related products in developing countries. But marketing emphasis is now being directed to second world and even developed countries, and this has the potential for providing even greater returns to the State.

BANKCARD

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Will the Premier say what is the Government's intention regarding the request by banks to introduce fees on Bankcard for cardholders who pay their bills before incurring interest charges, and will he say when the Government working party examining this and other aspects of consumer credit legislation will report?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Certainly, at first sight I do not like the concept. I do not really see why banks should be charging anything extra on Bankcard. I should have thought that they would be doing pretty well from that style of business anyway. As to its impact and treatment by a consumer credit review, I would have to refer that question to my colleague in another place.

ETHYLENE

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): Can the Minister of Agriculture say what are the implications for the export of Australian fruit and vegetables to Europe following recent research which appears to link the presence of ethylene in refrigerated containers with the premature deterioration of horticultural products during transit? A report on the Australian Broadcasting Commission's *Food Program* on Sunday 11 December last year suggested that recent research had linked ethylene with the deterioration of fruit and vegetables in refrigerated containers. That report further suggested that careful control of ethylene emissions might well extend the shelf life of such products and indeed open up new markets to horticultural exporters in this country.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question and for his interest in this matter. Horticultural exports are of great interest to a number of members and to many people in the community who are concerned with the continuation of our export markets. A number of areas such as air freight and shipping are being addressed, as well as a whole range of import problems that we face on reaching foreign destinations. The market quality of the produce is important. Having had the opportunity,

with a senior horticultural officer, several years ago of visiting international markets and meeting many importers both overseas and out here on numerous occasions, I believe that there is no doubt that the quality of the fruit that we can present to the market place, whether Europe, America or Asia, is equal to, if not better than, the products produced in those places or imported from other countries.

So, this question is relevant and these technical problems encountered in respect of transportation, especially of high value produce, are of immense concern to the community, particularly the horticultural community. As the honourable member knows, ethylene is a naturally ageing and ripening hormone produced by fruits and vegetables in varying quantities. What is being done in terms of addressing the sensitivity of the produce through transportation is for proper ventilation continuously to prevent the build-up of ethylene, which at temperatures of less than 5 degrees has little if any impact on the deterioration of produce.

So, it is important that those technical aspects are addressed by exporters, and advice is available from the horticultural export people, from the department, and from the new Federal corporation set up under the Federal Minister (John Kerin). Certain products are more affected by ethylene and that effect needs to be carefully assessed by any horticultural producer who wishes to export. With a product such as kiwi fruit, which is extremely sensitive to softening even at low temperatures, ethylene absorbent material can be included in the packages to prevent deterioration. Apples, pears, table grapes, citrus and onions, which represent the bulk of Australia's horticultural exports, are not sensitive to ethylene when transported in refrigerated containers at temperatures and rates of ventilation recommended with exporting.

Loss of quality, the thing that we fear, occurs through long voyage times, and in many cases we are disadvantaged because of the shipping routes and conferences that we must confront, for instance on voyages to Hong Kong or Tokyo. However, I think that, despite the delays occurring sometimes through Singapore *en route* to some of those destinations, ethylene is not the problem that it has perhaps been described by some sections of the community. Nevertheless, I assure the honourable member that this matter is being addressed by all our experts and that we are concerned about it. Certainly, it must be taken into account when considering our export markets, especially as regards the quality produce that is presented for export. I am sure that the honourable member's constituents, whom he so ably represents, will appreciate his raising this question because several of them active in the export area are successful, and I believe will continue to lead the way in many areas of horticultural export in this State.

INSTANT LOTTERY TICKETS

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport say when will all of the provisions of Bill No. 134, passed by Parliament on 13 April 1988, be put into operation? That Bill provides for the licensing of suppliers of instant lottery tickets and, when it was introduced, the Minister said:

The situation has reached the critical stage where blatant instances of malpractices and substandard methods are being regularly witnessed. This has provoked a groundswell of criticism from the community as well as from organisations licensed to run lotteries and from those printers and suppliers who endeavour to maintain high standards and a reputable image within the industry. Some of the more obvious areas of abuse are the poor paper texture and adhesion of tickets, the duplication of ticket numbers, the pre-identification of winning tickets, 'sweetheart'

deals with lotteries promoters in falsely declaring actual ticket sales, the display of fictitious licence numbers and overcharging for cost of tickets.

People have told me that this matter was an important issue at the time; indeed, the Minister and the Government considered it important. The community is now concerned that malpractice has been going on for 12 months and that no action appears to have been taken by the Minister to implement the provisions of the legislation in order to stop people from being ripped off, as the community sees it.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This matter, which was originally within the control of the Minister of Recreation and Sport, now comes under the control of the Treasurer and is being administered through the Treasury. So, I am the appropriate Minister. Four main recommendations were made by the committee established by the Minister of Recreation and Sport to look into this matter. They included the printing and supplying of instant lottery tickets being licensed and subject to strict standards in accordance with Government criteria. That is the issue that is being focused on by the honourable member in his question. Regulations to give effect to that recommendation are being prepared at present, and we expect them to be in our hands soon. They will obviously be subject to Cabinet consideration prior to their promulgation but I hope that that aspect can be put into effect rapidly. I understand that 20 or 30 small organisations are involved. We are awaiting the finalisation of the regulations.

OZONE LAYER

Mr TYLER (Fisher): Can the Minister for Environment and Planning say what action the Government intends to take to help eliminate the ozone depleting substances now that the Ozone Protection Act (1989) has passed through the Federal Parliament? The Federal Act is one of the world's most stringent pieces of legislation controlling and reducing the manufacture and use of substances such as chlorofluorocarbons. The legislation controls the production, export and import and ends the use of ozone depleting substances. By 1995 it is hoped that Australia will have reduced its consumption of substances such as CFCs by 50 per cent, thus achieving the target of the Montreal protocol in half the time.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Government's attitude towards this matter has always been that we should first carefully consider the Federal legislation and that any legislation that we had to introduce should be complementary to that legislation. In addition, we considered that it was appropriate that we amend the Clean Air Act rather than introduce entirely new legislation. Tomorrow, I will give notice of such legislation and I will introduce that legislation on Thursday so that both Houses can debate it in the final two weeks of this session. I should expect the unanimous support of all members of both Houses in this matter.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move: That the time allotted for all stages of the following Bills: Supply (No. 1), Holidays Act Amendment (No. 2), Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment, Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act Amendment be until 6 p.m. on Thursday.
Motion carried.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 9 March. Page 2308.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): The Premier's second reading explanation forecasts that tax revenue will exceed budget estimates again this financial year. It appears that rising stamp duty revenue will be a principal reason. The Premier has given no specific indication of how much stamp duty revenue is running ahead of estimates. But the budget had forecast further real growth in this revenue of 3.3 per cent this financial year. So, even with rising inflation, stamp duties will remain the Government's bonanza tax. The amount budgeted for this financial year is 177.6 per cent higher than the level of stamp duty revenue when the Premier came to office. This rise is about three times the consumer price index for the period. In the six full financial years since the Premier took office, stamp duty receipts have been estimated at \$1 117 500 000, but actual receipts have been \$72.5 million more.

The revenue forecast for this financial year will be the Premier's total tax take from stamp duties to \$1.5 billion. Much of this comes from property transactions, particularly home sales. Whenever the Premier is challenged about this tax, he asserts that it is a Government's right to cash in on rising property values. But where is the fairness in a Government increasing its stamp duty revenue by more than 177 per cent when, over the same period, average house prices have risen by about 100 per cent? There is much more than an inflation factor in this tax grab. It is, in fact, a rip off: it is a rip off which means about half of the houses currently for sale in the metropolitan area will attract the highest stamp duty in Australia. The Premier cannot evade this fact. He cannot escape the charge that he is cashing in on the hurt and the misery which home buyers and home owners currently face. In the range of house prices—

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: If the Premier will just wait a moment, I am sure the facts will demonstrate clearly that what I am saying is factual. In the range of house prices—\$75 000 to \$125 000—South Australia has the highest rate of stamp duty of all the States. (This range includes both the median and the average house prices in South Australia). So, let him at least acknowledge that point. We are talking about the average, not the \$1 million homes with which he tries to evade his Government's high taxing policies in relation to stamp duty. I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* a purely statistical table which shows the stamp duties payable in various States within this price range. The table clearly shows a disparity between the stamp duty applicable in South Australia and that applicable in other States of Australia. It is interesting to note that the member for Adelaide is not saying much now, having those facts put on the table.

Mr Rann: Let's hear where you stand.

Mr OLSEN: On what? The fabricator's at it again; he did not follow it up. Mr Speaker, I sought leave—

Mr Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Briggs is out of order.

Mr OLSEN: Mr Speaker, I did seek leave some time ago to have a table inserted in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Principal place of residence (not first):						
	SA	NSW	VIC	QLD	WA	TAS
\$75 000	1 955	1 202	1 600	750	1 312	1 675
\$100 000	2 830	1 990	2 220	1 000	1 900	2 425
\$125 000	3 830	2 865	3 700	1 250	2 712	3 175

In the real estate section of Saturday's *Advertiser*, 316 houses were advertised for sale in the metropolitan area at a set price. Of these, 152—or more than 48 per cent—fell within the range of \$75 000 to \$125 000 which, I repeat, attracts the highest stamp duty in Australia. The current average price of a house in the metropolitan area is \$94 268. This attracts stamp duty of \$2 630.50 when a house of this price is purchased as the second or subsequent home. At the time the Premier came to office, stamp duty payable on the average priced metropolitan home was \$1 090. Compare that and the \$2 630.50 now payable. That rise is just over 141 per cent.

The Premier will say that there is assistance for first home buyers. But, in fact, they are even worse off in this comparison. A first home buyer purchasing the average priced house in Adelaide in December 1982 paid \$310 because of the generous stamp duty exemptions introduced by the former Liberal Government. Then, the amount exempt from stamp duty was about two-thirds of the amount of the average priced home. But today, a first home buyer faces exactly five times that tax to purchase the average priced house.

Stamp duty on a house selling at \$94 268 (the average) will cost the first home buyer \$1 500.50 even with stamp duty exempt for the first \$50 000 of the value. So, first home buyers are significantly worse off under this Government because the Premier has refused to honour his 1985 election promise to continually review the stamp duty exemption level. When questioned about it last week, he said, 'There is a continual review.' They review it but they do not do anything about it. They do not lift the exemption level to give relief to first home buyers in South Australia.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Conveniently forgotten.

Mr OLSEN: More than conveniently forgotten; it is just another of the broken promises of this Administration. They will certainly be maintained by the next one.

At the 1985 election, I put forward a detailed and costed program for continuing stamp duty exemptions. Under my proposal, a first home buyer purchasing the average priced house in Adelaide today would be paying \$400.50 in stamp duty—\$1 150.50 less than under this Government. In the current climate of rising interest rates, it is becoming increasingly difficult for potential first home buyers in particular to enter the market. As such, it is essential that this burden be eased through lifting the exemption level to fully reflect current property values. Realistic and generous stamp duty exemptions were introduced in 1980 by the last Liberal Government: they will certainly be maintained by the next one.

It is all very well for the Premier to chortle. The fact is that the Premier's 1985 housing policy promised to match the Liberal's program. He chortles about it, but in the heat of the 1985 election campaign he promised exactly the same deal, which he has failed to implement. He has failed to match it and failed to live up to that election promise of 1985. As a result, home buyers are suffering even more. This is typical of a political Party which has played X-rated politics with home buyers and the dreams of home buyers in South Australia.

Mr Duigan: He's embarrassed by the script.

Mr OLSEN: I am not embarrassed at all. What ought to be embarrassing is the way in which you are trying to laugh it off—

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: He's going to blush at it now.

Mr OLSEN: No, he's not.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Yes, he is.

Mr OLSEN: You laugh off the fact that you are ripping off first home buyers in South Australia. You have broken an election promise to first home buyers in South Australia.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: On a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. I am quite surprised that the Leader, who has had some experience in this place, continually refers to members on this side as 'you'.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr De Laine): I ask the honourable Leader to address the Chair.

Mr OLSEN: Let me take it just one step further. Let us look at the 1985 election promise when the Premier said, 'We reject the Liberal Party plans to remove controls on interest rates.' Four months later, those controls were removed. The Labor Party's advertising message during the course of the 1985 campaign stated:

On 7 December, don't blow up your interest rates, vote Australian Labor Party.

What does the Premier have to say now, when rates are 2 per cent higher? What does he have to say? He goes to Canberra and then comes back saying, 'I have no answer to the high interest rates in South Australia, and I have no answer to the dilemma facing young home buyers.' Yet he can relieve the pressure on first home buyers.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: You go out there and talk to South Australians now. Their interest rates are 2 per cent higher than they were in 1985. They have to pay, on average, \$77 a month more in mortgage repayments than they did in 1985. You go and talk to those people. Labor Party policy and economic direction clearly has brought about this result. What does the Premier do? He goes to a housing summit. He says, 'That will fix it. We will have this on the agenda during the housing summit in Canberra.' What does the Premier do when he gets back? It is not on the agenda, it has not been debated, and it has not been resolved. The Premier puts his hands in the air and says, 'I have no answer.' That is little help to those out in the mortgage belt. It is little help to the 'oncers' on the back bench when this economic policy really starts to eat into incomes, as it is right now.

It is the Government's stamp duty policy and its taxing policies that have been ripping people off. What is more, the Government knows it. In trying to pretend that he is doing all he can to ease the housing crisis—the heart on sleeve stuff—the Premier is, in fact, doing less than nothing. He is compounding the situation. His own stamp duty tax hurts average home owners in South Australia more than in any other State. That is the Government's track record and it cannot be denied.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: I can, and I will.

Mr OLSEN: You can't. The facts speak for themselves.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: They are not facts.

Mr OLSEN: They are facts. The figures that I put before the House this afternoon demand not only that the exemption level be immediately lifted but that there be a comprehensive review of all stamp duties on property transactions. This should not wait for the next budget, and certainly not the next election. In his second reading explanation the Premier admits that he is getting more revenue than he budgeted for from stamp duties. Rather than putting this into Government spending, he should be using it to ease—

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: The Timber Corporation, the Justice Information System, the Central Linen Service, the write-offs on share values, and so the list goes on.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I call the Premier to order. The Premier will have a chance to contribute in his reply. The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr OLSEN: We should be easing the pressure on home buyers now—immediately—not later in the budget. I call on the Premier to announce a review of stamp duty rates—a review that brings about change, particularly with respect to stamp duties payable on average-priced homes in Adelaide—and to nominate dates from which stamp duty exemptions will be introduced for the benefit of South Australians.

Ms Gayler interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Well, if you had listened a little earlier you would have heard me explain the policy in my speech to the House. Obviously the member for Newland is a little dense and did not want to pick it up because it is a policy that will obviously receive a lot of support. One tax not mentioned in the Premier's second reading explanation is land tax. This tax is also adding to the pressure on accommodation in Adelaide. While the former Liberal Government removed land tax on the principal place of residence—I remind the House that that measure was opposed at the time by the Premier—of course, there is no guarantee that a future Labor Government will not reintroduce that tax given that land tax on the principal place of residence continues to be part of Labor Party policy. Land tax revenue this financial year is budgeted as \$63.5 million. That is 229 per cent more than it was when this Government came to office. With such a rise in revenue the Premier ought to be considering how land tax relief can be given for property used for rental housing.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: It gets land tax relief each year.

Mr OLSEN: That interjection just proves how much this Government is out of touch with reality. The Premier says, 'We have given land tax relief. You ought to be grateful out there.' That is why land tax receipts have gone up by 229 per cent! The Premier says, 'We have helped you out; we have given you relief,' yet the revenue has gone up by 229 per cent. What arrant nonsense! I understand why the Premier did not choose to study accountancy during his younger years. With such a rise in revenue, the Premier needs to look at how that tax relief on property can assist rental housing in this State. Inevitably the cost of the tax is passed onto tenants. This means that there is discrimination between home owners and occupants of rental housing. Fairness demands that that situation be looked at. Certainly, a Liberal Government will do so. A Liberal Government will not cash in on rising property values—as this Government has done with stamp duties and land tax—and ignore the consequences to home buyers and other people struggling to maintain affordable housing.

Ms Gayler interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: The honourable member for Newland says that the Liberal Party is looking after all the wealthy people. I remind the honourable member that I talked about stamp duty for first home buyers and subsequent home buyers. The level of stamp duty in South Australia on the average and medium-price homes is higher than that in any other State in Australia. We are talking about the average home owner out in the marketplace. If the honourable member cannot grasp that basic fact, she has no hope of understanding an economic argument.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: The Premier is culpable in this housing crisis. He has done little to provide relief in areas where the State has some real responsibility. He has not lifted a

finger or uttered a single word of criticism at the Hawke/Keating economic policies which have pushed our interest rates to record levels and left them there for far too long. I remind the House that only a few weeks ago the Premier was in Western Australia saying that we need another Labor Government so that we have State Labor Governments and a Federal Labor Government consistently pushing the Hawke/Keating economic policies for the benefit of all Australians. Some benefit when we get interest rates at 15.5 per cent with the prospect of a rise to 16 per cent within the next week or two!

The impact in South Australia is being measured on a number of fronts. There is poverty—the highest rate of poverty in Australia—and that is not a record of which the Government should be proud. There is increased demand for Housing Trust accommodation—the waiting list has almost doubled under this Government to well over 40 000. That is another record of which the Government cannot be proud. Currently South Australia accounts for about 17 per cent of bankruptcies in Australia, which is double what our share should be on a per capita basis. Small business—the State's and country's largest employer—is particularly hurt by rising interest rates and high levels of stamp duty and land tax. The impact has been passed on to small business and, because it cannot absorb it, staff numbers are reduced. That is why this State has the highest level of unemployment in mainland Australia and one of the highest levels of teenage unemployment in Australia.

That is this Government's track record with respect to its economic policies. Clearly, the impact on economic activity is something for which South Australians are now paying a very dear price. South Australia accounts for only 5.9 per cent of building approvals in Australia; yet, when this Government came to office in 1982, the figure was 8.8 per cent, which was above our per capita share. Now we are almost 3 per cent below what our share should be. That is one reason why we continue to have the highest level of unemployment on the mainland. Last week's labour force figures were greeted with some selective comment from the Government about job creation. In fact, employment growth under this Government has been the lowest of all the mainland States. Western Australia's job creation rate has—

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: The Premier is even starting to argue with Australian Bureau of Statistics figures. That shows that he is blind to reality. Western Australia's job creation rate has been twice ours since 1982. It was also suggested last week that the South Australian unemployment rate is high because the labour force participation rate is high. In fact, the February labour market participation rate in South Australia was the lowest of all mainland States except New South Wales.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: It is increasing faster.

Mr OLSEN: It was the lowest except for New South Wales but the Premier says that it is increasing faster. What a nonsensical economic argument.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Our growth rate is higher than the national average.

Mr OLSEN: Mr Acting Speaker—

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Get your facts right.

Mr OLSEN: Well—

The Hon. J.L. Cashmore: Get your perspective right.

Mr OLSEN: Yes. The Government uses facts and figures like a drunk uses a lamp post: more for illumination than for the record. I daresay that, in reply, Opposition members will get the usual accusations of being negative and of being knockers of South Australia because we have recounted the true record of this Government's economic performance.

The Government does not like its economic performance being laid out in front of it. It likes to sweep it under the carpet, close the door and wait for it to go away. The Premier does not like being reminded, nor does the Government, about his failures and, in particular, his broken promises. This State needs a better deal for home buyers, and first home buyers in particular. Again this year the Government is getting better than its estimates in receipts from stamp duty, but rather than give relief to people—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: The Government is not interested in individuals in the electorate who are finding it increasingly difficult to survive under Federal and State Labor Governments.

Mr Robertson: Let's see some policies.

Mr OLSEN: I can understand why the member for Bright is a little concerned, given the feedback that he is getting when doorknocking in his electorate.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Yes, the short straw lot.

Ms Gayler: It is not really very funny.

Mr OLSEN: I can understand why the member for Newland does not think it is funny, either. She is about to jump off the ship. The people in the electorates are hurting as a result of Federal and State Labor policies which have eroded their capacity to live. For the first time in 30 years we have had a net reduction of 1.2 per cent in real disposable income. That is a statement of fact. That is why people are finding it more difficult to make ends meet.

Mr Robertson interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Do you deny that people in your electorate are finding it difficult to make ends meet? I notice that the member for Bright has gone silent. So he should, because people are hurting. They are under pressure and they are looking for an easing of that pressure. They have come to know that they should not trust the Labor Party and its leaders, at Federal and State level, because their rhetoric does not match their action, and that has been borne out in relation to stamp duty. In 1985, the Government promised an increase in the exemption level; yet there has not been any increase in the exemption level—another broken and failed promise from a tired Government.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): It is interesting to watch and listen to the Premier attempting to defend, by way of interjection—

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The Premier says that he has not spoken. He has had plenty to say by way of interjection, all of it in an attempt at his own defence. The Premier should go into the shopping centres where I have been over the past few Saturday mornings and defend himself there. He would find it a lot more difficult to defend himself face to face with the people who are really suffering than it is to defend himself with a majority of members sitting behind him in this Chamber. Happily, that circumstance will not last very much longer because there is no way on earth that the people of South Australia will face yet another term of Labor Government, State or Federal.

The Premier's second reading explanation contains its own indictment of what Labor Governments have done to this State and nation. The Premier said:

On the receipts side, there are indications that total receipts may be ahead of budget.

He then went on to explain why, as follows:

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.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: They are tied to the inflation rate.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Exactly. That is precisely what is killing everyone outside this Chamber.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: It is the impact of the inflation rate, but inflation is high—and it is that rate under Labor Governments which is causing the extreme degree of suffering.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: You have misunderstood the point being made.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I understand the point being made very well.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I ask the House to come to order.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The second reading explanation states further:

Specific purpose recurrent funds from the Commonwealth are also expected to be above budget . . . and 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.

By way of interjection, during the Leader's speech the Premier said that there has been relief from payroll tax and stamp duties under the term of his Government. It is a strange kind of relief that, first, is not noticed by the sufferers, the victims upon whom this tax is inflicted and, secondly, results in a higher take during each year in which Labor has been in office.

Reference to the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1988 shows that the revenue from stamp duties less commission amounted to \$215 million in 1987 and \$276 million in 1988. The Premier describes that as 'relief'. Substantial relief would normally be a substantial reduction in the impact of a tax, but there has been a substantial increase in the impact of tax. There has been no relief as far as financial institutions duty is concerned. In 1987 this amounted to \$44 million; in 1988 it was \$57 million; and it will be higher still in the current year.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: That reflects economic activity.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: It reflects economic activity—we will come to that in a minute.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: There is certainly not much economic activity around here, as the Leader says, as evidenced by the number of small business failures.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Every key economic indicator—whether we are looking at population, net migration gain, employment, unemployment, overtime, dwelling approvals, new motor vehicle registrations, savings, exports, inflation and retail turnover—shows that South Australia is not doing well when compared with the rest of Australia.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The Premier might say that retail turnover is increasing, but it is increasing from such a very low level that there could be no praise or justification for the Premier's actions.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Since 1985 South Australia's retail turnover has increased by 21 per cent compared with 30 per cent for the rest of Australia. South Australia ranks almost at the bottom in terms of retail sales in this country, but at the top when it comes to bankrupt-

cies. Since 1982 the number of bankruptcies in this State has increased by 87 per cent compared with 85 per cent for the rest of Australia. If one looks at the number of small business bankruptcies, it will be seen that for the 13 700 small retail businesses in South Australia the annual failure rate is 30 per cent.

Mrs Appleby: Where did you get those figures?

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The figures were obtained from a report to the Government. I agree that it is an extraordinary report, a report of an almost bizarre nature, but nevertheless we can assume that the figures are correct. It is entitled 'The Establishment of Small Business Incubators in South Australia'. One could talk at length on this topic, but perhaps this debate is not the time to do so. This report states that the failure rate is 30 per cent. That percentage rate is very relevant to the matters under discussion in this debate. One might ask: why did those small businesses fail?

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Because the Government is bleeding them white.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: There are a variety of reasons, such as lack of capital in some circumstances and lack of management expertise in others, but the reality is that Government costs, such as land tax, stamp duty and workers compensation charges are significant factors.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I ask the House to come to order and to give the member for Coles the courtesy of being heard in relative silence. The member for Coles.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The Premier protests that relief has been given, but the figures give his protests the lie. Relief cannot have been given if the total amount of tax taken by the Government has increased significantly. Net taxation receipts for the previous financial year increased from \$660 million to \$790 million and the figures will be somewhat higher for this year. In relation to responsible balanced development, some of which the Premier has achieved, one might say, through manipulating the environmental impact assessment procedures, that is not part of the terms of this debate, so I will not pursue that matter; there will be plenty of opportunities to do so later.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The Premier—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: He has a sense of humour, but it is a bit warped.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: That is quite right. The Premier states, with his tongue very firmly in his cheek, that on the expenditure side the Government is maintaining its policy of tight control. How can he stand there and say that in the face of the record of the *Island Seaway*, the Justice Information System, and the tens of millions of dollars invested by the South Australian Timber Corporation in the New Zealand timber company? How can the Premier say that his Government is maintaining tight control when we have on the public record acknowledgement of the loss of tens of millions of dollars?

Mrs Appleby: Where did you get those figures?

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: They are on the public record. The honourable member's own ministerial colleagues have put on the public record the acknowledgement of the loss of these millions of dollars through the precise failure of what the Premier claims is tight control. In relation to stamp duties, the Premier said that there has been much more economic activity. Conveyances, transfers, mortgages and other instruments for the current financial year will no doubt reflect the same factors which influenced the position in the previous financial year, that is, net

receipts increased from \$107 million to \$166 million. Was that general economic activity or was it simply an exchange of some commercial properties within the city boundaries? In Committee it will be interesting to discover the significance of a few major property transfers, which have reaped significant profits for the Government, as distinct from what might be described as the ideal: namely, a substantial increase in diverse and broadly based property transfers.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: A few big transactions. I refer to the figures cited by the Premier, the Premier's defence of his Government's economic management; as opposed to that, to go out into the real world where people are suffering and to acknowledge this extraordinary rate of bankruptcies in South Australia—a failure rate of almost one-third annually of small retail businesses in this State—is surely an indictment of the climate in which small businesses operate. Surely this must be a clear indication to the Government that the climate in which small businesses operate in this State is so appalling that the failure rate of small businesses has hit the highest level ever in South Australia, certainly outstripping that of any other State.

The rake-in from State taxation has increased annually and there is no way the Premier can escape this reality. It is interesting to note that tax take of \$610 million was obtained from only 45 000 small businesses. That is not the total figure but the sum paid by small businesses alone in the year before last and included \$215 million in stamp duties, \$44 million in land tax and \$33 million in financial institutions duty.

If one third of those businesses went bankrupt, one could assume that the payment of those taxes was a significant factor in the bankruptcy. If one talks to the businesses which continue to operate, one finds that those State Government taxes and charges are a very significant factor in loss of profitability and in the sense of burden which is borne by many of those businesses and which ultimately will bring some of them to the ground.

As the Leader said in his speech, the stamp duty levy is higher in this State than in any other State in Australia. The total taxation take, which the Government says it has reduced, has been increased. That increase cannot be attributed entirely to increasing economic activity. Much of it is attributed to the high original rates and to the fact that the Government has not addressed a lot of critical issues such as the impact of land tax on multiple holdings; the flow through of that impact on housing costs; the flow through of those housing costs on so many young people who cannot afford to maintain their mortgage repayments or obtain housing in the first place; the flow through of that to the extraordinarily high waiting lists for South Australian Housing Trust accommodation; and the flow through of that in terms of another burden on the taxpayer through people who cannot maintain their economic independence and who have to throw themselves on the mercy of the State.

That is a downward spiral in South Australia and has been set in train by Federal and State Labor Governments. It is something that the Liberal Party in government in the very near future will reverse and it is something that South Australians are now beginning to understand only too well. I refer to the deteriorating financial situation and the increasing financial pressure which affects most households and which can be laid, in large measure, at the door of State and Federal Labor Governments.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I do not intend to detain the House for long in this response,

because the contributions made by both the Leader of the Opposition and his newly found economic spokesperson have been extremely thin; they have certainly been repetitive and inaccurate. The first major speech by one of the seven dwarfs in the Opposition was quite interesting, but not very helpful in terms of advancing our knowledge. The analysis of the economy was very shallow and reflected the way in which the Leader had approached the matter—not that the Leader of the Opposition's record is terribly good in this area.

It was interesting to refer to his budget speech in which he made certain predictions about what would happen this year. I would have thought that he would remind the House now of some of those predictions. He said that South Australia has had the worst sustained economic performance since the Depression. Under this Government, economic growth in South Australia has exceeded 30 per cent in real terms. Under the Tonkin Government there was an actual real decline in the size of the South Australian economy.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: You cooked the books.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We cooked the books! Even the Deputy Leader excels himself on that one. Last September the Leader of the Opposition said:

We cannot have lower levels of employment growth and still assume that South Australia's economic growth will keep pace with that in the rest of Australia.

He further alleged that South Australia has fewer new job opportunities, but that was absolute nonsense. In the year to February 1989 employment growth in South Australia has been well above the Australian figure. What a great prediction! The Leader of the Opposition spoke about fewer job opportunities, but in the past year 33 600 jobs were created, which represents a growth rate of 5.5 per cent compared with 4.4 per cent nationally, so that is contrary to what the Leader predicted.

The Leader said that we would have a lower level of growth than the national average and that there would be fewer job opportunities. In fact, the opposite has been the case and 26 000 of those jobs are full-time positions, which again represents a growth rate of 5.5 per cent, and that is a full 1 per cent higher than the national growth rate. It is worth reminding the House that since December 1982 more than 80 000 jobs have been created and, when the Liberal Party was in government, that figure was an increase of a mere 4 000.

Mr Olsen: The level of unemployment was lower.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That's right, because nobody was in the work force; they all dropped out, and had given up. The remainder were leaving the State in droves—more than 5 000 people.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is not true. On the contrary, the job growth was pathetic, so it will be interesting to hear the Leader's rhetoric when he presents his policies to the electorate. Fortunately, we have some measure of the performance of his Party when in government. The Leader of the Opposition made gloomy predictions. However, although he cast it in a negative vein, he made one very optimistic prediction and it is worth reminding the House of that. He said that there would be anticipated lower interest rates in this coming period and I wish he was right. Unfortunately, interest rates have increased. One could say that was a positive statement by him. He normally says that everything will get worse, but in this instance he said that something would get better.

However, the context in which he viewed lower interest rates was not to say, 'That will be welcome for ordinary people, home buyers and others,' as indeed it would—not a bit of it: he said that such a situation would be a bad

thing, because SAFA's earning potential would be diminished, its potential to contribute to the Consolidated Account would be affected, and the return on its investments would be reduced. That is how he viewed lower interest rates. Unfortunately, that prediction was not correct, but the Leader's false claims about SAFA have not been borne out and lately, as part of his attack on our financial institutions, he has moved from SAFA to the State Bank.

It was interesting to hear the Leader trot out the figures (he trots them out every few weeks) relating to State taxation. Again, the Leader of the Opposition ignores the way in which the performance of the Liberal Government between 1979 and 1982 could be measured against that of our Government and how our Government's performance should be measured against that of other States. He referred to growth in stamp duty revenues, and he lumps into that not only private homes, of which he made a great deal, but also property and equity transactions. Indeed, there is considerable conflict between the two speakers opposite.

The Leader of the Opposition claimed that the stamp duty impact has been on that medium level and average home buyer, whereas his colleague claimed that it is related to a number of large transactions. In this instance, the member for Coles is a little more accurate than the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Olsen: You don't like the truth, so you twist it.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader of the Opposition is right to interject, because the member for Coles is more correct. She might have been able to advise the Leader of the Opposition of a major mistake which he made in the fourth paragraph at the beginning of his speech when he had just embarked on this analysis of stamp duty. He talked about the budget predictions in relation to stamp duties and he said that the budget predicted a 3.3 per cent real growth in stamp duties and that that was outrageous. In fact, that failed to take into account (and this was described in the budget papers, if only he had read them) a major transaction of \$12.4 million payable by GMH which was refunded; in other words, it went in on one side and appeared in the receipts but, as the note shows, it also went out in payments under the refund arrangements. In fact, if that transaction is excluded, which, as I say, was explained, the actual growth is 5 per cent, or minus 1 per cent in real terms against the expected inflation rate. So, that was completely wrong.

Of course we are talking about a large transaction. One can see how the member for Coles was more accurate than was the Leader of the Opposition about the composition of the increases in stamp duties. In terms of taxation, in terms of total revenue, one has to look at the growth of the economy when measuring the growth of tax, and one also has to measure it against the CPI. The figures of the Leader of the Opposition change very drastically indeed when that is done. I have put them on the record on a number of occasions. He fails to correct; he fails to acknowledge it. The true comparison is between the growth of the total tax revenue against economic and CPI growth. We then have a better measure and there is very little discrepancy indeed.

A useful comparison—and this is one I think we should look at particularly when the Leader talks about State taxes and charges—is the CPI measure of State and local government charges, how they in fact have influenced changes and what changes are recorded. Under the Tonkin Government, under the Liberals, in their 2¾ years in office, it increased by 60.8 per cent, that is, 27 per cent per annum. The rate under the present Government—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member does not want to hear this, because, in fact, over the whole of

our term of office—twice that of the previous Government—it has increased by 56.5 per cent, or 9.4 per cent per annum. The difference there is that it was three times greater under the Liberal Government. Referring to a few of the items: under the Liberals, for electricity the increase averaged 24.2 per cent, while under us it has been 7.8 per cent; under the Liberals, the increase for rent on Government-owned dwellings was 23.7 per cent, while under us it was 14.6 per cent; and for urban transport fares, under the Liberals it was 28.9 per cent, while under us, 20.2 per cent. The contribution made to the CPI, that is, the pressure put on prices by Government taxes and charges, under the Liberals was 14.4 per cent, while under us it has been 6.2 per cent. That, I think, surely silences finally the tedious argument we keep having trotted out to us every time these matters are debated.

I shall conclude by looking at just a few factors in the economy. Certainly, our economic performance could be better—and I wish it was. Certainly, there have been indicators in which we have lagged, and retail sales is one example. We have never hidden that and we have never denied it. Certainly, our unemployment has been unacceptably high—and we have never denied it and we have never hidden it. But we are not into talking down the economy into unrelieved gloom. There are in fact some extremely positive indicators, particularly in the last few months—not just the investment figures.

Mr Oswald: Name one.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I can name a number. As to employment growth—just that one figure alone—there have been 33 600 jobs, including 26 000 full-time jobs.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Well, the honourable member who opposes developments in this State, with his colleague who got switched out of that area, probably is not worried. However, I have named just one, and I will go on and name a few others. Manufacturing employment has been growing at the rate of 6.2 per cent. Indeed, our manufacturing performance has been, in national terms, spectacular. It has been matched by investment growth. In 1987-88 private new capital expenditure grew by 25.6 per cent—the second highest level in Australia. That is the growth in investment. That is not a bad indicator for the future, because as that investment is made and becomes productive we will see jobs and economic activity flowing from it.

The growth slowed in the second half of 1988, with a September annual growth of about 7 per cent, but that level of investment will pick up again, following a new round of investment, which has been announced, progressively through late 1988 and into 1989. Unemployment is certainly still too high, but it has improved, and that level of improvement has been limited by a large rise in the participation rate, well above the national level. In the three months to February 1989, it has risen by 1.3 percentage points over the three months to February 1988. Nationally, it was .6 per cent. So, more people are coming on to the job market because they feel confident that they can get jobs, because they have looked at the job creation and job growth which is going on. That is something that members opposite should be praising and not damning.

Population growth is certainly very encouraging. The September quarter shows a 1 per cent growth, up from a mid-term average of .82 per cent. It is still below the Australian average, certainly, and we do not hide that or deny it. However, it is improving very well indeed and we have seen a significant turnaround in net interstate migration at the same time.

As to inflation in South Australia, we do not hear members opposite bleating about inflation—because it does not suit them. Earlier the member for Morphett said 'Name one,' and here is another: the national average is 7.7 per cent, while the average is 6.8 per cent in South Australia. The cost of living here is being kept down, below the national average, and that is a positive factor.

Mr Oswald: Tell the pensioners that.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is a fact of life. I do not think anyone would encourage any pensioners to go interstate—to Victoria, Queensland, New South Wales or Western Australia. They would have higher taxes and a higher cost of living there. That is why they are here in South Australia. As to bankruptcy rates, certainly a lot has been made of that, but they fell significantly in the three months to December. They are down about 25 per cent compared with the year earlier. So, I hope that that trend will continue. I believe it will continue, but it is certainly not helped by the denigration by members opposite, by their shonky figures and by their inadequate analysis. I commend the Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time.

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

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

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): In the 10 minutes available to me, I wish to talk about the gas supply contracts which were recently negotiated and announced to the public with a fanfare from the Premier. It was with some interest that I read the comments made recently by the Hon. I. Gilfillan in another place.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: Your friend.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, I do not agree with a lot of what he does and says, but on this occasion, as Chairman of the Upper House select committee on energy, what he was saying was in fact correct. He said that the gas contracts, in effect—and this word was expressed to me by another well-informed commentator—indicate the fragility of the supply position for South Australia up to the next century. The Premier came into this act and announced that our gas supplies were secure to the turn of the century. In fact they are not.

The Hon. Mr Gilfillan has said that these contracts relate to gas yet to be discovered. That is perfectly true. Nothing has changed since 1982—when I was criticised vehemently by the Labor Party for trying to moderate an 80 per cent increase (as a result of its shonky legislation of years before) and, into the bargain, provide for a regime of prices which would guarantee, for the first time ever, a \$50 million exploration program. One feature of these gas contracts which is desirable is the fact that that guaranteed exploration program is to carry on.

To suggest that our gas supplies are secured into the next century is nonsense—and people in the gas industry know this. Again, this is an attempt by the Premier and others to put a gloss on the facts and to talk up the position, to seek to tell the public that all is rosy in the garden. It is not—and what the Hon. I. Gilfillan said, namely, that the contracts are based on gas yet to be found, is perfectly true. The alternative supplies, if the gas is not found in the Cooper Basin, have been there since 1982. The Northern Territory supply; the Cooper Basin supply in south-west Queensland; and Bass Strait gas: all these alternatives have been there, and the Liberal Government of which I was a member followed up each of those vigorously.

The present Premier promised the electorate in 1982 that he would see that the oil from the Jackson field flowed into South Australia, but that promise was only one of a legion of promises that the Government made and broke. I do not think that he actually saw the then Queensland Premier (Mr Bjelke-Petersen) let alone try to ensure that the oil flowed into South Australia. However, the Government of which I was a member was interested in the gas flow in that part of the State and that is an option that we are told will secure our future to the turn of the century. So, for once I must agree with the Hon. Ian Gilfillan concerning the gas contracts and the long-term fragility of our gas supplies. The only new encouraging factor is the discovery of gas in the Otway Basin in the South-East of South Australia, particularly at Katnook No. 2 well.

I certainly hope that further exploration and appraisal drilling will prove a significant gas reserve there because that would be a major boost on the South Australian energy scene. If in time that field proves to be a major gas resource I also hope that the Government, of whichever complexion it may be, will have more sense than the Dunstan Government had and will refuse to sell that gas across the border. After all, the Dunstan Government, in selling our gas to New South Wales under favourable terms, ensured that that State would have an adequate supply well into the next century when our own gas supplies were not (and still are not) secure. That was a major folly and one of the stupid economic decisions made by the then Labor Administration.

So, we should put these most encouraging announcements made by the Premier and his Minister into perspective. There is nothing new about these contracts except that they contain an agreed price and an escalator, which is 95 per cent of the inflation rate. In that regard, let us hope that the Federal Government can do a better job than it has done thus far in tackling inflation. Prices have increased and they are on the way up. Any escalation in price will have a significant impact on South Australian domestic and industrial consumers who must pay for the gas. For these reasons, I commend the Hon. Mr Gilfillan for his sensible statement concerning these gas contracts. His experience as Chairman of the Legislative Council select committee on energy resources has obviously taught him something.

I now turn to the imposts levied by the Federal Government on the petroleum industry. In imposing its resource rent tax, allegedly to boost its revenues, it is only doing the nation a great disservice in the long term. I received a copy of the APEA report every week or two and I read it. The continuing theme week after week is the effect of the resource rent tax on oil exploration in Australia and the consequent declining level of production. This, in turn, leads to an increase in the import bill because we must import petroleum and petroleum products. Indeed, this was a factor in last month's disastrous balance of payments figures.

The APEA report that I received yesterday, when referring to our declining oil production, states that the demand for petroleum products is increasing and running at about twice the rate that the Federal Government predicted. The report quotes the Australian Institute of Petroleum as stating that the higher demand 'will mean a balance of payments deficit of \$3.5 billion on petroleum imports by 1998'. That was reported in the *Advertiser* of 15 February. It has been pointed out that from the day on which the resource rent tax was imposed it has continued to have an adverse impact. The report continues:

In 1987-88, Australia exported \$974 million worth of oil (mainly light crude) and imported \$1.4 billion worth (lubricants and heavy crude). From 1991 the inexorably rising demand veers away from the rapidly declining production forecasts, leaving a wide gap.

The discovery of any large fields would narrow the gap, but the finding of more fields hinges, to some extent, on the question of the resources rent tax. The executive director of the Australian Petroleum Exploration Association (APEA), Mr Keith Orchison, said companies were switching more money to exploration outside Australia.

I make this point: the Federal Government's role in the generation of wealth in this nation has been entirely negative. We see this march of the socialists towards more and more power for Canberra and less and less for the States. However, the entire development of resources around the nation has been the result of State Government initiative. Let any member point to any resource development that has resulted from a Federal Government initiative. The North-West Shelf and the Pilbara were developed as a result of the initiative shown by Sir Charles Court as Western Australian Minister of Industry, the Federal Government's only contribution to that being to impose export controls and to institute a taxation regime.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am talking about development in Australia.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Briggs.

Mr RANN (Briggs): I am privileged to follow the Deputy Leader's swansong. Once again, listening to the Leader of the Opposition and his Deputy, we have observed a total failure by the Opposition, those economic quislings of this State, to enunciate any hard policies in terms of the State's economy or the management of that economy. That is typical of the Liberals' performance at State and Federal level. We hear much locally about easing the pressure but, when we look at the fine print, what has the Leader of the Opposition promised in order to ease the pressure: 'to arrange lectures and discussion groups on State economic matters'. He will arrange lectures and discussion groups and probably a few task forces!

The Federal Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party and that aspiring leader, Mr Andrew Peacock, the soufflé who may rise twice, when asked about his economic policies, said, 'I'm not saying. You would like me to, but I am not prepared to.' He is not prepared to detail the Federal Opposition's economic policies: it has none. The other evening John Howard challenged the Prime Minister to a televised debate on the state of the economy. He made that challenge even though throughout the previous two weeks in Parliament he had failed to do so: he had neither the guts nor the policies.

We know what we will get in South Australia. At the last State election we got page after page of reruns of policies from Kennett in Victoria, from his failed election campaign. Last year, we had second-rate reruns of Greiner's campaign in New South Wales, and more recently we have had WA Incorporated transposed here, simply because the Opposition in this State has absolutely no ideas of its own.

As I say, and I repeat—and I will repeat it outside this House—the Opposition in this State delights in playing the role of economic quislings. They seek at every single turn to criticise what is being achieved and to disparage people in private enterprise who are out there trying to create jobs. The Leader of the Opposition challenged me on a question by way of an interjection. What is his attitude to the so-called State income tax that is part of the Liberal Party's new policies? I want to know whether he will detail his policies on the State Bank. We have seen an unprecedented attack on the head of the State Bank in this State, Tim Marcus Clark, by the Leader of the Opposition, both in this House and outside privately. It has been a smear.

However, when he got down to the State Bank, typically—as we have come to expect from the Leader of the Opposition—what does he do? He is cringing and pandering, because he tailors every speech to the group to whom he is speaking at the time. He does not have the guts to be consistent. The Leader says he will not sell the State Bank, but I do not believe that. Will he sell it or any of its subsidiaries, like John Moore, the other Liberal spokesman is saying? Does he intend to sell off Beneficial Finance? We want no ifs, no buts: the Opposition must come clean or keep its hands off the State Bank and its subsidiaries. I want to know how the Leader intends to limit the bank's operations as he hinted in this House. How does he intend to limit the State Bank, the most successful economic generator in this State? How will he treat SAFA when he is critical of its structure and activities at every turn in this House?

I remind the Deputy Leader and the Leader of the Opposition of some of the things the Premier was outlining previously. Let us compare our records in terms of economic performance. During the past 12 months, the Leader of the Opposition has shown by his statements a worrying inability to grasp any economic fundamentals. Just about every major prediction that the Leader has made during the past 12 months has been wrong. For example, in a major economic speech in reply to the budget in September last year, he said that the State had had its worst economic performance since the Depression, and there was a big smile on his face at the time.

As the Premier has outlined today, in the past six years economic growth in South Australia has exceeded 30 per cent compared with a decrease in the size of the State's economy under the Tonkin Government, of which the Leader of the Opposition was supposedly a senior Minister. In that same speech last September, the Leader of the Opposition predicted fewer new job opportunities for South Australia in the coming year. Once again, he was totally wrong. Since he made that quisling comment, when he was showing that he hoped that the economy would get worse (to help his own political fortunes), 33 600 new jobs have been created in this State, giving South Australia a growth rate of 5.5 per cent since February last year, compared with—

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr RANN:—and I remind the member for Mount Gambier—a 5.5 per cent job growth rate since February last year compared with 4.4 per cent nationally. In fact, since December 1982, more than 80 000 jobs have been created in South Australia, compared with 4 000 jobs when the member for Mount Gambier was the late, lamented Minister of Education in the Tonkin Liberal Government. Go out and sell that to the electorate!

Just for the record, in the same speech in September last year, the Leader of the Opposition—that economic whiz kid with a bodgegy accountancy degree—predicted that interest rates would drop in the current year. Any comparison between the Government that he was part of and ours shows that they have failed. Look at the charge increases that the Premier has detailed. We have heard the Deputy Leader of the Opposition boasting about his record as the Energy Minister, but let us remember that electricity increases averaged 24.2 per cent per year when he was at the helm, compared with 7.8 per cent each year since we have been at the helm. Transport fares under the Liberals went up by 28.9 per cent each year.

Members interjecting:

Mr RANN: They do not want to hear the facts. Transport fares increased by 28.9 per cent each year under the Tonkin Liberal Government, one and a half times the increase since

1982. Local government rates and charges increased by 22 per cent under the Tonkin Government compared with 10 per cent under Labor. So, if you want to compare the Liberals' record with ours—any day, any time. You failed! You squibbed! It was three years of going backwards. Even the then Premier in his most famous economic speech said, 'We are going backwards, but more slowly than we could be.' How exciting! What a record to be proud of!

Let us talk about education in this State. We have heard from the Liberals that the State Government is making financial cutbacks to education. I keep hearing on talkback shows those bodgegy Libs out there in Burnside who are paid or persuaded to ring up talkback shows and they say that we have been cutting back on education. They keep saying that class sizes are going up and that there are now more students per teacher. Last year we brought down a State budget of \$816 million for education. That was a record figure, and I am sure that people who talk about these cuts—

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr RANN:—probably including the late, lamented Minister of Education, the member for Mount Gambier, would say, 'Okay, so what; it was a record budget for education, but that is inflation—it's a record every year.' I have the Treasury figures which show that during the past five budgets funding for education has been increased by 65 per cent under Labor in this State, 17 per cent above the level of inflation. This year we are spending \$60 per pupil more in our schools than last year—\$60 over and above inflation. That might not sound a lot for someone like the member for Mount Gambier, but we have 187 000 students in State schools alone.

We also hear from the Liberals that class sizes have increased and that somehow South Australia is worse off than other States. That is simply the grossest of lies and distortions. Over the past decade, the number of students in our schools has dropped by 39 000, yet 830 teachers would have been sacked under the Liberals. Look what they did in New South Wales—got rid of 2 000 teaching jobs. We now have the lowest class sizes on record. I also want to refer to other initiatives in the education area and I am glad that the Minister of Education is in the House because he deserves an enormous amount of credit in this area. Only recently he launched the Year of Industries in Schools, which I think is one of the most exciting initiatives in the history of this State's education.

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

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): The member for Briggs has just tried to tell that it has never been better for the people of South Australia than under a Labor Government. Unfortunately, I have had the sadness of having to doorknock in some of the marginal seats in recent times. It is sad—

Mr Rann interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: The member for Briggs wanted to yell and shout. We know it is a method that, when you are in trouble, you try to howl down any others. That is an admission that you are in trouble, especially a person with a lot of journalistic experience, and a good fabricator: we know that.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.G. EVANS: It is quite obvious. I ask any honourable member to go out and doorknock and have a look at the number of houses now that do not have a lawn in a

condition that the owner would prefer. Lawns are neglected; they are dying, and it is not because of a personal choice. It is because excess water is too expensive. Do not say it is the hot weather, because the reservoirs are holding over half their capacity in the middle of one of the driest spells ever. That is a clear indication that people are not using the water because the Labor Government has priced them out of the market.

Honourable members should look at the other aspects in those marginal seats. The member for Fisher knows that. He knows that I have been in his area. Look at the homes that are only seven or eight years old and in need of a coat of paint and maintenance. People quite openly say that they cannot afford it. Someone like the member for Briggs tells us that we are better off under Labor. Families are suffering more than they have ever suffered before. I have spoken to the owners of homes displaying 'for sale' signs and mentioned that they may not be there at the time of the election. They reply that that will be the case if only they can sell at a price which will give them enough equity in something a little bit smaller or of less value in another area. They say that, if they cannot sell their current home at such a price, they cannot re-establish. They are doing that because of the level of interest rates.

The Presidency of the Australia Labor Party—the most powerful position in that Party's structure—is held by the Premier of this State, and yet he sits back and does not attack Mr Hawke and Mr Keating. At least the Hon. Don Dunstan had the courage to go out and fight for his people in times of trouble. But not this Premier—he is too weak-kneed to do that. The members who represent marginal seats are worried about it. However, constituents in marginal or safe seats, whether they be Labor or Liberal, will lose their homes if the level of interest rates stays the same; and they will lose their homes more quickly if interest rates go up, as predicted.

I know of a woman from the member for Fisher's electorate who has three children under 12. She has a good job, she is a teacher. She was able to handle the repayments on her home when interest rates were about 14.5 per cent. At that level she had to find about \$830 a month. She now has to find \$940, and that has put her in the position—

Mr Duigan: She can extend the loan.

Mr S.G. EVANS: The honourable member comes out with this hogwash about extending the debt so that a person is in hock for the whole of their life. The Federal Government keeps putting up interest rates and the member for Adelaide thinks that that is great and that it is all right to say to the individual, 'Just extend your loan for a few more years.' That guarantees that the home owner becomes a slave to interest rates and a working agent for money lenders—one of which is the State Bank—at the whim of ALP philosophy. The ALP does not believe in helping the average person. It wants to rip off the one asset that most Australians aspire to: ownership of one's own home. Many home owners have made a commitment. They have gone without some of the luxuries in an attempt to raise a reasonable deposit on a home that they hope to buy and, at the same time, raise a family. In single income households the other partner is forced back to work to try to salvage the home, but in many cases that does not save them from disaster.

I ask honourable members, when they go doorknocking, to not think only about what will happen to them in the future—that is of little consequence to the State. They should look at the unpainted homes that are in need of maintenance, where gardens and shrubs are dying and where the motor car may be in need of repair, because people have been priced out of the car market. Water rates have

gone through the roof and electricity charges have gone up to a point where people are struggling to survive.

There are also the homes that I have doorknocked in, for example, the member for Fisher's electorate—homes that do have a dog, high fences and security doors. When he was Premier, Mr Dunstan said that we needed to have an easier life. His attitude was, 'We don't like the police, so we don't need so many of them'. Therefore, he destroyed public confidence in the Police Force and developed an attitude within society—and, in some cases, this was even taught in schools—that authority should be torn down. Do honourable members remember the paper tiger argument about tearing up authority and throwing it out the window?

Mr Tyler: We have more police per head of population than any other State.

Mr S.G. EVANS: The honourable member for Fisher tells us we have more police per head of population than any other State. I ask him to go through his area and ask people how much they have spent on security doors, alarms and maintaining a dog that can act as a guard dog within the area. I ask him to do that, because he will find that the Government's philosophy has imposed on the community another cost—not a few hundred, but thousands of dollars per home because police protection is not available. Then we have Neighbourhood Watch—a system brought in from another State. It is quite a good idea, but it is not the sort of thing that was promoted by the ALP a few years ago when it found that its philosophy failed. The ALP has been in government since 1982 this time, but it has governed for practically all of the past 20 years. Now, it starts to say—

Ms Gayler: Who introduced it?

Mr S.G. EVANS: I have admitted who introduced it and I admitted where it came from. That is quite a different thing. However, the Government did that only after the other system failed; that is the reason for it. The Government is feeling the repercussions from the electorate, so it is claiming the credit. I gave the Government credit for doing it. However, it does not solve the problem of the expenses placed on the average family. Anybody who argues that people are better off under Labor in this State is kidding themselves. Go out and ask the people in the community what they think. What can be worse than losing your own home?

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: The member for Fisher says that that is not bad news, that it can be worse. The honourable member for Fisher tells people who are about to lose their homes that that is all right, it is not bad, and it could be worse under the Liberal Party. That is what he is saying. What could be worse than losing your own home—the one asset you want to work for? The pressures placed on families are quite traumatic.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Labor Party is panicking, and rightly so. It cannot offer the community security in their own homes or security of tenure. It has destroyed that. I am sure that people will give the Liberal Party the opportunity to prove that there is another way to ease the pressure on them. The Labor Party has destroyed their way of life. It has destroyed the security that South Australians desire. The Liberal Party will ease that pressure because the people of South Australia will give us that opportunity. I am sure the member for Fisher knows that, and that is why he is looking for other work; in a couple of months he will be out the door.

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): I apologise to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and the House in advance, because I want to change the tone somewhat and speak about my electorate rather than the electorate of any other member. I am not

sure whether it is because the member for Davenport does not understand where the boundaries are or that he is so confident of not being knocked off by one of his cohorts over there that he insists on trying to do them a favour. I think that in continuing to doorknock in Fisher and other marginal seats, he is doing the Labor Party a decided favour.

I want to look at a couple of issues in my electorate which have benefited from the budget process over the past 12 months. I welcome the continuing progress on a number of those projects. The Hallett Cove school (formerly known as the R10 school) which caters for the children in the Hallett Cove, Sheidow Park and Trott Park areas up to and including year 10, is nearing completion, Stage 3 of the school, which is to accommodate the high school component and the arts, technical studies, other specialist areas and the science laboratories, is nearing completion. The standard of work on this site has been quite brilliant.

The other aspect of the project nearing completion is the joint use gymnasium which is being constructed by the Education Department and the Marion council. Again, that will provide the community of greater Hallett Cove, including Trott Park and Sheidow Park, with a large covered space which will benefit the community virtually 24 hours a day. The intention is that the school will use the venue during school hours and the council will have access to it out of school hours, including weekends. In turn, that will provide a meeting place and a place for sport, which has been sorely lacking to this point.

The grounds at Hallett Cove Primary School are coming along nicely and the areas where construction has finished have been grassed. Enrolments have exceeded expectation and, as a result, three additional portable classrooms were installed this year. I pay tribute to the employees of the Department of Housing and Construction who were able to get those buildings on site and into workable condition for the beginning of the school year.

I also welcome continuing progress towards the completion of the Hallett Cove Kindergarten. In addition to the Hallett Cove Child Care Centre and the Karrara Kindergarten, it becomes the third kindergarten on the western side of Lonsdale Road. Given that the Director (Kath Christie) and her committee have been operating out of a mobile kindergarten for a year and a half, I am sure that they will welcome the completion of the new kindergarten. The building appears to be of a very high standard and, apart from the central room, there are places for children who need extra attention. The building also has wet areas and other places to enable children to partake of other than passive activities such as reading, which they tend to do in the carpeted areas. It appears to be an excellent facility and I look forward to its opening, which will bring relief to the people who have been operating from the mobile kindy and to the parents of the children who have had to put up with more than most during that time.

I also welcome the spending on transport, which is a fairly critical issue south of the hills face zone. Over the past couple of years, spending on the new signalling equipment on the Noarlunga line has been of the order of \$18 million. The project is now complete and I am hopeful that it will overcome some of the problems that have been encountered during past years, particularly in periods of excessively high temperatures when, occasionally, signals have not worked as they should have. The electronics associated with the project should give the STA the capacity to produce a better and more coordinated set of signals on the line and, in the future, to install information systems for the benefit of its clients.

I also welcome the acquisition of the last of the 20 3 000 class Comeng railcars, which will come into service at the end of this financial year. The Government has let out to tender a new contract for 50 additional railcars of the 3 000 type, although they will not be called that because, I presume, Comeng has a patent on the name. Comeng may tender for that work but the standard of the 20 3 000 class railcars on the line is very high and it is a great pleasure to travel on them, many of us in that part of the world having been teethered on the red hens.

I compliment the STA on the success of the Crouzet ticketing system, which has given the STA the flexibility of more effective timetabling. Over the past 12 months, revised timetables have shown this increased sensitivity to the needs of STA consumers. Several weeks ago, the timetabling of a bus running from the Lonsdale railway station to Reynella was altered as a result of information obtained from the Crouzet system, and that assisted people wishing to commute from Lonsdale. It is pleasing that Crouzet is beginning to have that impact. The system has enabled similar initiatives to be taken with respect to altering bus timetables. Whilst on the subject of transport, I congratulate the Government on the success of the Morphetville tram depot. Not only has it meant that a superb site is vacant in Victoria Square but a tidy, well-developed site at Morphetville is available to store trams not operating on the line.

In addition, I acknowledge the work of the Highways Department on the installation of median strips on Brighton Road. I have had some association with this project for a number of years, first as a member of a resident group in Glenelg which opposed some aspects of the proposal. The median strips that have been installed in the electorate of Bright between the Hove railway crossing and Ocean Boulevard have enhanced the capacity for Brighton Road to carry traffic.

I concede that the Highways Department has been generous in considering applications by traders to have various lay-bys and gaps installed in the strip. Their concerns have been taken care of to a large extent. They have been treated sensitively and sensibly because the resulting network of median strips has had exactly the effect it was supposed to have. Traffic moves freely on Brighton Road and I can vouch for the fact that delays in the morning are minimal. With due respect to some traders, the impact will probably be fairly transient. I welcome the Government's spending on transport and education projects in my electorate. The Bannon Government has been doing the right thing in these areas: long may it continue to do so.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Following a question this afternoon to the Premier by the member for Light, I will pursue the question of bank credit and the imposition of bank charges for extending credit. The question related to the campaign by Australian banks to introduce fees on Bankcard for cardholders who pay their bills before incurring interest charges. The prospect that anyone should be penalised for paying a bill on time is one that I find absolutely abhorrent. I believe that the majority of people in the community also find it abhorrent.

The prospect that banks may seek the approval of State Governments to introduce such a fee was canvassed in last weekend's *Sunday Mail*. The Minister of Consumer Affairs said that, last year, State Ministers of Consumer Affairs were generally opposed to the introduction of up-front credit card charges. The Premier reinforced his opposition today but did not make an unequivocal statement that his Government was opposed and would oppose any such prospect at the ministerial council of Ministers of Consumer Affairs.

There should be an unequivocal statement from the Government that it opposes this proposition. When one examines the information that is already to hand, irrespective of what may come out of the working party, it becomes clear that the spiralling debt which is afflicting the community, particularly middle and lower income earners, has reached a level at which it should become an issue of deep national concern.

In the small business section of the *Sunday Mail*, in a story under the heading 'Banks Deny Credit Catastrophe', it was claimed that Australian household debt is very low by international standards. Does household debt, as defined by the banks, include mortgage debt? If it does, and if it is compared with household debts by international standards, it should be noted by Australians that mortgage interest repayments are tax free in the United States and up to a ceiling of £60 000 in the United Kingdom. So, to incur home mortgage debts in the United States or the United Kingdom is easier, safer and a much more attractive proposition than in Australia. A further statement in this story by the banks in the *Sunday Mail* is, in my opinion, hard to believe. The article states:

Rather than being irresponsible, consumers are buying what they can afford and paying their debts on time.

Yet, on page 2 of the same newspaper in a story headed 'New Bankcard row looms' the spokesmen for Australian private banks were full of complaints because 30 per cent of Australians who use Bankcard are paying their debts on time and thus, in the opinion of banks, 'free loading' on the system. If 30 per cent of Bankcard users are paying their debts on time, it follows that 70 per cent are not.

Mr Hamilton: The banks ought to be happy.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Exactly. Banks now propose to impose a penalty for promptness on those people and to increase credit card interest by 1 per cent from 21.9 per cent to 23.1 per cent from 20 April. We are talking about a system which becomes extremely worrying when so many people are attempting to use it to pay their household accounts. They use Bankcard to pay not just for consumer purchases of material goods but for the recurrent costs of household living, such as engineering and water supply charges, electricity and Telecom accounts. They can all be paid using Bankcard.

People who cannot afford to make cash payments on time, or to pay within 55 days, pay their accounts using Bankcard in the hope of deferring the evil day. These people will now incur an interest charge of 23.1 per cent, which means that an electricity account of, say, \$100 will cost \$123. An E&WS Department account or a Telecom bill of \$100—an average quarterly account—will become \$123. The spiral of debt becomes monumental, a downward twist to which there is no end except in bankruptcy, in the case of small businesses, or, for families, the selling of their homes and going into tenancy. The prospect looks extremely tragic.

This proposition of imposing a charge on those who pay their accounts on time follows not only the recently announced increased interest rate but the proposed levy on savings accounts of less than \$250. That proposition was defeated. In fact, the Commonwealth Bank abandoned its plan to charge a levy on savings accounts of battlers in the face of huge opposition. Last year several banks introduced the new charges, with the Commonwealth Bank charging a \$1.50 monthly fee on savings accounts of less than \$250. The responsibility of banks towards the less well-off in the community was brought home only after enormous opposition by ordinary people, particularly pensioners and young

people, many of whom are lucky to have a savings account of \$250. The prospect that they could be penalised for holding such an account is not one which I believe any responsible person can possibly justify.

The claim made in the story to which I referred in the *Sunday Mail* was that Visa International puts Australia at the bottom of world default rates. I therefore ask: why does the 1988 annual general report of the National Australia Bank Limited disclose on page 1 that the bank's bad debts written off against provisions rose by \$262.7 million during the year to \$354.6 million, including \$143.3 million of rescheduled country debts?

I am working from memory, but I think that last year Westpac budgeted for bad debts totalling 15 per cent of its total revenue. This bad debt provision is borne by every depositor of the bank. Every customer of any bank bears the total burden. At the time that banks are increasing charges to cover bad debts they are also embarking on credit marketing campaigns along the lines of 'If you want it, get it'.

Mr Duigan: Who is paying for that?

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The bank customers are paying for that. It is a highly significant move by banks which, once upon a time, were concerned about people being able to finance their borrowings. These days the concern seems to be considerably less.

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): I wish to contrast the Opposition's negative and pessimistic view of the South Australian economy with the rather more realistic appraisal that has been given not only earlier in this debate by the Premier and the member for Briggs but also in the regular quarterly statements issued by the State Bank. The State Bank quarterly reports on the Australian and South Australian economy have been issued for some years and comment on the economic activity of the previous quarter, making projections and predictions about future economic activity.

These reports are an honest appraisal of South Australia's economic performance in a wide variety of areas and look at the underlying strength of the South Australian economy, the extent to which policies pursued by the Federal Government impact on the South Australian economy and the extent to which overall world economic trends impact on what we are able to do in South Australia.

The most recent report issued by the State Bank is for the December quarter 1988. I expect that the report for the first quarter of 1989 will be issued shortly. Reports which have been issued for the past couple of years do not attempt to gloss over or hide any of South Australia's difficulties but explain in a realistic and honest way where growth has been, where there is optimism and investment and where there have been some shortcomings. There is no doubt that the reports issued by the bank describe a State and an economy which is strong, growing and picking up in a number of areas of major economic activity. It is picking up in terms of employment growth, private investment, Government investment in State infrastructure, residential development—and, more particularly, non-residential development in the City of Adelaide—and the manufacturing sector.

I wish to refer to some of those matters. A major contribution has also been made to the South Australian economy by the tourism industry which for so long has been a Cinderella industry in both South Australia and Australia. However, the contribution which is now being made by that industry to growth in employment, investment, infrastructure and the overall size of the South Australian economy

is substantial indeed. Some major projects, the most substantial of which have been the Casino or the ASER development and the Grand Prix, have brought a much higher profile to the South Australian tourism and hospitality related areas. That is in marked contrast to the period in the early 1980s when there was very little investment in tourism and tourism related infrastructure. That infrastructure investment is absolutely essential if we are to capitalise on two things: first, on the increasing number of overseas visitors who come to Australia; and, secondly, on the job potential in the hospitality and entertainment area.

In relation to the growth in international tourism, in recent years South Australia has invested an enormous amount of money in trying to attract to South Australia a greater percentage of the international tourism market than has been the case in the past. At the moment, South Australia's share of the international market is 11.5 per cent and it is growing in two respects: first, it is growing in absolute numbers; and, secondly, it is growing in terms of the number of dollars which international visitors contribute to the South Australian economy.

They would not be able to contribute to the economy if such facilities as the Hilton International Hotel and the Hyatt Regency Hotel were not available. These facilities bring to South Australia an increasing number of tourists who contribute more to the South Australian economy. Those projects are an indication of the fact that a number of other hotel related investments (and a number are on the drawing boards, including the East End Market development and projects in the Hindley Street precinct) will provide facilities that can cater for those people.

In addition, a number of other development projects, particularly in the Flinders Ranges and along our metropolitan foreshore, will provide facilities enabling tourists to visit wilderness areas of our State and to gain from that experience. Those hospitality and hotel industry developments also provide opportunities for the large number of Regency Park and Adelaide TAFE School of Hospitality and Training graduates. Very few graduates, if any, are unable to obtain employment immediately after leaving the TAFE hospitality and tourism related courses. Apart from the TAFE business studies course, it is the most popular course for TAFE students and the graduates are not only employable in South Australia but also, increasingly, taken on as hotel and hospitality industry expert staff elsewhere in Australia.

A number of significant developments in the tourism and hospitality area in South Australia are on the boards at the moment. Last year about \$300 million worth of tourism related projects were developed in the tourism area and another \$200 million worth are on the drawing boards for this year. I have already mentioned the International Markets. We will house them through a number of projects and this year there will also be a major development thrust in order to attempt to capture more of the Australian market. There is no doubt that the Australian component is by far the largest proportion of the tourism market and it is necessary for us to attract people from other States.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Do you support the Mount Lofty development?

Mr DUIGAN: We are providing opportunities for development. The member for Heysen just mentioned the very exciting Mount Lofty development, which is the subject of much public debate and a vigorous environmental assessment project. There is no doubt—

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: Do you support it?

Mr DUIGAN: The honourable member asked me whether I support it. Provided that all the environmental objections

can be overcome (and this Government has an excellent record in ensuring that environmental considerations are taken into account in our major development projects), yes, of course I support it. The view from Mount Lofty is superb. I think that it gives a wonderful panorama of the city. One is able to get a picturesque view of the gulf area (where development has also taken place) as well as views to the south and to the east. It will be a very exciting development that will replace facilities which, unfortunately, were destroyed in that area. The project will provide a wonderful panoramic vista of metropolitan Adelaide for local people and for interstate and international tourists. I have no hesitation in saying that, provided these environmental objections are overcome, I support it, as I support a number of the other tourism development projects around our State, because I believe that they are making a major contribution to our economy.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): On 25 August last year I moved a motion as follows:

That this House calls on the Government to proceed as a matter of urgency with the rehabilitation of those Government irrigation area distribution systems outstanding and to honour the undertaking given at the time of the commencement of the rehabilitation by the former Deputy Premier and Minister of Works, the Hon. J.D. Corcoran, that no irrigator in the State Government irrigation areas would be financially disadvantaged as a consequence of the work to be undertaken.

That was more than six months ago and I am still waiting for the Minister of Water Resources to respond to that motion. When the member for Mawson became the Minister of Water Resources, she began with quite a flurry when she made decisions on a number of issues which had been on the agenda for some time. However, as time has gone by, she is making fewer and fewer decisions and many of the major issues in her portfolio area are now grinding to a halt. Those issues have been in limbo for a number of years since this Government came to office.

By referring to the rehabilitation of Government irrigation areas, the Minister is trying to convince the irrigators in those areas that they should fund half the rehabilitation of what is a Government resource and asset. The contribution being made by the irrigators in Government irrigation areas is adequate to provide their contribution to the rehabilitation so long as the Government operation is efficient and effective.

The rates that are charged to Government irrigators are as high, if not higher, than those charged to any other Australian irrigators, certainly above those being charged by the Renmark Irrigation Trust and the First Mildura Irrigation Trust. Private irrigation areas have been rehabilitated at no additional cost compared with the Government irrigation areas.

The requirement by the Government that the Government irrigators contribute half the cost of the rehabilitation will mean that at the end of 10 years Government irrigators will be at an enormous financial disadvantage. The compounding effect will be that Government irrigators in 10 years time will be paying somewhere between 40 per cent and 50 per cent higher irrigation rates than those applying to any other irrigation district in Australia. Of course, that is totally out of the question. It would put the Government irrigators, because they are unfortunate enough to be within the Government scheme, at an enormous disadvantage. That cannot occur. I believe that it is high time that the Minister made the decision to proceed forthwith with the rehabilitation and that the undertaking given in the mid-1970s by the Hon. J.D. Corcoran be adhered to by this Government.

The Minister has just agreed to the proceeding of the Woolpunda ground water interception scheme. This scheme was contemplated back in about 1980 or 1981, and at that time a contract was let to consultants to determine whether the interception scheme was feasible. It proved to be feasible, and at long last the scheme is to proceed. The Government has sought funding for this project from Victoria, New South Wales and the Commonwealth. In other words, the Government has had to enter into a scheme of arrangements, a trade-off if you like, with the eastern States and the Commonwealth for funding. It means that the Government has agreed to allow the States of Victoria and New South Wales to put additional saline drainage water into the Murray River in exchange for providing some financial assistance to enable the Woolpunda ground water interception scheme to proceed.

At the time of this trade-off being negotiated we find the Government and the Minister talking about the grandiose scheme of bringing water down to the southern part of Western Australia and to South Australia from Lake Argyle. It is estimated that that project will cost, in real terms, some \$20 000 million—or \$20 billion—a figure that is hard even to contemplate. I refer to this because of the Minister's entering into an agreement with Victoria and New South Wales and becoming involved in a trade-off situation (which will allow those States to put additional saline water into the Murray River) so that she could get sufficient resources to fund an interception scheme that will cost only \$20 million, while at the same time giving credence to a project that would cost \$20 000 million. In reality, it is a pipe dream—pie in the sky. From an engineering point of view, yes, it is feasible. In this day and age, as far as engineering is concerned virtually anything can be done, but talking about \$20 000 million just falls into the realms of total unreality.

I also refer to the Woolpunda scheme and the trade-off that the Minister has entered into because about three weeks or a month ago I proposed to the Minister that Lock 3 should be lowered to enable the poor quality water that is presently in Lake Bonney, in the Riverland, to be discharged, flushed away and replaced with good quality water. I said that that should occur as soon as possible, but at a time when there was sufficient flow in the Murray River to enable the water flowing out of Lake Bonney and the other backwaters between Lock 3 and Lock 4 to be sufficiently diluted so as to have minimal effect on the downstream users.

Since that time the Minister seems to have been searching around for reasons why it cannot be done rather than for

means by which it can be achieved. That is a very negative sort of approach. I have said publicly that, if the Minister and the E&WS Department can come up with a better answer than the one I have suggested, that would be fine by me, but at this stage no better suggestion has been forthcoming. Lake Bonney is a key resource in South Australia. It is worth millions of dollars not only to the Riverland but to South Australia as far as tourist and sporting attractions are concerned. The Minister started off with quite a flurry, as I have said, in the first month or two of her appointment, and she did make a few decisions in those early days, but it surprises me that she now appears to have gone completely back into the fold and that she is just echoing whatever sentiments are coming from the department.

It is not as though the proposal I have put forward is something new. In the early 1970s, a former Minister, the Hon. J.D. Corcoran, agreed to this procedure on two occasions, at my request, and, as I have said on other occasions, he is surprised that this has not been done since that time. The quality of the water in Lake Bonney is poor. As I understand, it is not a health risk, but the water has been steadily deteriorating over recent years and, if that is allowed to continue, sooner or later it will become a health risk. If an outbreak of any form of disease could be traced back to that resource, it could involve countless millions of dollars of damage to South Australia's tourism industry and sporting activities. I call on the Minister to once again start making a few decisions, as she did in the first month or two of her appointment to the water resources portfolio, whereby it is hoped that we will see some of these outstanding issues resolved.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): The Leader of the Opposition's contribution clearly showed how this Government continues to be a high taxing Government. The people of South Australia certainly recognise this. Other speakers this afternoon have reinforced those views. I think the member for Davenport's examples from the everyday working person clearly show how the Government's policies are hurting, and hurting more and more. First, I refer to tables which show State Government receipts from taxation, and also from other sources, on a recurrent basis. I seek leave of the House to incorporate in *Hansard* two purely statistical tables.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr De Laine): Can the honourable member assure the House that they are purely statistical?

Mr MEIER: Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

South Australian Government Receipts, 1985-86 to 1988-89 (Estimated)

	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89 (Estimates)	7 months to 31 January 1989
	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	(\$'000)
Recurrent Receipts					
1. Taxation—					
Property	38 477	44 209	56 663	63 500	48 162
Gambling	56 039	71 134	86 762	87 730	47 674
Motor Vehicles	71 061	89 510	104 649	111 200	57 176
Pay-roll Tax	265 565	279 695	307 615	354 700	212 627
FID	31 128	33 307	37 995	41 700	25 248
Stamp Duties	205 034	215 298	275 597	301 300	173 636
Business Franchises	121 218	126 581	152 923	172 011	104 515
Fees for Regulatory Services	6 480	7 047	9 350	12 265	7 380
Business undertakings	40 736	50 288	52 925	55 454	27 822
Total Taxation	835 738	917 069	1 084 479	1 199 860	704 240
2. Public Undertakings	256 827	276 600	305 439	44 139 ^(a)	24 375
3. Recoveries	101 811	410 154	519 799	673 629	155 736
4. Fees, Fines and Charges	—	70 291	89 629	90 405	50 121
5. Charges on Other State Government					
Agencies	—	13 524	43 821	12 266	3 900
6. Territorial	61 451	37 248	39 894	43 014	31 369

	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89 (Estimates)	7 months to 31 January 1989
7. Commonwealth Payments	1 381 720	1 381 859	2 142 608	2 150 581	1 287 057
Total Recurrent Receipts	2 966 345	3 217 176	4 225 669	4 213 894	2 256 798
Capital Receipts	501 819	571 077	641 744	275 508	156 841
Borrowings	—	—	—	226 135	68 622
Total Receipts and Borrowings	—	—	—	4 715 537	2 482 261
Total Receipts Only	3 468 165	3 788 254	4 867 413	4 804 148	421 556
Total Recurrent Payments Less Commonwealth Recurrent Grants	1 584 625	1 835 317	2 083 061	2 063 313	969 741

(a) A change to the accounting practice has reduced this figure.

Increase in Receipts, South Australia, 1985-86 to 1988-89 (Estimated)

	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89 (Estimates)
Receipts from Taxation, Fees, etc.				
1. Property	100.0	114.9	147.3	165.0
Gambling	100.0	126.9	154.8	156.6
Motor Vehicles	100.0	126.0	147.3	156.5
Payroll Tax	100.0	105.3	115.8	133.6
FID	100.0	107.0	122.1	134.0
Stamp Duties	100.0	105.0	134.4	147.0
Business Franchises	100.0	104.4	126.2	141.9
Fees for Regulatory Services	100.0	108.8	144.3	189.3
Business Undertakings	100.0	123.4	129.9	136.1
Total Taxation	100.0	109.7	129.8	143.6
2. Public Undertakings	100.0	107.7	118.9	17.2(a)
3. Recoveries	100.0	402.9	510.6	661.6
4. Fees, Fines and Charges	100.0	—	—	—
5. Charges on Other State Government Agencies	100.0	—	—	—
6. Territorial	100.0	—	—	—
7. Total (=Recurrent Payments Less Commonwealth Recur- rent Payments)	100.0	115.8	131.5	130.2

Mr MEIER: I refer first to statistics relating to Government receipts from 1985-86 through to 1988-89, the later figures being estimates. However, the figures up to January 1989 indicate that those estimates will probably be very close to the mark, if not a fraction under. We see that taxation from property increased from \$38.477 million to \$63.5 million from 1985-86 to 1988-89—or almost double. We see similar examples in relation to gambling, and motor vehicle taxation increased from \$71 million-odd to \$111 million. There was a large increase in payroll tax.

As to financial institutions duty, I still remember very well the debate on that and how the Premier said it would be an insignificant item for the average person. Well, insignificant maybe, but let us consider it: in 1985-86 it brought in \$31.128 million and this year it will bring in \$41.7 million—an increase of 34 per cent. There were also increases in payroll tax, 33 per cent; motor vehicles tax, 56 per cent; tax on gambling, 56 per cent; property tax, 65 per cent; stamp duties, 47 per cent; fees for regulatory services, 89 per cent; and tax on business undertakings, one of the lower taxes, 36 per cent. The total taxation increase was 43 per cent. Not all of the figures are available in some areas but, nevertheless, the figures still show that increases are occurring. Members might say, 'Okay; so increases had to occur, but how do they relate to the average person's wage?'

Remember that we are talking of increases from 33 per cent to 65 per cent. Have people's wages increased by that sort of amount from 1985-86 to 1988-89? A teacher on the first step in 1985 received \$16 174 per annum; in March 1988, the salary was \$17 068, a 5.5 per cent increase. The salary of a teacher on step 12 increased from \$28 845 to \$30 030, an increase of 4.1 per cent. A primary principal's salary went from a maximum of \$44 303 per annum in 1985-86 to \$45 844 per annum, a 3.5 per cent increase. A secondary principal's salary was increased by only 3.4 per cent. We are discussing increases for the teaching profession of between 3 per cent and 5 per cent, yet we have seen taxation increases of between 34 per cent and 65 per cent.

No wonder it is starting to hurt people's pockets. No wonder they are having to forgo the payments on their houses and leave their houses, as we heard from members earlier. It is a typical ploy of this Government to tax the people hard, and it is shown clearly in those figures.

Looking at the Public Service figures, we see that an administrative and clerical officer on the first step of the CO2 rating received \$17 939 in 1985, and that increased to \$20 667 in 1988, a 15.2 per cent increase. The salary of an officer on the first step of the AO4 rating rose from \$36 490 per annum to \$41 154, a 12.8 per cent increase. In every case, the people are dragging way behind what the Government is taking in receipts from taxation. It is a very clever ploy.

As a member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, I know that virtually all fees that have come before that committee in the past year or two have been increased in line with the consumer price index increase. However, to my knowledge, no-one in the work force has received a wage increase anywhere near the consumer price index increase during the same period, so wage earners are getting further and further behind. If the Government is dragging in all this money—and it is quite clear that it is—is it being spent on services on which we would like it to be spent? I want to consider briefly a few of those services in my electorate.

With regard to the Department for Community Welfare, its services have been reduced. The offices at Maitland and Point Pearce have been abolished. The office at Kadina is the only one left, and its staff cannot cope with the workload. Virtually the rest of the peninsula is no longer served. Kindergartens have suffered staffing decreases, and I made quite an issue of this matter last year. While some of that staffing is being reallocated, overall many kindergartens are worse off. I hear the continual comment from school teachers that they are totally dissatisfied with the situation and principals claim that their staffing is not what it was or what it should be. As an example, no person has been

appointed to the music department of the Yorke Peninsula Region in the past three years, and that is a disgrace to the Government. It is certainly a letdown for our students.

With regard to roads, the RAA has campaigned vigorously, and thank goodness it is doing so. Every time I drive to Adelaide, my neck is jarred out of place because of the roads. If I had sufficient funds, I would love to sue the Government for my injuries.

E&WS services have taken a nosedive, and during January I highlighted an example of one person whose pipes had to be cleaned three times a week so that a water service could be maintained. The water is so dirty, muddy and filthy that the E&WS attends three times each week. The Minister says that she will not have the pipes replaced, and that things will be left in an *ad hoc* fashion.

Last week I presented a petition from over 1 200 people calling on the Minister of Agriculture to increase the number of officers at the Department of Agriculture office in Kadina which services a huge region. Again, I have been calling on the Minister for over 12 months, but he refuses to take any action.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): In this address to the Parliament I wish to express my concern about the greenhouse effect on the coastal areas of South Australia. My concern relates to my own electorate and the purpose of my address is to make a plea for more money to be spent on research in this area. It is my belief that the responsibility for research in this area should be a joint responsibility between the Commonwealth Government and the various State departments. In a sense, this is what has happened so far, with the Federal Government's providing funds for various experiments and investigations and the State Government's providing some funds, although not a great deal, towards research in this area.

I attended the first seminar given by the Coast Protection Board in the Festival Theatre towards the latter part of 1988. However, I was unable to attend the two-day seminar which followed that meeting, although I did glean enough information from the first meeting to learn that it is generally anticipated that sea levels in South Australia will rise over the next 20 to 30 years by just under one metre. This figure is a guesstimate based on the information and data that have come mainly from work undertaken in the United States of America. I should say at this time that most of the money for research and for providing a database on things like rising sea levels has been funded by the United States Federal Government.

Therefore, my earlier suggestion that a joint funding arrangement for investigation into the greenhouse effect, from both the Federal Government and the State Government, already has a precedent in the United States. My deep interest in this subject relates to the possible problems which may occur in the coastal area that I represent. I have taken the opportunity to write to the City of Henley and Grange seeking its policy in respect of the greenhouse effect on the coastal environment of Henley Beach.

Local government cannot—nor, in my opinion, should it be expected—to provide the appropriate funds for experimentation, research and consistency of data that needs to be gathered for proper predictions to be made. If one looks at the very large coastal section for which the City of Henley and Grange is responsible, with only 12 000 ratepayers, one sees that the City of Henley and Grange could not afford the necessary research into this problem. However, it is very important that the council receive accurate predictions of what may occur so that it can set building standards appropriate to rising sea-level expectations.

The Coast Protection Board has suggested to local councils that they set a standard at least equal to the flood level which occurs in a one in every 100 years flood. I have had some conversations with officers of the Coast Protection Board and they have agreed that due to the lack of appropriate data this standard is very much an estimate of the necessary requirements. I quote the following significant paragraph in the correspondence sent to me by the City of Henley and Grange, which explains the dilemma in which coastal councils find themselves:

Under the current conditions it appears possible that considerable expense or inconvenience could be incurred in raising the developments in susceptible areas or, alternatively, accepting risks of future damage and litigation as a consequence of council's failing to adequately exercise its duty of care and regard to development of 'at risk' land.

Henley and Grange council has told me that the greenhouse effect is a nation-wide and global problem, and it is the council's opinion that Federal funds should be provided to coordinate and accelerate research. This appears to me to be a proper approach to the question. The national committee on coastal and ocean engineering of the Institute of Engineers of Australia has recently provided two position papers on the coastal and hydraulic impacts of the greenhouse effect. The findings of the institute in these papers has widespread support, especially among coastal councils in South Australia. Time does not permit me to canvass all the arguments proposed in the two papers referred to, but I would like to give a *precis* of what the institute considers is the action required:

1. A concerted effort to improve the current 'best estimates' for sea level and climatic change effects.
2. An evaluation of the impact of these effects on the social environmental and economic fabric of the coastal zone and its implications on the coastal management strategies and engineering practices.
3. Establishment of an expert committee to develop rational and consistent guidelines for engineering practice in the coastal zone.
4. Establishment of a review process so that management strategies and engineering practice can be varied as further information comes to hand.
5. Make political and economic decision-makers aware of the potential seriousness of the problem so that adequate funds are made available to implement the above actions.

I recommend that members obtain copies of these papers, which I have no doubt will be available through Parliamentary Library.

I have contacted officers of the Coast Protection Board who are, quite rightly, responsible for providing information on the prospective rising sea level of the South Australian coastline. The State Government has agreed to set up a committee on the sea level rise and this committee will, of course, comprise members of the Coast Protection Board, a local government representative and people from the Department of Marine and Harbors. It is my understanding that once this committee has met it will then forward recommendations to the State Government with respect to research into rising sea levels. It will then be for the Government to decide whether or not to invest in the appropriate research. From the information tendered to me, one of the things that may well be thought necessary will be the upgrading of tide measuring equipment, especially at Thevenard.

It has also been put to me that current measurements being taken in South Australia by tide gauges involve a problem because it is not known whether the tide gauges themselves are on stable ground. Therefore, the cooperation of the Mines Department will be needed with a possible upgrading of special equipment. Flinders University already provides information on the tide gauges measuring the increase of sea levels in and around the Australian conti-

ment. This work is financed by the Commonwealth Government. I believe that the Flinders University group involved in this work will be making recommendations to the Federal Government that seven new tide gauges be installed in various areas around Australia so that more accurate data can be obtained on the rise in sea levels. I understand that other areas need to be studied involving the storm surge that occurs from time to time in various coastal areas of Australia.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): In the brief time available I will discuss three issues. First, I would like to again address the House on the question of taxation. Earlier today we heard the Leader of the Opposition present a very cogent case clearly demonstrating that the State Labor Government has taxed this population with gay abandon and at great cost. I will address that issue in the context of what we are trying to do to achieve employment growth in this State. As all members would understand, South Australia's unemployment level is the worst of the mainland States and some 1.3 per cent above the national average. That is simply not good enough. In the global context we realise that governments are now understanding that you do not tax the productive enterprises. We note, for example, that in almost every country that terrible term 'privatisation' is actually being put into good effect. When I was in Japan, Nipon Telecommunications was being thrown open to competition. The railways system also is being thrown open to competition. We have seen it in Russia, China, Korea, Taiwan, England, Germany, Spain—right across the globe. There is one fundamental reason for that: governments have suddenly realised that they cannot do it better than private enterprise can.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: You will have your opportunity whenever it comes. Importantly, those same countries are realising that their taxation policies are a vital ingredient in determining whether or not they progress. Quite clearly, the Government of South Australia has gone on a gorge of taxation to the absolute detriment of the population and, indeed, of productive enterprises.

In 1982-83, land tax receipts amounted to \$23.7 million. In 1988-89, the estimated receipts are \$63.5 million, which is an increase of 168 per cent. In 1982-83, motor vehicle registration fees amounted to \$58.6 million but, by 1988-89, it is expected that they will amount to \$111.2 million—an increase of 90 per cent. Payroll tax is probably the only area that has kept pace with inflation or has not exceeded it to a great degree. It has increased from \$222.8 million to \$354.7 million, an increase of 59 per cent. Since 1982-83, two new taxation areas have been introduced. This year, the casino operations are expected to bring in \$12.4 million and the financial institutions duty should amount to \$41.7 million.

In 1982-83, stamp duties amounted to \$118.3 million and, by 1988-89, receipts are expected to be \$301.3 million—an increase of 155 per cent. From the gas franchise tax, the State collected \$2.9 million in 1982-83 and the estimate for this financial year is \$5.9 million, representing an increase of 105 per cent. Petroleum tax, which is paid by every motorist, amounted to \$25.8 million in 1982-83 and it is expected that, this year, \$76.2 million will be recouped, which is an increase of 195 per cent. Tobacco tax, which is probably a very worthy form of taxation, amounted to \$16.1 million in 1982-83 but is expected to rise to \$50.9 million in 1988-89. Fees for regulatory services amounted to \$4.4 million in 1982-83 and will increase by 180 per cent to \$12.3 million in 1988-89.

As most members would understand, most of those taxation measures have increased well above the rate of inflation. Importantly, they have hit areas that are crucial to the State's development. Land tax, for instance, is not a tax on capital; it is a tax on the poor little business person, so small businesses are being retarded in this State. Stamp duties are another excellent example, whether they apply to houses, cars, certain goods or financial transactions. That increase of 155 per cent has been borne by the people, and stamp duties also retard growth. The increase of 195 per cent in petroleum taxation is added to the cost of every commodity produced in this State. Regulatory service fees are paid mainly by business people and, as I said, the increase has been 180 per cent.

If Government members read a little about events in the rest of the world, they would understand that what they are doing is against the very principles that have been grasped overseas, even by socialist nations. They have said that they will give business a go, that there will not be Government control of some enterprises and that they will not be taxed out of existence. This Government is not pursuing those policies. The issue is an important one for small business people as it is for larger enterprises.

My second point concerns interest rates and on this point I have never seen such a wimpish performance by any State Leader as that by the Premier. I was ashamed for our Premier to go over to Canberra and say that his Government does not care about home buyers who are trying to pay mortgage bills. He has decided to stick with Federal policy. It was a pathetic performance by someone who should have stood up for his State and for the people who are struggling to survive in the face of bills that are going through the ceiling, all because of the ALP's economic policies, which have been an absolute failure. It is about time that South Australia had a Premier who is willing to go in and fight with new ideas about economic performance, about how to conquer the balance of payments problem and what to do with open-ended financial arrangements. It is a great shame and a great detriment to this State that we do not have a Premier who is willing to fight, because fighting is what is needed at this time. Make no mistake: the problems that we have today will take 10 years to fix. Unfortunately, this State does not have a leader who is capable of fixing anything.

In addition to increased taxation on all fronts, the quality of service offered to the community has diminished. In my electorate, which has a very high proportion of elderly people, the Government has seen fit to take away the station master and the selling of tickets at the Mitcham Railway Station, which is strongly patronised. Because of accommodation problems the Department of Social Security has decided to move its office out of the centre of the electorate to the edge of the electorate. That office is not there to service people, it seems, but to suit itself. The only reason the Motor Registration Division office is still in Mitcham is because it has not got its act together at Marion, and the cost of new accommodation is enormous. When it is moved to the Marion office, that service will be lost to the people of Mitcham.

The quality of service has gone down and the cost of taxation has gone up. The great farce about the proposal to move the motor registration office was that the Government cut out ticket sales from that office and from the railway station and the union put a ban on ticket sales at the local post office so no-one could buy a ticket except in town. Time and time again we find that the people who deserve honest, good government are being deceived. They are being treated like second-class citizens. I know what economics is

about. It is about providing the best service available at the cheapest cost, and we can do that at Mitcham without losing those offices.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): In the 10 minutes available to me tonight I will discuss children's services, which has been a success story in this State. In South Australia, 50 per cent more than the national average is spent on children's services. In particular, 94 per cent of four year olds in South Australia attend kindergarten for four sessions a week—the highest percentage in this country. These figures compare favourably with other States. For example, in Western Australia less than 20 per cent of four year olds attend four sessions of kindergarten.

Our standards are recognised as the highest in this country. We have an administrative and support service for our children's services which is the envy of every other State. We can plan across the State according to the needs of our children. The country areas of South Australia have been very real beneficiaries of this structure. It is worthy of note that children's services programs for small children are dotted across the State, even in areas where there are no schools.

Advisory and support programs for children with special needs are being developed in the western suburbs. Not long ago many of these children were regarded as unsuitable for admission to some preschools. Now they are encouraged and assisted by this Government to attend kindergarten. The staff who care for them are given support and the parents of these children are linked with many support agencies—I refer specifically to health, welfare and social security agencies. The CSO employs a number of advisers who are skilled in assisting parents and their children and in ensuring that all agencies assist where and when needed.

South Australia has a planned and coordinated approach to meet the needs of children in their most formative years. As I have indicated, I believe that South Australians should be pleased with what this Government—and particularly this Minister—has done in this area. We are committed under the Government's social justice strategy to provide support services for special needs.

It must be recognised that a share of commitment to the western region as a whole is required. The western region of Adelaide has particularly high needs with regard to social justice strategies. In general, it needs to be acknowledged that the western region has pockets of disadvantaged children. Careful review of any Government strategy or planning needs to be addressed in terms of resources for the western suburbs. I make no apology for that statement because I have had experience in this area over many years. In fact, I must give myself a pat on the back and at the same time thank the former Minister of Education because I believe that he recognised my involvement—

Mr Tyler: Didn't you open the West Lakes Shore Kindergarten?

Mr HAMILTON: That is true. I thank the member for Fisher for mentioning that fact. I was involved in the creation of the West Lakes Shore Kindergarten. I congratulate the former Minister on his involvement in that area. He asked me to open that kindergarten, and I think that that is a fair reflection of my involvement in the area.

I make no apology for the fact that I believe that every child in South Australia has a right to these facilities. In the most formative years of their lives they need backup support—particularly those disadvantaged children who may stutter, or who have learning difficulties or other problems in their own homes. I have noted over recent years that in the western suburbs in particular, with redevelopment in

the Housing Trust areas of my electorate, many of the elderly—for whatever reason—are shifting out of the area into nursing homes, granny flats or whatever and younger families are moving in. I refer in particular to the Woodville West area. The increase in the number of children attending the Woodville West Kindergarten has been quite dramatic.

The Woodville West Kindergarten is a special place for me because it was attended by my children. The assistance given to one of my children was quite dramatic and I believe instrumental in helping him to overcome a difficulty which he had in those very formative years. The love and attention given to my son was such that in a very short period his problem was overcome.

I believe that South Australians should acknowledge what this Government has done in this field. It would be remiss of me not to mention the input of my Federal colleagues and the commitment of the Hawke Government to child-care centres throughout Australia. Of the money that has been spent on child-care centres, 80 per cent has been under a Hawke Labor Government. So, the contribution made by our Federal colleagues should not be forgotten. The Bannon and Hawke Governments have put their money where their mouth is in looking after disadvantaged areas and those people who really need assistance. I remember many years ago—

Mr Oswald interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: The honourable member talks about where the money is coming from. I will come back to that a little later because I do not want to be sidetracked. This Government puts its money where its mouth is. The member for Morphett says he wants to talk about real issues, but he is trying to put down the Government instead of coming up with alternatives. Anyone who wants to look at *Hansard* will see the pathetic, puerile contribution that he has made in this House about law and order. He has not made one point by way of positive contribution to this issue. After the evening break I will have a lot more to say about this matter.

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

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with an amendment.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

Debate resumed.

Mr HAMILTON: In the three minutes remaining to me I would like to take up the earlier interjection of the member for Morphett. I challenge him to place on record in this Parliament what proposals he has put up in terms of law and order issues in this State. I cannot remember any since I have been in this Parliament. He is great on mouth and rhetoric but not so great in terms of action in this place. I indicate that I proposed and had accepted the Neighbourhood Watch program in this State. Anyone who looks at the record would see that the then Minister (Hon. G.F. Keneally) indicated in this place on 17 November 1983 that he would take up this matter. The program has been effective in reducing crime in many parts of South Australia, and I refer particularly to the Semaphore area where the crime rate has been reduced by about 77 per cent. Having said that, there is a need for employment programs in the

western suburbs for the many unemployed and disadvantaged people in that area.

In the area there are many retired people (who retired either prematurely or at age 65) who have many skills that are being wasted. I have spoken with the local mayor about this matter and I am looking forward to the support of the local council in respect of initiating a program to assist disadvantaged people in the area who do not have employment opportunities. The creation of such a program in the western suburbs would enable skilled people to pass on those skills to disadvantaged groups in my electorate. Many places can be utilised to assist those disadvantaged groups. People compulsorily retired at age 65 still have many skills that they can impart and share with people in my electorate in both teenage and adult groups.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I defer to the last member who spoke mainly on electorate matters, but I found several other Government members who have spoken today to be childish and almost grossly insulting of members of the Opposition. Indeed, their contribution reflected absolutely no credit on them. Others were self-congratulatory in the extreme, which smacks largely of a pre-election panic. In fact, I believe that members opposite rightly are suspicious that they are going to lose the forthcoming election. What members fail to acknowledge—

The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Certainly not. If the honourable member looks at the Mount Gambier results for the past five elections, he will realise what faint hope he has. What members opposite fail to acknowledge is that the ALP successes over the past six years, faint though they may have been, have been built upon the Liberal foundations that were established during the Tonkin years between 1979 and 1982. Rather than planning for survival as it should have done had it simply wished to maintain Government for another three years, that Government planned for a decade. During the following seven years the Labor Government has benefited tremendously from the plans laid by the Liberal Government.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: 'What plans?', the honourable member opposite asks. I will tell you, as follows: Stony Point, the petrochemical project; Roxby Downs, the world's greatest mine with potential for uranium, copper, rare earth, gold, silver, and a host of other things in this mirage in the desert, according to the Premier when he sat on this side of the House; and Technology Park, the dream child of Dean Brown, who invited here British Aerospace and Fairey Aviation, who committed themselves before this Government came to office, but of whose achievements the Government is so proud because they are part and parcel of the industrial redevelopment of South Australia. I point out that that was a Liberal Party rather than a Labor Party initiative. I refer also to the rapid transport system from Tea Tree Gully into town, which everybody is anxious to show tourists and which was the brainchild of Michael Wilson, the former Liberal Minister of Transport who, with Dean Ashenden and others, inspected the Mercedes Benz project.

The juvenile members of Parliament on the other side of the House who have spoken during this debate may not realise that, when the Liberal Party came to office in 1979, it had to write off massive debts. Samcor had debts of \$13 million. An amount of \$10 million was owed to the Frozen Food Factory and \$20 million was owed to failed industrial developments of the Dunstan/Corcoran era. An amount of \$20 million was written off for the Monarto development,

which was a loan and not a grant from the Whitlam Federal Government. We gave \$30 million in immediate remission to South Australians in the form of stamp duties, death duties, gift duties and the like. We gave remissions to first home owners which meant that they had to pay only a third of what they are currently paying when they buy a first home. Over \$120 million was written off or granted to South Australian taxpayers, not in the first three years but in the first three months of the Tonkin Government regime, making South Australia the lowest taxed State in Australia during the period 1979 to 1982.

An honourable member: Balderdash!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Someone in the most recent edition of the *Sunday Mail* stated that the present Government was dining on Valium every Monday. He really meant that it is bereft of ideas and, compared with the Liberal Party's imagination during the period 1979 to 1982, it has they have very little to offer. I remind members opposite who were so critical of our achievements in three years that they have been in Government for 17 out of 20 years and their achievements have shown little imagination. The Government promised an entertainment centre in 1985; it promised Finger Point in 1982; and it promised redevelopment of the Mount Gambier Hospital in 1982, not because it loved the South-East but because it wanted to buy the South-East seat from the people. However, people in that electorate did not fall for it and my majority increased. However, the promises were made in good faith, so we expect Finger Point to be completed and, indeed, the development is well under way.

We expect the hospital to be redeveloped and that also is well under way. I congratulate the Premier, because at least he, of all members opposite, has a conscience and he is anxious to fulfil those promises that were made. However, I would like to know whether plans have been drawn up for this much-vaunted entertainment centre. I would lay odds of 100 to one that plans do not exist. The centre has been promised and the Government is honour bound to keep its promises, but it is very short-lived.

When the Tonkin Government lost office the unemployment level in the South-East was 8.2 per cent. However, the Bannon Government said, 'We will be the salvation of the nation; we will reduce unemployment to 2 per cent or 3 per cent.' In fact, it increased to 10 per cent, and it is now back to the 1982 figure of 8.2 per cent. When we lost Government, in my South-East electorate the unemployment figure was 1 100 souls, and now it is 2 600, having reached 3 000.

So my electorate, after six years of Labor Government, is considerably worse off in relation to the employment situation. Of course, for all the Labor Government's much vaunted jobs that it has created, it never mentions that the unemployment situation in South Australia is still the worst of all the mainland States. Jobs created do not really give much assurance to that 8.2 per cent of the population looking for work—exactly the same as when Tonkin was thrown out on his ear. All the promises that the Labor Government has made come to nought. I would like to deal with the mortgage belt to the north and to the south. We were thrown out of Government in 1982 because mortgages stretched out to 10 per cent.

Look at what the prospects are. Mortgages at the moment are at 15 per cent, and one manager of the ANZ Bank said only at the weekend that they would go to 16 per cent. I suggest that the prospects of members opposite for the next election, whether it is called next month, in September, October or November, are looking pretty slim. That is probably why one or two of the backbenchers have long

faces, instead of big, wide smiles. One family of whom I was made aware last week knows of 10 imminent forced mortgage sales in the mortgage belt in the better area of Flagstaff Hill—and members opposite think that they do not have problems! I suggest that they listen to their electorate secretaries who are down there shopping and finding out what the people are actually saying. They are the ones who are really telling the Government what is going on.

That is the reason why members opposite are a little more worried than they are prepared to admit. The smiles from those on the front bench at the moment are pretty forced, I tell you. Let us look at the mortgage situation. A \$60 000 mortgage at 10 per cent three years ago attracted \$6 000 in interest. A \$60 000 mortgage today at 15 per cent attracts \$9 000 in interest. That is \$60 a week extra that someone must find. Tell me where the increase in wages has been to enable young couples to pay that extra \$3 000 in interest. A \$60 000 mortgage is not really an extreme example when one has a \$97 000 average price for a home in South Australia.

I agree that members opposite should be worried. One of them is even asleep over there: I must be a very boring speaker. However, in the South-East we do have some promise: the Katnook gas development has great promise for Mount Gambier, at least, because there is enough gas proved up to supply us with cheap energy for industry. So, the South-East will really burst at the seams. I only hope that that gas is proved up and that Adelaide, too, can benefit from a cheap source of supply.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It was not Labor money: it was private enterprise—the very people that members opposite cry down and the very thing the Minister was always crying down when he was Minister of Mines and Energy. I remind members that it was the then Liberal Minister of Mines and Energy, Roger Goldsworthy, who brought in the Roxby Downs Indenture that members opposite cried down. They could not say enough against it when we were in Government. They said it was awful: they referred to uranium, that terrible thing that was helping Third World countries to survive. Members opposite are not mentioning the copper and the rest of it. Katnook has great promise for the South-East, and I hope that it will be as good for the rest of the State as it promises to be for Mount Gambier. However, it will need trained staff, and it will need more migrants. The present Federal Government has a migrant policy that decries John Howard, but one needs to be a Rhodes scholar or a \$500 000 Hong Kong migrant before one is even allowed into the country. There are 500 000 applicants and—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. T.M. McRae): Order! the honourable member's time has expired.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I have received a letter which is circulating amongst the parents at Glengowrie High School and which was sent to them from the school council Chairman, Mrs Lesley Johnson. It contains matters of vital importance to the school and school community, and I believe that they should be of vital importance to the Minister of Education and Premier Bannon. For that purpose, I would like to read the letter to the House. Dated 13 February, it states:

Dear Parents,

Council is seeking your support for your children. Two weeks ago the new school year commenced with our allocated number of teachers and a timetable in place for an effective start with classes. Since that time, however, the department has decided that, as we are 15 students fewer than the number predicted for 1989, we must displace the equivalent of one staff member.

This is not necessarily one person to be removed but one salary position which could be made up by taking that time from two

or even three subject areas. Our school is not the only one affected—other schools are currently in disarray at this critical time of the year. Staff changes such as these have resulted in all of the following disadvantages for students;

1. increased class sizes; 2. the reorganisation of the timetable thus disrupting the students' learning time; 3. teachers being required to teach subjects outside their area of experience in order to cover these subject time losses (a problem currently experienced in the State education system and one on which parents and teachers across the State have been vocal for some time).

The department requires that a wide curriculum choice for students be offered and classes and timetables are prepared to reflect those choices together with the number of staff allocated by the department at the end of the preceding year.

For the department to interfere with staff numbers when schools should be concentrating on educating our children is a situation to be deplored by parents.

If you are concerned then we respectfully request that you register that concern by signing the attached letter and returning it to school immediately. Council intends to express your concern to the Minister of Education, the Director-General, the Government, and the Opposition.

Yours sincerely,
Lesley Johnson (Mrs.)
Council Chairman.

Although all parents have not yet returned the letters and their reply has not yet gone to the Minister of Education, I will use this debate to bring the concerns of the Glengowrie High School community directly to the attention of the Parliament, the Minister of Education and Cabinet. As the letter states, in the second week of school, when the year's staff and curriculum had been set, the school was told that it would lose one equivalent staff member—a disaster from a planning point of view. It takes many days for senior staff members to set in place the staffing and curriculum for the year, and to be told two weeks into the year that they would lose one staff equivalent is outrageous.

I am told that this was to be achieved by their losing a .6 physical education teacher and a .4 home economics teacher. The loss of this one staff member equivalent will have two impacts: first, it will create a dangerous level in the home economics laboratories; and, secondly, it will create a situation where teachers, who are neither confident nor qualified to teach outside their area of expertise, are allocated to do so—and they do so because they feel a duty towards the school, and they are to be applauded for that. However, I do not believe that the Government should force teachers into this position. Also, we find that, where teachers previously taught five subjects a day, they are now having to teach six subjects a day—and this not only applies to the Glengowrie High School.

When staff cuts are imposed on schools the size of the Glengowrie High School, we find that staff are taking science and maths subjects when they have a background in other disciplines. Also, we find that technical studies teachers have to take maths classes. It does not take much imagination for members to realise the impact that that has on students.

The Hon. L.M.F. Arnold interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: The Minister of Employment and Further Education has expertise in this area, but I am a pharmacist, not a teacher, and I am advised—

Mrs Appleby interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: The member for Hayward is laughing at this matter, but I do not think it is funny at all. I am advised that it is not in students' interests to have teachers of one discipline being asked to teach in another discipline—and I leave it at that. Not only Glengowrie High School but most high schools are being forced to manage as best they can without proper departmental financial and personnel support.

The Government is quick to remove teachers when the number of students drops. From talking to staff, I have

learnt that it is quite a different position when students come back and they then ask for the staff to return. Glengowrie High School is a relatively small school if compared with some of the larger high schools. Conveniently overlooked by the State Government is the fact that small schools like Glengowrie High are not provided with any additional finance because they have low student numbers: they are expected to provide the same curriculum choice as larger schools but are given no additional finance to help provide this choice. In forward planning the Government should take this issue on board. The Government offers no support in recognition of the work that Glengowrie High is doing in maintaining a subject range that will attract new students to the school.

Following the Newberry report and the reorganisation of educational resources in the south-western corner of metropolitan Adelaide, during most of last year the staff tried to turn the school into the centre of computer training for the south-western suburbs. They tried desperately to see Treasurer Bannon to explain the objectives for the school, but he refused to see them. In fairness, the Minister, the Hon. Lynn Arnold, did see a deputation from the school council, but as yet it has not received any promising news that would indicate that Glengowrie High could be heading in this direction. However, in this period we (and I include myself in the school community) watched the South Australian Government create a computer centre of excellence within a school complex in the northern suburbs, with over \$100 000 being invested, whilst completely ignoring the students in the south and south-western suburbs and their high schools.

I raised this matter last year and again remind the Minister of Education and the Premier that, despite grants and subsidies being given to other high schools and primary schools (and I do not decry those schools receiving subsidies and grants for computers—in fact, I applaud it), Glengowrie High has had to fund totally all its computers. That is neither fair nor acceptable to those in the south-western suburbs.

Mr Tyler: If they had a decent local member it might help.

Mr OSWALD: The member for Fisher says that if they had a decent local member it might help. I believe I have represented the school community well. The Opposition and the school council is getting sick of inane interjections from members who try to put slights on Glengowrie High and the Glenelg area. One Minister decided to criticise that community previously. We now have the member for Fisher criticising those people.

Mr TYLER: On a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to Standing Order 153 which provides:

No Member shall use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to any Member of the House.

The member on his feet said that I interjected criticising the Glengowrie High School. That is not the case.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. T.M. McRae): Order! There is no point of order. The member for Morphett.

Mr OSWALD: No, it is not a point of order—it is a deliberate attempt to prevent me from saying what I wanted to say. Honourable members have denied me the time to complete my speech, but I put on record that the school council and I have made representations over and over again to this Government to do something about funding for our computers.

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

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I congratulate my colleague the Leader on his contribution to this debate earlier this afternoon wherein he indicated clearly the manner in which this Government is ripping off young people with regard to housing. I will come to that in a short time relative to building in 'so-called' bushfire prone areas and also in those areas which are not directly connected to sewerage systems but which have to rely on septic tanks.

First, I seek leave to introduce into the record a copy of the table which appears at page 46 of the 1988 annual report of the South Australian Local Government Grants Commission. The table gives the Commonwealth general revenue assistance figures for local government, Australia and South Australia, 1974-75 to 1988-89.

Leave granted.

COMMONWEALTH GENERAL REVENUE ASSISTANCE
FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT, AUSTRALIA AND SOUTH
AUSTRALIA, 1974-75 TO 1988-89

Year	Australia		South Australia	
	(\$'000)	(\$'000)	Percentage of Total	Percentage Change from Previous Year
1974-75	56 345	4 774	8.47	
1975-76	79 908	6 785	8.49	42.12
1976-77	140 000	11 925	8.52	75.76
1977-78	165 328	14 220	8.60	19.25
1978-79	179 427	15 433	8.60	8.53
1979-80	221 741	19 072	8.60	23.58
1980-81	300 786	25 871	8.60	35.65
1981-82	350 866	30 178	8.60	16.65
1982-83	426 519	36 510	8.56	20.98
1983-84	461 534	39 507	8.56	8.21
1984-85	488 864	41 847	8.56	5.92
1985-86	538 532	46 098	8.56	10.16
1986-87	585 613	49 901	8.52	8.25
1987-88	641 532	55 519	8.65	11.25
1988-89 (Est.)	652 500	57 348	8.79	3.29
TOTAL	5 289 495	454 988	8.58	—

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: This table indicates clearly that the collective States are being rorted by the Commonwealth Government which is refusing to make available to the States for distribution to local government the proportion of income tax previously promised. The percentage reduction since Labor came into office in 1983 has been quite dramatic. The figures for 1987-88 and 1988-89 show a reduction in the percentage of distribution from 11.25 to 3.29. When the Liberal Government was in office and first introduced this measure, there were percentage changes in the positive of 75.76 in 1976-77, 19.25 in 1977-78, 8.53 in 1978-79, 23.58 in 1979-80, 35.65 in 1980-81, 16.65 in 1981-82, and 20.98 in 1982-83, the last year of the Federal Liberal Government. Since then there has been a gradual reduction to this disaster which has beset local government in 1988-89—of a quite massive reduction to the 3.29 per cent increase, which is nowhere near half the cost of inflation. In real terms, the funds distributed to local government have been very markedly reduced.

I turn now to housing and our responsibility to young people, in particular with regard to building costs. The Government, through a backdoor method, has affected costs relating to septic tanks. A proclamation of the Health Commission—not a regulation, which could be dealt with by this House—has greatly increased the cost of providing a septic system for a house of normal size. There has been a major increase in the size—

The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I believe that the Health Commission, like so many other commissions in this State, is

riding roughshod over its Minister. The Ministers are not awake enough—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Or strong enough.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: —or strong enough, to pull the bureaucrats into line. I suggest that members could go into many areas of South Australia—and this would have been possible for almost a century—and find problems with septic tanks that have not led to major health problems. However, at present we find that young people are being asked to pay up to \$10 000 to install a septic tank when just 18 months ago they would have been able to pay about \$1 500 to \$2 000 for a serviceable system.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: Can you name the area for \$10 000?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Yes, the Cockshell Estate at Gawler East. I have before me a note from a gentleman who happens to live in the area of the Minister of Housing and Construction. This gentleman lives at Elizabeth Park and hopes to build a home for his family in the Cockshell Estate at Gawler East. He had a contract with one of Adelaide's main builders.

Included in the contract was a prime cost item of \$3 500 for a septic tank. It was necessary that he provide an assessment. Koukourou and Partners, having regard to the proclamation that they must be followed, recommended that the area of soakage field be eight metres wide—I ask honourable members to take heed of this—by 55 metres long. Where in most suburban blocks in this day and age, when we have moved away from the quarter acre block, can one get a 55 metre long stretch for a single run trench to be deep ripped, ploughed and or rotary hoed to a depth of 650 millimetres? That area must be rotary hoed to a depth of well in excess of two feet. The area must be 55 metres long and eight metres wide and the quote that he received from this reputable Adelaide builder for making an installation according to the requirements was \$10 560, with \$3 500 as the prime cost item. Fortunately for this man he received an indication of the cost before he had finally signed the contract, and he had to withdraw from the building of that home.

Let us take the situation in fire prone areas in Tanunda, Angaston and Nuriootpa, where houses are being built in what used to be vineyards—part of today's suburbia. There is no risk of a range fire or grass fire, but residents are required to pay in excess of \$2 750 extra to provide for these bushfire prone area regulations. If one has the money, one cannot detract from the fact that these measures may give a far better product. However, if one then goes to the supplementary development plan, which is being developed, one finds that these areas, which are currently subject to regulation 16 (1) (a) of the Building Act in relation to fire prone areas, are listed as non bushfire prone areas. Reality has prevailed and they have been taken out. However, when one makes inquiries about the SDP with respect to having this area excised, the building regulations prevail over the SDP.

Ms Gayler: Why don't you get them changed?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: That is a very interesting little comment because the Minister for Environment and Planning and others have been in this discussion over a long period and have thrown their hands up in horror and said, 'Sorry, we cannot do anything about it.' When he was in the Tanunda area—right in the middle of one of these areas—I showed the Deputy Premier what was happening. He said that it was never intended that that set of circumstances should prevail. Yet young people are getting a bill for an additional \$2 750 to provide for a fire prone area which does not exist and which the Government's own SDP says does not exist.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): This Government has engaged in a quite disgraceful binge of charging and we are debating whether we will give the Government permission to spend another \$750 million. For the honour of having their names recorded on established water meters by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, constituents of mine who have recently purchased farming land in Booleroo Centre in the Melrose area have been told they must pay \$600, just for the name change. Originally it was to be more than that in one case.

This is a disgraceful and unnecessary set of circumstances. Who is responsible for these charges and what is their purpose? The water system is there and the meters are in place. When a property has been transferred, all that is required is the change of name on a card or on a computer disc. My constituents are amazed that they should be inflicted with such a charge. I have suggested that they should approach the Minister, as, I have already done. I have not yet had a response, but I am looking forward to it. If the charge were \$50, no-one would quibble. It would be excessive anyway, but \$600 is far too much. In one case it was to be over \$3 000 for two people. Who is drawing up these charges and what is their purpose?

The purpose of government is not to endeavour to rip every dollar possible out of the community or to continue to devise means of taxing people out of their hard-earned dollars. The role of government is to provide a service at minimum cost to the community. If these charges are to be inflicted on the community, the Government will end up as the major recipient of people's incomes. That is a situation that no democratic society should tolerate. I shall seek to know from the Minister during the Committee stages how much of this \$750 million will be allocated to my constituents and others on Eyre Peninsula who are having such a terrible time.

There are other matters of which this Parliament and the Government should be aware. Australia—and South Australia is a large and isolated State—is an area of the world which is designed for light aircraft operation. We are fortunate in having two airports, Adelaide, and Parafield which is basically used by light aircraft and charter operators. Unfortunately, the Commonwealth Government, in its wisdom, has embarked on a program of charging for the right to use those facilities, and that will drive the small, third-tier operators and the private aircraft user out of the sky and out of using those airports.

The charges which are to be inflicted on these people will be horrendous. They are unfair and unnecessary. It is bureaucracy gone mad. In Australia, and particularly South Australia, where we have some of the best climatic flying conditions in the world—we do not have many mountains—we should be encouraging people to fly. Our population is spread right across the State. The Aircraft Owners and Pilots' Association of Australia magazine, of February 1989, it says:

GA aircraft flying into capital city primary airports will continue to attract landing charges and from 1 April these will increase to \$5.00/1 000kg/landing with a minimum of \$25.00 and \$8.00/day parking fee in a designated GA parking area (the first 2 hours is free).

These proposed charges have not been agreed to by the aviation industry and serious objections have already been voiced to the FAC. Further, these charges at the primary airports do not replace the CAA's movement charges to recover their costs of providing terminal navigation facilities and rescue/fire fighting services.

The articles also says:

By the time this appears the Minister will have approved the CAIT system of charging at FAC owned secondary airports. With effect 1 April 1989 the FAC is expected to charge CA aircraft weighing less than 10 000 kg \$3.00/1 000kg/day for the use of Bankstown . . . Parafield . . . Longer term users can buy a monthly

ticket for \$80.00/1 000 kg, a six monthly ticket for \$350.00/1 000 kg.

These charges, in addition to those already in place, will drastically affect the small operators who fly to Eyre Peninsula providing the service from Adelaide to Cleve and Wudinna, and the services to Port Lincoln, Leigh Creek and Coober Pedy. We have had a tremendous battle in this State to maintain those services. The Commonwealth Government does little for these communities and now it wants to plunder their profits by placing surcharges on airline tickets.

Aviation is very expensive and it is difficult to organise and operate these services, which are sought by the more isolated communities. Such services must be maintained and these operations should not be placed in jeopardy by unnecessary, outrageous and unfair charges. It is deplorable that the Civil Aviation Authority and the Federal Airports Corporation have not given any detailed reasons why they are necessary. Have they trimmed their operations? What action has been taken to make sure that they are running efficiently, that they do not have staff standing idle, and that the services they provide are necessary? What guarantee have we that they are effective and efficient organisations?

I am appalled at these charges because they will affect people in isolated parts of the State. It is unfortunate that too few people who are elected to Federal and State Parliament know anything about aviation or are fortunate enough to be able to fly themselves. I do not profess to be an expert in this area. However, as someone with a little knowledge who spends a lot of time flying around South Australia, I am appalled at these proposals, and I call on the Ministers to make representations to their Federal colleagues with a view to having something done about them. The cost of hiring an aircraft is quite high, to say nothing of the charges that go with it. To have additional charges inflicted upon operators will force the average pilot out of the sky.

On the way north yesterday I called in at Parafield and at one of the well-known flying schools and charter operations, I spoke with a gentleman who told me that he was pleased that someone was trying to do something about it. This gentleman owns a small aircraft which he has on line at Parafield. He will be hit between an extra \$5 and \$750 a year just for the honour of running it. It will still sit out in the open, in the same park. Many people are battling to pay for their aeroplanes, as it stands, so it is hard enough to get people to put aircraft on line at the flying schools. It is expensive for people to train to fly, so why put other burdens in their way, particularly in a State such as South Australia which has everything going for it for flying? People should be encouraged to engage in the aviation industry. We should demand that the Commonwealth Government puts in more navigation aids. It is deplorable that places such as Coober Pedy do not have sufficient navigation aids. As well as MDBs, DMEs should be put in.

The Hon. R.K. Abbott interjecting:

Mr GUNN: No, I want to stop this new charging system that the Federal Airports Corporation is attempting to impose. Members of the State Government should support the stand that I am taking and make representations to their Federal colleagues.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I want to draw the attention of the House to two issues. The first relates to the building of motor vehicles—particularly racing cars—at TAFE colleges. I am glad to see that the Minister is here because I wish to read a fairly long letter into *Hansard*. Secondly, I will refer to discrimination against aged people who apply for a driver's licence. The letter to which I refer reads as follows:

At a time when the funds available for education generally and the TAFE colleges in particular are under considerable pressure I find it impossible to accept what is going on at the TAFE college at Regency Park. You might recall that the college undertook a project that was designed to involve the students in the building of a racing car to the new Formula Holden formula. The car was completed in time to be shown at the Grand Prix meeting in November last.

The cost of a car of this nature, if bought commercially, would be in the range of \$100 000. The operating costs associated with travel to meetings, tyres, fuels, etc would amount to say \$7 000 to \$8 000 per meeting taking account of preparation, etc. What has happened at TAFE is that this project has taken elitist status with the people involved in it treating it as their own little race team which is being funded at Government expense. This little team is set up in a cyclone wire enclosed cage with their own design office complete with advanced computers and engineering equipment. Access to the area is guarded and it is watched at most times.

The personnel working on the project were originally to be the instructors and the students however that has changed so that a handful of instructors are playing this game with virtually no student involvement. One alarming aspect is that the existing instructors were not capable of doing the aluminium fabricating of the wings, body and other parts and so they contracted an outside worker to do this work—he is still engaged in this project on a full time basis and has been so for 9 months with no end in sight. Why is he still there you might ask? Well it has just come to my attention that this little elite, select group is building another three of these racing cars which it intends to lease to drivers to enable them to compete in the Australian Drivers Championship. Where is the money for such a project coming from?

I direct that question to the Minister. The letter continues:

Many of the components such as gearbox, brakes, fire extinguishers, etc are manufactured in England or USA and it is my understanding that they have been obtained by this group on a duty free basis due to the TAFE involvement.

The Hon. L.M.F. Arnold: Where do you stand on this matter?

Mr INGERSON: I am asking the Minister to explain it to the House. The letter further states:

With an estimated cost of \$100 000 per car plus the running costs we have an investment of nearly a half million dollars in a group that are treating the whole project as their own exercise and it cannot possibly be described as of benefit to the education of the TAFE students.

The Hon. L.M.F. Arnold: Are you serious or what?

Mr INGERSON: Yes, I am taking it very seriously. The letter goes on to say:

Taking this a step further—CAMS, the controlling body of motor sport in Australia asked the TAFE college if they would care to use their car for some tyre testing experiments here in Adelaide. This was rejected and Elfin, another Adelaide manufacturer, did the testing.

The Hon. L.M.F. Arnold interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: This letter has been written to me, and I ask the Minister to comment on it.

The Hon. L.M.F. Arnold interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. T.M. McRae): Order! The honourable member for Bragg has the call.

The Hon. L.M.F. Arnold interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: Perhaps it is embarrassing to the Minister—I do not know, I am just asking. The letter continues:

Now this testing gave the opportunity for the car to be sorted out under near race conditions with the costs being met by CAMS. The TAFE car has had minimal testing and the first race in the championship is on 7 May at Mallala north of Adelaide. This car has been designed by people that have had only basic design experience and certainly nothing of the advanced technical knowledge required by this state of the art formula. They have done no comparative testing to see how their car compares to others and general opinion of experienced designers and engineers is that the car is far too heavy and bulky and will not be a contender.

In summary, we have a Government funded education facility spending a huge amount of public money on a project that only a very select group are benefitting from at a time when general education is screaming out for funds. The project appears to have

got out of control financially with a small number of individuals finding themselves contract work on a permanent basis.

At a time when there are commercial race car manufacturers that can build cars to this formula (both Elfin Sports Cars and K & A Engineering here in Adelaide have built new cars for the formula) there is no reason why a Government body should be involved in the manufacture of cars with the intention of leasing them out. I would of thought that this was outside the area of operation of a college.

That is the letter. If the Minister has an opportunity, I would like him to provide a serious answer. The second issue concerns what I believe to be the worst form of discrimination against the aged in this country.

In the past week I have been telephoned by two people—one 81 years and the other 80 years—who applied to have their annual driving test, as is required by law. They turned up in their own vehicles, which happened to be a 1961 Holden and a 1962-63 Falcon, and were advised that, because the front passenger side of their vehicles did not have a seat belt fitted, they could not do the test. If members look at the laws of this State, they will find that vehicles built before 1966 are not required to have seat belts fitted. However, under an occupational health decision of the Department of Labour, driving examiners must be protected by seat belts. Accordingly, any vehicle without seat belts must have them fitted before a test can be done.

There are two issues. First, the problem of having to invest \$120 to \$180 to have a seat belt fitted in a car which by law in this State does not require it. Secondly, the two aged drivers have been advised that there is a way around the problem—they can use another car for their test. The Registrar of Motor Vehicles has no intention of allowing them to use their vehicles for the test because occupational health inspectors from the Department of Labour have made this decision.

The ridiculous aspect is the few times that these two conditions would apply. The number of instances involving persons aged 75 or over driving vehicles built before 1966 would be almost nil, yet we have this most ridiculous situation discriminating against these aged drivers. I clearly understand the stress faced by inspectors who conduct driving tests, and I recognise that there are many instances when seat belts are absolutely necessary. As the House knows, seat belts are a legal requirement in cars built after 1966. However, in this situation we have two aged drivers over 80 years with their own vehicles being told by this Government through the Motor Registration Division that they cannot have their licences renewed unless they use another vehicle.

These two drivers have owned their vehicles for over 30 years. This Government is totally inflexible and has no understanding of the situation faced by these two important aged people in our community. It is disgraceful, and I call upon the Minister of Transport to investigate the matter to see whether he can come up with some simple solution to allow these two people to have their licences renewed. I do not know whether these people are capable of passing the test, but I am concerned about this issue. If we had a reasonable Government that was willing to look at what really are unusual circumstances, this would not occur. I always thought that a caring Labor Government would do something about such people.

Members opposite always talk about how caring they are, that they are always interested in aged people, yet here is an example where the Government through its regulations and procedures has gone mad. I have no doubt that the occupational health legislation is not intended to include these extreme points of view. I hope that the Minister in examining this matter will do something about it.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): First, I commend the Leader of the Opposition for the contribution he made in the House today. If time permits, I will come back to some of the issues to which he referred on that occasion. I will also take up some of the matters raised by my colleague, the member for Light, regarding the difficulties and the added expense experienced by people when building their homes. I wish to refer specifically to examples in the Adelaide Hills. The additional costs for the construction of a new home make it virtually impossible for the average wage earner, and certainly impossible for young married people, to build their own home in that area. I will return to that topic a little later.

Because of the time limitation in this debate, I will be able to refer to only some of the issues in this matter. I will read into *Hansard* a copy of a letter which I received from one of my young constituents who has been part of a dairy farming family for many years. The family has been there for about 40 years. The letter explains very clearly some of the difficulties being experienced by people on the land in the Hills, and particularly some of the dairy farmers. It is a lengthy letter, but I think it spells out very clearly some of those problems. The letter is written to the manager of one of the milk producers in this State and, naturally, it would be inappropriate for me to mention the name of the company or the name of the person who wrote the letter. However, the letter states:

Dear Sir,

I am the son of [and the name is quoted] of [a particular area in the hills] who has been a milk supplier of your company for some 40 odd years. I write to you with some concern about the future of our family farm business in the dairy industry. My father and I are currently in partnership in operating the dairy; milking 90-100 cows all the year round. [My father] was more or less a pioneer to this land and district, starting with nothing to his name, clearing the land and making it the very productive and fertile property that it is today. It has been a life time development for him to build a comfortable home and lifestyle for his family, building a dairy, implement sheds, hay sheds, fence the property, equipping a bore and large dam for an extensive irrigation system. He has also had to equip and maintain the farm with machinery and implements and reliable tractors over the years to help develop the land and to make the hard work somewhat easier.

Furthermore, in later years he's had to rebuild the dairy complex; conforming to modern health regulations and has acquired new machinery for the making of round baled hay, plus all the necessary machinery for the stacking and feeding out the bales. All this has been necessary to make the whole operation more viable and less labour intensive. [My father] has, in addition to this, assisted my brother establish himself in the broiler chicken industry; and when I married seven years ago, he had to build a new home for himself and my mother, in the hope that I would remain on the farm to carry on the dairy operation.

It is no wonder that after this lifetime of events, my parents have very little in the way of savings, although they have many so called 'assets', which of course are only assets if you sell them. They have always been good parents to their four children; have never been wasteful or frivolous with their hard earned income . . . and owning the barest essentials in their comfortable home.

Now at the age of almost 70 years, [my father] has suffered a severe heart attack, but fortunately has recovered remarkably well. His lifestyle however, has now had to change quite dramatically, especially because he is also asthmatic, which has developed in later years—probably due to certain working conditions on the farm. His wife, my mother, has also had her fair share of illness of late, being hospitalised at times.

We as a family are now posed with very serious problems in that the dairy remains a two man job, seven days a week. My parents can not receive any form of pension, because they own too many assets. We cannot afford to employ as the farm will have to financially keep my parents in their retirement. I myself have become very run down, doing the work of two men, and of being continually tied to the farm, which has become a real burden.

My wife often helps with milking but finds it very difficult to manage with two very young children. We have not received any

wage rise since being married seven years ago. At that stage our wage seemed quite attractive, but with the cost of living rising dramatically each year it has become a very menial rate of pay. I receive \$350 gross per week and work between 60-70 hours in this time. We certainly realise the importance of having a good superannuation policy, knowing the almost hopeless situation my father is now in, but, however, we can only afford about one third of what we should be injecting into it. The farm's total income this year just exceeded \$100 000 including sale of beef cattle; probably \$80 000 of this was earned from the sale of milk. This, no doubt, almost sounds attractive, except that after all farm expenses and wages, plus taxes etc. and keeping two families, there is very little left. In fact we are lucky to break even.

It has now come to the crunch. Why should we be expected to keep all this hard work going with very little incentive at the end of it all? I would enjoy the work if I had more time for my family and perhaps was compensated a little more for all my long hours of work. I really do not know what I am going to achieve in writing this letter except that you may be able to advise us which direction we should pursue in the future, and if there is some compensation that my parents could receive from somewhere. We are currently considering selling the cows and stocking the farm with beef from which my parents will receive their living and I would have to find alternative employment. It is hard to find good employment with no certified qualifications. We would also need help with a planned strategy to make the change from dairy to beef, so that this can be done successfully, making the best possible use of our resources and finances.

I do not really understand what the Kerin Plan is trying to achieve for the industry, apart from the fact that it will mean the end of small and unviable dairying concerns which especially seems hard hitting to the Hills districts. Sometimes, I wonder if in fact our milk manufacturing companies, and of course the consumers, are actually benefiting from this otherwise unfair plan. Furthermore, with the free trade about to begin between Australia and New Zealand, things will become worse, creating more competition. Please could you offer us some guidance in this urgent matter or direct us to someone with the expertise who could advise us of different alternatives.

That may not sound such a difficult situation to some members opposite, but when one has the opportunity to meet and talk with so many of these people in the same circumstances—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: They're trapped!

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: They are trapped. They have worked on the land all their lives. They have built up their properties and their assets and they want to retire. Also, they want to be able to keep their families on the farm, but they find it impossible to do so. I do not know how many similar examples have been brought to my notice through my electorate office in recent months, but it is a particular concern. This matter has been raised by a number of my colleagues in this House on different occasions, without results from the Government, and we will continue to hear about it. Also, it will lead to more misery in these circumstances.

Probably, one of my greater concerns is that much of the Hills area will eventually not be productive in agricultural terms, and that is a very sad state of affairs. This is a subject to which I could refer at some length, as I mentioned earlier. However, because of the lack of time, I do not have the opportunity to speak on other subjects such as the CFS. I restate that we still have no new CFS legislation, although the Government has been talking about it for 18 months to two years. We have no funding arrangements on the part of the Government regarding the CFS. One can only presume now, with only two weeks of sitting in this session, that we will not see that legislation. If we do see it, it is most unlikely that it will be debated and finalised in this House with the amount of consultation that the legislation will require. That is a very sad state of affairs.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): Because the member for Ross Smith is also Federal President of the Labor Party it is pertinent that in this debate I talk, for a moment, about the state of the Australian economy. From the rural perspective

and our balance of payments point of view, with commodity prices the way they were 12 months ago and with the floating of the dollar (with which I had no qualms; indeed, I was one of the few people who publicly supported it), Australia should be getting back on the sheep's back and getting our balance of payments fixed.

Unfortunately, the President of the Labor Party, the member for Ross Smith, and his colleagues in Canberra have no idea how to run the economy of this country, and we now see a completely different scenario than otherwise would have been the case. One does not have to be a Rhodes scholar—and the Treasurer is not but his mate is—to work out that, if one floats the Australian dollar, it is all very fine. However, if it is a dirty float there can be grave misgivings for the Australian economy. The Australian dollar was floated, and interest rates were artificially increased, as a result of which everyone in this State and throughout the nation is now suffering.

If one increases interest rates, what happens? All the smart money people of the world then say, 'Australia has a false interest rate. Why don't we put our funds in that country.' That then increases the demand for the Australian dollar. And what did we see? We saw the Australian dollar go from what was accepted by everyone as being a real value of some 70c (and at that rate it would have helped fix our balance of payments problem) to 89c not more than four weeks ago. This occurred because of the flood of overseas money that poured into this country because of those artificial interest rates.

We did not hear one thing from the Federal President of the Labor Party or the Treasurer about what that was doing to our balance of payments. In fact, they went on blandly saying, 'Isn't it fantastic that the Australian currency is at the level it is, because that is good for the nation.' However, in about two months all the gains that were made through increased commodity prices and confidence were wiped out.

We have seen commodity prices ease back quite dramatically. We have also seen our balance of payments blow out to record proportions because of the inability of the Federal President of the Labor Party and his colleagues to understand the basic economics of supply and demand in this country. So, the great chance that Australia had in relation to commodity prices to get back on the sheep's back and to fix our problems has been thrown away.

The next scenario was the Federal President, the member for Ross Smith, going to the housing summit. Before he went he mouthed to the people of South Australia, aided and abetted by the fabricator, the member for Briggs, what he was going to do when he got there. He said, 'I am going over there to tell them exactly what the problem is and what I am going to do about it. Don't worry South Australia; we will fix it for you.' But what happened? The reports are that he sat there like a wimp. Not once did he mouth anything for the people of South Australia. He sat there because, in discussions with the Prime Minister of this country, he had said, 'Don't worry. As Federal President I can't go in too hard. I will sit there and get the fabricator, the member for Briggs, to put out the stories that I am going to be a big deal. They will believe it in South Australia, as they have been believing the fabricator for ages because of his influence with the press.'

Well, it did not work, did it, because he came back and sat in this House while we questioned him and was seen to be the wimp that he is. The people of South Australia should wake up to exactly what is going on with this Government. It does not have the guts to stand up for the people of South Australia. It does not have the ability to manage the economy in South Australia for the benefit of South Aus-

traliens. It is up to us on this side of the House to keep pointing out that fact to the press in South Australia and to keep saying to the press, 'Do not listen to the member for Briggs. What has he ever done on the economic front in this State to help the Government of this State run the economy better?' He does not have the first clue about economic principles or the first clue on economic management. He is the one pulling up the puppet strings behind the Premier to try to get in cahoots with the press so that the Premier can appear to be the man that he is not in this State. It is about time that the people of South Australia were reminded of these facts.

Let us get on to the receipts and payments that we are debating. It is interesting to note that the receipts and payments, which are monthly statements, for November, December and January were all issued at the one time. Why would that be? Why would the economic management of this State be in such bereft condition that we cannot even get our receipts and payments on a monthly basis? Why would that be? It is because of total incompetence! What happens when the statements come out? I ask members to read one paragraph in the front which states:

The impact of seasonal fluctuations, differences in the timing of major salary and wage increases, the impact of revised accounting treatments and the timing of planned borrowings from SAFA distort comparison with previous years and projections of likely end of the year results.

Any accountant would laugh at that. That paragraph has been used every month since I have been in this place and it is wearing a little bit thin. If the Government cannot manage things better than that, there is something wrong. If any company in this State did that, the auditors would make mention of the fact in its annual accounts.

The Hon. L.M.F. Arnold: You can't even understand our accounts again.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I must pause a moment for this guru. The greatest thing that he has ever done is lead the Vietnam march up and down King William Street. That is the economic brilliance that he has shown since being in this place. Who is he to interject in relation to economic matters? He does not know the first thing about it and members ought to realise it.

Mr Plunkett interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: The member for Peake interjects at this time! He would not even help me out on the pastoral legislation when all his friends the pastoralists were desperate for his help. He would not even stand up and speak on it.

Mr Plunkett interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: I would like *Hansard* to get all that on the record.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to continue his speech.

Mr D.S. BAKER: We heard the Premier today trying to tell the people of South Australia that there have been rebates in land tax. What an absolute lie! I ask him to show me anyone in this State who will pay less land tax this year than last year.

Mr Plunkett: You and your family have not done too bad out of it over—

Mr D.S. BAKER: I asked a question. The honourable member can't show that, because it is a fabrication by the member for Briggs. Everyone in this State will pay more land tax than they paid last year. It shows up in the receipts and payments and in the Auditor-General's Report, because it is a fact.

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

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): The member for Victoria has been talking about interest rates and the current account deficit. I will pick up the debate at that stage and reiterate that the problems the farming community is having at the moment relate to interest rates.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: And everyone else.

Mr BLACKER: It may or may not affect everybody else. It affects those who are borrowing. Regrettably, it is a situation of the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer because of the Government's fiscal policies that attract these interest rates. People who have money to invest rake it in at a greater rate. Those who have to borrow because of the nature of the industry or because of housing or whatever are those who, in turn, suffer. So, that gap between the haves and the have-nots is widening instead of reducing. That is one issue that is creating some of the greatest problems.

The rural crisis on Eyre Peninsula is something about which this House has heard a fair bit and will hear a lot more because Governments of the day, both State and Federal, must carry some of the blame for those problems. Of course, they cannot be blamed for the drought—that is a natural phenomena, something the rural community, if given a fair go, can handle. That community was able to handle it in the days of the income equalisation deposits. When farmers had a good year, they were encouraged to put money aside. That money was taxed at that time, but was taxed as income for the year that it was used. Therefore, there was an incentive for farmers to look after themselves in times of plenty by putting money aside for less favourable times.

I wonder what the result would be now if that scheme still applied, because so many of the people who are presently having problems would not be having those problems if they had catered for themselves in the past. In the meantime, taxation seems to be swallowing up more and more. I just hope that sooner or later a Government will come to its senses on this issue and recognise the gravity of the situation.

The other day I referred to the social implications that such a rural crisis is having. I cannot stress too much just what is happening. Each of the Ministers on the front bench will have to come to grips in their respective portfolios with what is happening. In my electorate we have three football teams amalgamating to form one team, with two football associations having to amalgamate so that collectively they can have a competition involving six teams. The necessity for teams to travel from Buckleboo to Port Neill to play football on a weekend in the same association highlights some of the immense problems that are occurring. Also affected are service groups, recreational groups, church groups and all sorts of organisations that go to make up a community. One of the tragedies is that the people who are leaving the community are young marrieds, and they take their children with them.

I draw to the attention of the House the situation at Kimba where the first wave of people who left the town and went to Roxby Downs included 26 young couples. That is potentially two classes of children who will not attend the Kimba school. That sort of social implication is something with which the Government has certainly not come to grips. As a total community, irrespective of which part of the State we live in, sooner or later we will have to come to grips with that situation.

I will now mention a couple of local issues. Rural areas seem to be left out at every possible turn in relation to road funding. I know that the Government will argue that, because the population is not great, it cannot afford to spend on a

per capita basis. One of the problems is the cost of production—and that cost is higher if there are bad roads. Freight costs are also higher. So all the commodities that contribute to the living standard of the community are affected by road funding.

I refer quite specifically to the Cleve to Kimba road and the Lock to Elliston road. Since the Second World War governments of every political persuasion have promised that these roads would be sealed. That has been a promise at election after election and, for some reason or another, it seems to be put on the back burner and those promises have never been fulfilled. I have been told that immediately after the Second World War there was a five year road sealing program on the Eyre Peninsula. These two roads were on the sealing program and, regrettably, the only road that has been sealed since then is the Cummins to Tumbly Bay road. With a couple of exceptions of minor stretches of sealing on some of the other roads. The general intent of that original undertaking in 1945 has not been fulfilled.

I implore the Government to look again seriously at that situation, even to the extent of revising the formula on which road funding is based. Back in the early 1980s, the Government of the day accepted from the Local Government Association a recommendation that a formula basis be set up for road funding. That formula was to take into account the length of road, the population, the area served by the council, the percentage of funds that the councils put into roads, and one or two other criteria. Although some consideration was given to sparsity of population, not enough consideration was given to the areas in need of catch-up. I have recommended to every Transport Minister since that time that a catch-up provision should be available for ministerial discretion so that the Minister of the day can say, 'There is an area of need on Eyre Peninsula; we will do that road this time, and next year it might be another road down in the South-East.' However, at least the Minister has some discretionary powers which enable him to direct funds to repair roads, rather than this piecemeal system that we have at the moment.

Under the current funding arrangements it will take about 22 years each for the Lock to Elliston and the Cleve to Kimba roads to be repaired. Most of us in this Chamber will not live long enough to see those roads sealed. That is the gravity of the situation. It means that until this is done another group of South Australians will be treated as second class citizens.

I wish to raise the issue of the Porter Bay sewage works at Port Lincoln. I raise this issue because the member for Mount Gambier referred to the Finger Point sewerage outfall in the South-East. I regret that I believe the Government of the day is treating the Porter Bay situation similarly. When the original plan for the Porter Bay sewage was put in, I assumed that sooner or later there would be a treatment works. However, that is not the case. The outfall from the sewerage at Port Lincoln goes directly into the sea. As a result, we have pollution of the sea. Officers of Government departments tell us that there is no serious problem. However, everyone who drives past can see the pollution and smell it at certain times. One has only to go near the area in a boat to recognise that the sea grasses certainly have been polluted to the extent where they are dying off. Large areas of seabed which were previously covered in seaweed and sea vegetation are now completely denuded. In marine terms, this has become a barren wasteland.

That problem will not go away, because the growth of the city of Port Lincoln will mean additional sewage. The problem will obviously continue to grow. It was recognised

back in 1973 that that area was the most seriously polluted area in the Spencer Gulf region.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): By way of grievance, I wish to raise the situation in my electorate involving Marineland and the West Beach Trust. Over the years that the West Beach Trust has been in operation, the management and development of that area has been of concern to my constituents and the people of South Australia generally. Not only that, it has been of great importance in recognising the initial request of the then Playford Government to provide the best recreation and sporting facilities for the people of South Australia. In some measure, that has occurred. However, in the past few years the management of the trust has left much to be desired.

It is disappointing that the then Minister, who was responsible for acquiring Marineland at the time that it was threatened to be vacated by the developer who built it and getting the West Beach Trust to take out a loan to purchase and to maintain Marineland, is now the Chairman of the West Beach Trust. There were many proposals to acquire Marineland and to develop the general area. I have no objection to the trust wanting to bring entrepreneurs into the area or to the trust becoming an entrepreneur and developing the remaining part of that area. After all these years that the trust has been in operation, the area should have been developed to its maximum so that people can enjoy the benefits that should have been provided. That is not happening.

The area leaves a lot to be desired and certainly needs cleaning and tidying up. Apart from having one of the best caravan parks in Australia—certainly one of the largest and best maintained, and one cannot be critical of that—Marineland is the disappointing aspect of what has occurred. It worries me that the Minister of State Development and Technology, his department, the Premier's department and the Government in general have been unable to come forward with a solution to retain Marineland as the people of South Australia have known it. It worries me that future generations will not have the opportunity to witness at close quarters the actions and activities of the animals that we have there. I believe that Marineland will be lost to South Australia.

I appeal to the Government to reconsider its decision, to renegotiate its position with the building unions, and to ensure that Marineland can be redeveloped in some form that is acceptable to all South Australians. To have six dolphins and 13 sea lions living there in conditions which virtually put them under sentence of death is absolutely cruel. I say most categorically that, if one of those animals dies, it will be on the head of this Government. If one of those animals dies in the preparation of transportation from that location, it will be on the heads of those involved in the building unions, Greenpeace, Wild Watch, or any other conservation group. I hold them responsible for it. I also hold the RSPCA responsible, because I have seen no evidence of it taking any stand in looking after these animals at Marineland.

That is no reflection on the staff at Marineland. Since it was closed in May last year, the staff have undertaken the mammoth task of looking after, maintaining and keeping active all these animals, particularly the dolphins and sea lions. Those people have done a magnificent job and have had to put up with a tremendous amount of ill-informed criticism about the proposals to redevelop Marineland. Cabinet must accept responsibility from here on in.

In adding to the questions that I asked earlier, I will also add to the concerns of the people of South Australia about the future of Marineland. No longer will future generations

have the opportunity to see these wonderful creatures. Tens of thousands of young children will have to be taken down to Victor Harbor, if that development ever goes ahead, to see these animals in the wild. It is not their natural play area so I do not see how anyone can justify the proposed development.

Credit must go to the present staff and management of Marineland for the health and welfare of the animals still there, despite the conditions under which the people concerned have been forced to work. The building unions, Greenpeace and Wild Watch stand condemned because they have forced the present unsatisfactory conditions upon the staff and animals at Marineland. I am not being hypocritical; I am being realistic. Greenpeace said that it had plans to develop Granite Island. When asked where it would get the necessary \$500 000, the organisation claimed that it would come from the developers. It did not have much of an idea of what was going on but it was developing a concept, one which should have gone before the Government and been approved by the planning authorities weeks, if not months, ago. It is an idea that has just been plucked out of the air.

I feel disappointed and I believe that we in South Australia have been conned by these organisations and their grandiose plans. They were to bring out from America an expert in the management of dolphins. It will be interesting to see what kind of passport he has and whether he has a work permit for Australia. I also wonder whether he has the qualifications to meet the standards set in Australia to tend to these animals, because they are not easily obtained. Try to get a passport and a work permit for America; try to become a political agitator in America and see how you get on. I warn this person and the Greenpeace organisation that we do not want these sort of people in this country, stirring up trouble and telling us how to run things. We are quite capable of looking after our own affairs, and that is particularly true in my electorate.

Mr S.G. Evans: Let them sort out their own pollution problems.

Mr BECKER: The member for Davenport suggests that they should sort out their own pollution problems. They are horrendous compared with what we have. We do not want political dissidents from another country interfering in the management of this State and I certainly do not want them in my electorate. We should throw them out. It is ludicrous to expect that the dolphins at Marineland, which are as much as 23½ years old, can be retrained. They are suffering from various disabilities and to try to train them to live in the wild is simply not on.

We have been conned. Representations have been made to some of the associated unions in the building industry and they are now having second thoughts about what they were told. As I said, three of the dolphins have been at Marineland for 23½ years and three of them were born in captivity. The Government is caught. It had the right concept originally in encouraging Marineland's redevelopment and it approved the taking of additional dolphins for the project. It should never have backed down to Greenpeace and the building unions. The Government was right, and I supported it, but it is not right in not finding an alternative location for them. It cannot.

Last week representatives from the National Parks and Wildlife Service found that, in the first session to prepare the dolphins for transport out of Marineland, the dolphins came under a tremendous amount of stress, demonstrating that it would be an extremely difficult exercise. As soon as the water level was lowered, the dolphins went into shock,

as they did when they were treated out of the water. There is a risk of losing those dolphins—of killing them.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): It is my honour, privilege and responsibility, or whatever else one might like to call it, to conclude this debate. It distresses me to have to reiterate—indeed emphasise—the importance of the deception of the past three-plus years of the Bannon Government in the way in which it has treated the people of South Australia. The kinds of things which we have had drawn to our attention tonight by members on this side of the House illustrate quite clearly that the people of South Australia were conned at the last election by the Labor Party and its leader, Premier Bannon.

One has only to consider the stamp duty revenue obtained—as my Leader has pointed out—from the sale of homes in this State to realise the truth of what I am saying. As my Leader said the Premier, as he himself has admitted in the course of his remarks in relation to this measure to raise the revenue necessary to finance Government for the ensuing three or four month period, has made more money, obtained more revenue, from home buyers as a consequence of stamp duty on the transfer of properties from those people selling them to those people buying them, making cash income on rising property values.

We all know that since the present Government came to office in 1982 average home prices have increased by almost exactly 100 per cent. What that means in terms of inflation, under this Government in this State and under a Federal Government of the same political persuasion, is something about which I will have nothing to say, other than that a 100 per cent increase in five years is something of which I would not be proud. The Minister on the front bench ought to take note of that. House prices have doubled since the time when he took on the job of Minister of Housing and Construction. His Government is responsible for that. Labor Governments have been in office here and in Canberra for the bulk of that period.

As if such a high rate of inflation was not enough *apropos* the cost of housing, we must add to that the fact that the Government has increased its revenue from stamp duty by 177 per cent. Since this Government came to office in December 1982 the unit cost of housing has doubled, but stamp duty has not increased by a factor of double: stamp duty per \$10 unit is not \$17.70 but is now \$27.70. The Premier and Government members argue that that is the action of a responsible and reasonable Government.

According to the Minister of Housing and Construction, the Government has been responsible for making home ownership accessible to the vast majority of South Australians. That is piffle, and he knows that it is piffle—and well he should be ashamed of it, to the point where he draws down his bottom lip tightly and buries his nose in the newspaper to distract himself from the horrible consequences of the truth as it sinks in. The Minister of Housing and Construction should hang his head in shame. This involves a rip-off factor. It is not just an increase proportional to inflation and the breach of an electoral promise but a rip-off factor has been built into it—admitted by the Treasurer and Premier of this State.

In metropolitan Adelaide, half the houses will attract the highest stamp duty in Australia when they change hands, as my Leader amply pointed out earlier this evening, and people out there are hurting because of it. I refer to houses in the range \$75 000 to \$125 000. We in South Australia have the dubious privilege or honour—indeed the responsibility, visited upon us by a dishonourable Government—of paying the highest rate of stamp duty of any State of

Australia. For instance, if a house worth \$75 000 is transferred in South Australia, the stamp duty is nearly \$2 000, while in Queensland it is only \$750. If a \$100 000 house is transferred, the stamp duty is \$2 830. Victoria, which is also run by a Labor Government is the only other State where the stamp duty would be over \$2 000. In all other States the stamp duty would be below \$2 000, and in Queensland it would be only \$1 000. In South Australia the stamp duty on transferring a house worth \$125 000 is \$3 830 duty, and in Queensland it is \$1 250. I ask the Minister: how is it that we have come to this sorry pass given that he claims that he has done more for private home ownership as the Minister of Housing and Constuction under the Bannon Labor Government than any previous Minister?

The Hon. H. Allison: He is telling the truth; he has helped more people out than any other Minister.

Mr LEWIS: Yes, helped them right out, I am reminded by the member for Mount Gambier. He has helped them right out of their homes. They cannot afford them not only because of the kinds of taxes and charges that have been increased—and I use stamp duties as an example—but more importantly because of the way in which the Government has allowed, aided and abetted the Federal Labor Government and the Keating economic policies to compel them through interest rate increases to forgo for the time being the ownership of their homes.

I notice that the Minister is no longer burying his head in his newspaper but some other document. Let us look at last Saturday's *Advertiser* where 316 houses were advertised for sale at a set price, of which about half fell within the range I have been talking about. The Minister may laugh to try to hide his embarrassment as his face goes red. The current average price of a house in metropolitan Adelaide is \$94 268, I remind the honourable Minister, which attracts stamp duty of \$2 630. I point out that when the Premier and his Government came to office the stamp duty payable on an average priced metropolitan house was just over \$1 000. Since then there has been a rise of 141 per cent. Is the Government proud of that?

Let us look at the situation at the end of the Tonkin Government. In December 1982, stamp duty on the average priced home was \$310 compared with \$2 630.50 now. That was because of the generous stamp duty exemptions introduced by the former Liberal Tonkin Government. At that time the amount exempted from stamp duty was about two-thirds of the average priced home, but now the first home buyer faces almost exactly five times that amount of tax to purchase the average priced home. At the time of the last election the Premier promised to match what the Liberal Party said, but since that time he has refused to honour that promise.

In 1980 realistic and generous stamp duty exemptions were introduced by the then Liberal Government, and they will be maintained by the next Liberal Government after the forthcoming election—you can count on it, Mr Deputy Speaker, and so can every other South Australian. A first home buyer purchasing an average priced house in Adelaide today under a Liberal Government would pay stamp duty of only \$400.50. That is over \$1 150 less than under this Labor Government. What a comparison!

The Minister and the Premier say that they are proud of their record. It amazes me every time I see them stand up and bray that kind of nonsense. The Government has tried to seduce South Australians with that kind of obscene nonsense. The Labor Party's advertising message in the closing days of the 1985 campaign was:

On 7 December don't blow up your interest rates, vote Australian Labor Party'.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Appropriation.'

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: During the second reading debate I made the point that a significant proportion of the stamp duties could well have come from the transfer of large commercial properties, and the Premier agreed with this. Will he advise what proportion of the stamp duty take has come so far this year from the sale of housing and from the sale of commercial properties. Of that proportion, is any particular proportion attributed to one or two substantial properties, as the Premier appeared to indicate in his second reading reply?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, I was referring specifically to the GMH transaction, which was budgeted for. The Leader of the Opposition made his mistake—

The Hon. J.L. Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes. It shows in the receipts. When the Leader of the Opposition was saying that we expect to collect a certain percentage, he ignored the fact that that transaction was included in it, which meant that we were expected to collect less than real. The anticipated growth at the moment is largely in the area of conveyances, as I understand it. I do not have any breakdown on housing as against commercial properties, but commercial properties and large transactions figure very highly in that. Motor vehicle transactions are also contributing.

There are other non-impact improvements as well. One related to a similar situation with the Submarine Corporation, as with GMH, but we are only talking there of a small amount, and not the \$12 million that was referred to before. In short, I cannot provide a breakdown in that specific way, but I can indicate that it is largely the non housing property transactions and the top of the market housing transactions that have shown the increase.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: In his reply the Premier said that he could not anticipate what the proportions would be. I asked not for the anticipated proportions but for what had actually occurred. Presumably those figures are available. Will the Premier make available to the Committee the answers to the specific questions I have asked, because they are significant when we are looking at the level of the Government's income and at the areas from which it comes? It may be one-third commercial property and two-thirds home ownership. As I have no idea, I would like to know. I hope that the Premier can obtain the details from Treasury and provide them to the Committee.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As I indicated in my answer, I am not sure whether we can provide that sort of breakdown in the sort of detail that the honourable member wants. I understand that she wants to resolve the dispute between herself and the Leader as to where the incidence lies. I have indicated that the commercial property area figures largely.

The values of top-of-the-market Adelaide housing have increased quite sharply. I do not think that any honourable member disputes that, under a progressive taxation system, that is an appropriate area where stamp duties should be levied. That would be where the majority of the increase is founded.

The Hon. JENNIFER Cashmore: Can we have the figures?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not know that we can provide them. I have said that twice now, and that is the third time.

Mr LEWIS: Earlier during the debate, I think while the Leader of the Opposition was speaking by way of interjec-

tion, the Premier indicated that, among other things, he needed the money for the purpose of funding additional hospitals, schools and police services. Can the Premier indicate where additional hospital facilities are to be provided during the ensuing period or upon what facilities the appropriation will be expended over and above those facilities that are currently available in the State? Further, what schools did he have in mind and what increase, if any, will there be in the level of Police Force staffing?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As the honourable member has picked up, I was making the point that it is not a simple question of saying, 'You have got increased revenue and therefore you have extra money that just sits around doing nothing.' On the contrary, during the course of any year we have increased demand for our services, which obviously we try to contain within the budgeted limits. As I said, I think in my second reading contribution, in the health area there has been much greater use of our hospital services than was anticipated and, although it is too early to say the extent, as a consequence that will probably require some extra allocation to hospital budgets.

In relation to the education program and those other areas, I refer the honourable member to the budget documents which show where the pattern of expenditure occurs. I point out that, where there are any increased demands, the only way one can fund them is through increased revenue.

Mr LEWIS: I was hoping for a more explicit description of where we could expect the expenditure of funds. The Premier, I am sure in all sincerity, said that more funds would be required to run hospital services in South Australia, and to provide for expenditure in schools and on police services. I had hoped that the Premier could say where and why. None of that expenditure is coming to the communities that I represent.

As you would know, Mr Chairman, the acute care section of the Tailem Bend hospital was threatened with closure. It has now virtually been caponised of its capacity in that regard, and I think that puts a kind construction on it. Within 12 months I can foresee an artificial industrial dispute being orchestrated on the grounds that people employed there are not really employed as hospital employees and therefore they should not be expected or required to provide first point of contact acute care after hours without a doctor being present.

Equally, the expenditure is not going to the schools in my electorate. The Government has this inflexible formula of closing schools in the electorate of Murray-Mallee. The Geranium Area School will shortly be closed. That fact may not amuse the member for Gilles, but I can tell the member for Gilles, through you, Mr Chairman, that it does not amuse me, either. In fact, it makes me livid!

The same kind of proposal is considered for Pinnaroo, East Murray, and Brown's Well, and is even being contemplated for the Swan Reach Area School. In Murray Bridge the regional police strength is the lowest *per capita* in the State yet, as the Premier and the Minister of Emergency Services know, the number of breaking and entering, drunk and disorderly, assault and similar offences that have been occurring in Murray Bridge and Tailem Bend is higher than in most other places in South Australia, yet we can get no additional police to any significant degree.

Certainly, decisions are not made on a *pro rata* basis *per capita* regarding staffing levels elsewhere, and it disturbs me that the Premier is neither able nor prepared—or both—to tell me how the people I represent will benefit from this appropriation. It is clear to them that they suffer not only a downgraded service in terms of extension, for instance,

of Department of Agriculture services, but also a downgraded provision of services of other kinds to which I have referred. That is in spite of the fact that their need as citizens of this State is just as great as the need of citizens in the electorates of the member for Gilles, the member for Bright or the member for Fisher, or in the Premier's own electorate of Ross Smith.

If you, Mr Chairman, along with other members of the Government think that my plea is unreasonable, that view will be reflected in the ballot box at the next election—for not only the House of Assembly but also for the Legislative Council. One cannot take more money and spend it pork barrelling to buy the election, as the Labor Party has tried in the District of Mount Gambier or, as I suspect it will do, in the districts of south-west and north-east metropolitan Adelaide, and fool the people who live in those areas that it is doing a good job for South Australia—and get away with it yet again.

People are waking up to the fact that that is not responsible and it is not reasonable and, what is more, it is no assurance that, when the time comes for them to be considered other than in marginal electorates under a Labor Government, they will not do as poorly as people in any other place such as Murray-Mallee. It is not fair or reasonable for the people whom I represent to have to drive on worse roads than people in metropolitan and near metropolitan areas of South Australia; to have to send their children to schools with poorer curriculum options than those available to people in other electorates in South Australia; to have hospitals within reach, but with no public transport to get them to and fro. They are poorer in their capacity to provide a service than other people in South Australia. At the same time, new schools, new hospital facilities and new policing facilities are being provided unnecessarily, ahead of time for the sake of pork barrelling, in those districts that the Premier wants to pick up.

It is not fair or reasonable, and I ask the Premier to search his conscience and come to an honest appraisal of his overall responsibilities to everyone in South Australia, and not leave people of the kind I represent less well off than they were when he came to office, with the prospect of being even worse off in the event that he and his Government are returned to office at the next election.

I also ask him to consider why he insists on retaining money, notionally in a fund available to the Rural Assistance Branch, invested with SAFA at interest which accrues to general revenue, while there are farmers on Eyre Peninsula who, through no fault of their own, suffer from interest rate increases in costs which transfer away from them the income that they have received to pay the cost of borrowing the money to keep on trying to grow a crop when the seasons are, or have been, against it. The Premier says, 'You have gone as far as we will let you. Even though you know how to farm this land and even though you know better than anyone else, we will still refuse you the opportunity of rebuilding your future by denying you access to funds and, in doing so, cut off our nose to spite our face by ensuring that, once you are forced to walk off and have your assets liquidated, your skill will be gone forever and whomever replaces you will not be able to get as much export income for this State and nation as you could achieve.'

That is really a very stupid policy—an unnecessarily vindictive or short-sighted, ignorant policy—and I leave it to the members of the Government to choose whichever they will of either those options. It is not fair, sensible or legitimate to tie up \$20 million or \$30 million that could return, in one season, that entire area to viability and prevent that money from being made available through the Rural Assist-

ance Branch, to put it back if there is just average or better than average rainfall and, if there is not, then we as South Australians are no worse off anyway. If we cannot do that sort of thing, which is in the overall best interests of everyone represented by each of us in this place, we do not deserve the confidence that has been placed in us by the people of this State to do what is in the common interests of the welfare of all South Australians.

Whereas I will not accept responsibility for it, and neither will any other Liberal member of this place—and I am sure the member for Flinders is in the same category—I then say to you, Mr Chairman, that the Government and the Government alone must accept responsibility and bear the odium for its short-sighted, pork-barrelling policies that are indifferent to the real needs and best interests of South Australia and the people who live here—the people who want to be able to own the homes they live in. The Government is doing that for the sake of personal engrandisement and the retention of political power, and I think that that is immoral. I ask the Premier to tell me which hospitals and schools, and in what way, there will be any benefit to the people I represent from the revenue that is to be appropriated under this clause.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am sorry that the honourable member feels this way about Government policy, because I can say that, contrary to his impression, this Government puts a great deal of store on regional development and on the placing of resources in regional and rural communities. The honourable member asks where the evidence is; some of the examples he gives indicate how we are trying to ensure that we improve the quality of services and facilities.

The hospital controversy, which resulted in the restructuring of the Tailem Bend hospital, was accompanied by the ability to improve the Murray Bridge hospital, to reinforce and develop its facilities and services, and to give Tailem Bend a different role in the community. The honourable member talks about comparative disadvantage. It is worth remembering that the Murray Bridge hospital *vis-a-vis* the residents of Tailem Bend is very much closer than any comparable hospital in a number of the metropolitan areas. That is just a fact of life in terms—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, the journey time is very much shorter. The schools' programs have received extra allocation for ancillary staff. Despite declining enrolments we have retained a level of resources to those schools. Schools in the honourable member's area are beneficiaries of that process also. General, rural and other services are certainly strongly supported by this Government, as are law enforcement and other regional development areas. The honourable member mentions Eyre Peninsula. Apart from the various range of services and so on, the Government has very large sums invested individually in farming enterprises there—over \$30 million—the figure referred to by the honourable member. I agree that it is appropriate that we have such investment, but make the point to indicate to him that we have a strong commitment to regional development and to servicing such people as the constituents of the honourable member. He ignores the facts. I am surprised that he has such a strong grievance.

Every member wants better and new facilities, but every member understands that there is a limit to the financial resources of the State, and that is the problem. Members opposite in particular (I am not pointing the finger at the honourable member specifically) will stand up, as has happened at times today, and decry the level of taxes in this State, say what a terrible thing it is and that they must be reduced. That is fine. We do not have high tax *per capita*

in this State, but it would be desirable to reduce it in some areas. How would we then pay for the regional services? The metropolitan area could probably look after itself in that situation. There would be ways, alternatives and means for the urban dweller, but the country and regional areas would miss out most if the Government started contracting its services. We have to raise revenue in order to provide those services.

Mr GUNN: I raise two brief matters on this clause. We are discussing the expenditure of some \$750 million. The Premier would be aware that earlier today I referred to difficulties highlighted by people who are having their finances cut off by the financial institutions. Will the Premier give an assurance that the Government will do everything in its power to provide sufficient funds through the Rural Industries Assistance Branch? Will he also make the strongest possible representations to such financial institutions in an endeavour to allow those people in such difficult situations—many through no fault of their own—to have a chance to put in a crop in the forthcoming year? If those properties are forced on to the market, banks will get little for them. The affected individuals will get virtually nothing and a dreadful situation will be created. Unfortunately the circumstances will be created whereby more people will join the every-growing list of so-called unviable operations (a term I do not like) and this will further depress the market. Will the Premier briefly give an assurance in relation to those matters? I have been given letters from financial institutions which greatly perturb me.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I also do not like the term 'unviable' or 'non viable' because of the implication it carries. Unfortunately, in certain situations that is a fact of life. There is little that anybody can do about it. I assure the honourable member that we are closely monitoring the situation, we are providing the appropriate funds and have made comprehensive representations to the banks and lending institutions. I personally took part in a series of meetings with each bank separately after the negative reaction received at the general meeting with the Minister of Agriculture. Both the Minister of Agriculture and I went through their portfolios with each of the banks and urged on them to exercise great care indeed in trying to ensure that those who had a hope of surviving in the long term and making a go of it were given every possible chance of so doing.

The crunch is coming and I appreciate the honourable member's concern. I heard his question today and I do not have much to add to the answer given by the Minister of Agriculture, but I can underline the assurance that we are well aware of the situation.

Mr GUNN: We are debating the expenditure of this money, and obviously some of it will be used to administer the Rural Industries Assistance Branch. A number of questions have been raised in relation to the operation of the branch. Over the years that the branch has operated in the Department of Agriculture, it has lent a lot of money and that money, both capital and interest, has been repaid by those people who have been the beneficiaries of the finance. I have frequently been asked what has actually happened to the money that was repaid. Has the capital and interest gone into a revolving fund? Has some of it been used to repay the Commonwealth or has the surplus gone into general revenue? If the Premier does not have that information available, would he provide a detailed statement indicating exactly the financial situation? It is difficult to see from the Auditor-General's Report where it has gone—whether it has gone into general revenue, back to SAFA, back into the fund to be lent again to other people or repaid to the Commonwealth?

The Hon. R.K. Abbott interjecting:

Mr GUNN: It is not the role of the Opposition to be dealing with that. The Opposition has access to the Minister. The Auditor-General reports to Parliament and my understanding is that the proper role of the Opposition is to directly approach the Minister, and they with their officers supply the material. Will the Premier clearly respond, either by ministerial statement or through the normal question on notice arrangement, because this is important. The following questions have also been asked: when the department borrows this money, what rate of interest does SAFA charge that department? Is there any subsidy or does the Government actually make a significant profit on the administration of the scheme? There is a great deal of merit in having this information made available to the public.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will take that question on notice and see what I can provide for the honourable member.

Mr BECKER: In his second reading explanation, the Premier stated:

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 . . .

Can the Premier tell the Committee what impact recent interest rate increases will have on the budget this financial year and what they are likely to have on the budget in the next financial year? Further, what were the reasons for the increased revenue in the Engineering & Water Supply Department?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The increased revenue is due basically to increased consumption, increased activity, particularly with new housing connections. A number of housing estate connections have apparently run ahead of schedule. There were also some savings from the pumping program to date, although we do not know what the rest of the financial year will yield. I take it that the honourable member is asking about interest payments generally—the global effect. It is hard to estimate, but the increase could be anywhere between \$15 million and \$20 million as a result of the level of interest rates. However, that is a net figure.

As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out when he was bemoaning the fact that interest rates might be lower in this financial year, last September he rightly pointed to the fact that that means that SAFA would earn less, so obviously, if interest rates go up, SAFA is able to get a more favourable interest rate. We must look at the net effect. If it is between \$15 million and \$20 million—and these are indicative figures—equally, SAFAs earnings, its investment return, could be increased by between \$5 million and \$10 million. The net figure is obviously reached by taking the increased cost from the increased earnings. However, there is a net loss. In other words, higher interest rates are not good news for Government because the higher earnings do not match the higher expenditure on interest payments.

Mr BECKER: According to the financial pages, every time the Australian dollar increases by 1c overseas, that is an impact of about \$17 million on the profit of BHP. My question was: every time interest rates increase by .5 or 1 per cent, what impact would that have on the State budget? There must be some yardstick.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is probably possible to calculate it by looking at the interest costs estimated in this year's budget and the estimated level of interest. One could then work out what difference it would make. I cannot provide a figure off the top of my head for the honourable member, but if this figure indicative of \$15 or \$20 million

is about, perhaps, a 1 per cent or a 1.5 per cent increase, one has a rough idea of what it might do. I can try to get a more accurate figure for the honourable member.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): On 24 February, my office received notification of a meeting to be convened in the Pioneer Hall at Marion by a group known as the Senior Citizens of Australia. There was no accompanying documentation with that notification of meeting and, indeed, no letter and no signature. It was simply an invitation to be there. Being a conscientious and obliging person, I went along to the meeting at 1.30 p.m. last Friday. I was accompanied by the member for Hayward in this place, the Federal member for Hawker and several Liberal Party pretenders to those and various other positions.

After an hour or so of gentle abuse and vilification aimed at members of the Government, during which time we were accused of variously thumb-twiddling, eloquent silence, disregarding constituents and consigning pensioners to the scrap heap, we were asked to leave and duly did so. I thought it was fairly interesting that, having had to face these accusations of thumb-twiddling and sitting idly by, of the three members who went to the meeting, the member for Hayward, in particular, has distinguished herself during her stay in this place by her involvement in issues such as the retirement villages legislation; taxis for the disabled, a matter which she has pursued from the day she arrived in this place; the new private parking measure, which can be ascribed almost entirely to her urgings and pressure on various Ministers; her concern for middle-aged unemployed; and her well-known work with the DOME (Don't Overlook Mature Expertise) group.

Indeed, recently she was recognised for those virtues and activities by being named as coordinator of the State Government's aged task force. Therefore, it was ironic that she, above all, could be accused of having no concern for aged people and aged issues. The only issue on which she has touched in her six years in this place that did not bear directly on matters concerning aged people was private swimming pools legislation. In a sense, that may even bear on aged people given that they live and are active longer.

The Federal member for Hawker, ironically, was the coordinator of the South Australian Federal aged task force. Modesty forbids me from discussing my involvement in issues concerning aged people, but if anybody wants to question that involvement, I suggest that if they ask people in my electorate they will find that I work on issues 16 hours a day, six days a week, 48 weeks of the year, and many of the things that I do are concerned with retired people. In trying to tar us all with that brush, speakers at that meeting were wide of the mark.

Jessie Taylor, who spoke at that meeting, seems to forget that my parents and those of almost all members, at least on this side of the House, are over 65 years of age. We talk to our parents and could be said to be in touch with issues concerning people in that age group. It is silly to suggest that people whose parents are in the over 65 age group do not have any concern or appreciation of the difficulties

facing those people. I have always venerated and respected aged people. Last year, in a grievance debate, I went to considerable lengths to expound my admiration for the Reverend Alan Walker and many of the social directions in which he has taken this country.

During my adolescence my greatest hero was the British philosopher, Bertrand Russell. I invite Mrs Taylor to recall one of his sayings. Bertrand Russell is quoted as having said that when he was too stupid for mathematics he took up history and when he was too stupid for history he took up philosophy. It seems to me that Mrs Taylor has followed the same path. She seems to have forgotten her maths. She does not recognise that there will be twice as many people in the over 65 age group by the year 2000 as there are now. She seems to have ignored the simple arithmetic, that fewer taxpayers and more recipients make for arithmetic difficulties. She also seems to have done what Bertrand Russell did and forgotten her history. She has forgotten that Bob Menzies killed off any opportunity for a contributory national superannuation scheme in 1949 when he threw out the scheme which had run for two years. She seems to have forgotten that the current Liberal Opposition has a policy which will abolish the pension for women under 65 years of age. That is a piece of recent history that she has forgotten.

Mrs Taylor appears to be trotting out a fairly tired old piece of rhetoric from the Queensland Grey Power Party trying to hold the Federal and State Governments to ransom by demanding a disproportionate share of the public cake at the expense of single mothers, unemployed people and those with physical and intellectual disabilities.

To paraphrase one observer, it seems that the job of Governments is to look after the poor, whether they be young or old, rather than to look after the old whether they be rich or poor. I must confess that some of the arguments put forward by Greypower and by Senior Citizens of Australia have some validity. I see some problems facing retired people in this nation.

As I have suggested before, many of the problems are arithmetical and structural. There are too few taxpayers and too many recipients. It is simply impossible to satisfy the political and social demands of both groups. One cannot physically and arithmetically satisfy the needs of those who want less tax and, simultaneously, satisfy the needs of those who want more benefits. It simply does not add up. The Federal Government may have some policy problems at the moment in that, if savings are taxed, as they currently are, and spending is not taxed, logically, people will spend. That has some problems and it may be that the Federal Government should look at that issue.

However, it is not an argument in favour of a consumption tax, although it may be an argument for providing some sort of limited tax on savings. It seems to me that, whilst a tax on savings would lead to a decreased tax take, it could be made up in other ways. My preferred option to make up the balance would be to tax the Alan Bonds of the world, to tax the companies which avoid and evade their obligations by using transferred pricing, tax havens and phantom \$2 companies, and to tax those incomes over \$35 000 or thereabouts at the rate of 49 per cent. I would not come down to 39 per cent, as I suspect the Federal Government will.

At the same time, I acknowledge that there is a need to lift the tax threshold for those who need it to be lifted. Indeed, many pensioners and superannuants have a fair and justifiable case in wanting the tax threshold lifted, and I agree with that. Whilst a tax on savings would have a negative effect in terms of revenue, it would have the

positive effect of moving money from consumption into savings. In doing so, it would lower interest rates, it would lead to a smaller capital inflow from overseas and it would thereby decrease foreign debt. It seems to me that, whilst this is the long road home, in pursuing that course the Federal Government would achieve a great deal more for the economic future of this nation than it would by listening to the snake oil being peddled by members opposite and by Jessie Taylor and her like.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I feel constrained to respond to the recent remarks in the *Border Watch* of the Minister of Forests, who was grossly unfounded in his criticism of the Leader of the Opposition (John Olsen). I wonder whether the new Minister was unaware of the facts or whether he was deliberately misleading the South-East public as an act of political mischief. The Liberal Party is very proud of the achievements of the Woods and Forests Department which, as the Minister said, was established by the late Sir Thomas Playford in 1948.

The Hon. R.K. Abbott interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: He did an excellent job in establishing it. The Leader of the Opposition expressed concern when he was in Mount Gambier that the State Auditor-General had, for several years, questioned the financial status of the South Australian Timber Corporation. He also commented on the commercial losses sustained by the department's milling operations, and in that he did no more than the Auditor-General has done for the past four or five years.

The Leader's concern was reinforced last week when the Auditor-General released another report, supplementary to the 1988 budget papers, dealing exclusively with the South Australian Government Financing Authority (SAFA) and its related groups, and the South Australian Timber Corporation. Satco shares a common executive and administration with the Woods and Forests Department, but they are not amalgamated bodies.

At page v of his 1988 report, the Auditor-General said that Satco's \$32 million investment had very little capital equity—almost zero. In fact, almost all of the funds had been borrowed. Over the past two years, during budget debates and in Question Time in the House, I have consistently questioned successive Ministers, as have my colleagues, with regard to the increasingly heavy losses sustained by Satco in its IPL(NZ) operations. We have received reassurances generally in the House that things were going along quite swimmingly. But the Auditor-General says that these debts will still continue to increase unless IPL starts to trade profitably. I ask members of the House: how optimistic are they in relation to that possibility?

At 30 June 1988 IPL(NZ) had accumulated losses of \$5.4 million. They are greater now. In September 1989 it has to find another \$12 million to repay its preference shareholders. The Auditor-General also points out that, in addition to that \$11 million interest free loan granted by the Federal Government to the Woods and Forests Department for three years (1983-86) for the Ash Wednesday damage relief, there are also other interest free loans on record. For example, interest is not payable on the 1987-88 Shepherdson and Mewett Sawmill \$1.3 million loan, and nor is interest payable by IPL(Holdings) on a \$6.7 million loan—both from Satco. That is pretty good business, if you can have \$8 million interest free—but someone has to pay. Of course, it is Satco which must pay, and its audited statements must certainly be qualified when they are presented.

The Hon. R.K. Abbott interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The former Minister says that I am knocking them. I am not knocking them—these are statements made by the Auditor-General of South Australia. He has said that the South Australian Government Financing Authority, concerned at the extent of its largely unsecured loans to Satco, persuaded the Government to convert \$21 million of the Satco debt into an equity holding to cover the \$3.7 million unpaid interest owing by Satco. That is in the Auditor-General's 1988 budget report at page x.

This was done by giving the South Australian Government Financing Authority a 16.2 per cent interest in Woods and Forests Department capital assets—largely in growing timber. The interesting thing, of course, is that Satco the debtor, does not own the trees. The Woods and Forests Department owns them. Therefore, Woods and Forests is handing over its trees to SAFA to cover a debt by Satco—a very heavy debt. There is another anomaly: recently, the Woods and Forests Department changed its accounting system to improve its annual profit figures, by adding the value of the tree growth annually into its profit and loss statement. That means that last year \$28.5 million worth of growing timber was added into the profit and loss statement.

However, Australian Accounting Standard No. 10 recommends that the forestry growth should be put into an asset re-valuation reserve account—so that it does not influence profit and loss. Thus, it does not influence profit and loss until the timber is milled and sold—which could be 30 or 40 years down the track. The Auditor-General still has that reserve this year about the way that the Woods and Forests Department is doing this accounting. For the past three years he has expressed concern that the Woods and Forests Department should consider a revised accounting method. This is referred to in the Auditor-General's 1988 report at page x, and in the 1988 Woods and Forests Department annual report, signed by the Auditor-General.

So, the Auditor-General's concerns are still current. Obviously, this method creates a cash bonus for the South Australian Finance Trust. Further, the following point is important: the South Australian Finance Trust Limited now gets dividends on unrealised profits, because the trees are still growing in the forests. They have not been milled, they have not been sold, and there is a good chance, says the Auditor-General, that the Woods and Forests Department, currently in debt, will have to borrow money to pay interest, to pay dividends on assets which might be milled 30 or 40 years down the track. Where is the wisdom in that sort of accounting? Creative accounting, of course, can lead to problems.

The nice thing about the Woods and Forests Department is that if you bloody well left it alone it would be a strong surviving organisation. Satco is a millstone around its neck. I did not vote for the formation of Satco in 1979 when Don Dunstan brought the Bill into the House—none of us did; it went through the Upper House by default.

Let us return to the Woods and Forests commercial operation. On page 235 of his 1988 report, the Auditor-General said that, notwithstanding a sales volume increase in the commercial operation of 29 400 cubic metres, on total sales of 152 700 cubic metres, and increased earnings of \$12 million, including a price rise during the year, the Commercial Division still operated at a loss for the second year running—\$139 000 was lost last year and \$264 000 the year before.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Well, the Minister said that the profitability had turned around—a \$2.5 million increase. However, when you have written off \$23 million to SAFA

and pawned the trees, put them in hock, even I could show a good return. It is the equivalent of my asking my next door neighbour to assume responsibility for the substantial mortgage on my house. We could all do very well on that sort of business, and I am sure that we would all come out of it smelling of roses.

Satco has put into hock stuff that it does not own and the Auditor-General says that it has sustained a record sales loss. Despite record sales of \$5.4 million the department sustained a small loss. He expresses nine or 10 other concerns. I have far more to go through from the Auditor-General's Report than I possibly can, but my simple plea to the Government is, 'For heaven's sake get Satco off the Woods and Forests' neck; stop putting Woods and Forests' assets into hock to pay off heavy debts, such as the \$32 million incurred by Satco, and for goodness sake let Woods and Forests operate profitably'—as it used to, putting \$9 million or \$10 million annually into the State's coffers. Then, the South-East people would be extremely happy, including union members who have been lobbying me strongly to express their personal concerns that Satco is going one way and they are pulling Woods and Forests down with them.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): During this debate I wish to refer to a problem of one of my constituents who has approached me about her disabled and epileptic son. Right from the outset I would like to say that I have never made a practice of bringing to Parliament the plight of the disabled. There are two reasons for this: first, I do not want to appear to be cheer chasing by emphasising the plight of the disabled and, secondly, I have always found that disabled people are, generally speaking, well and truly able to speak for themselves.

I think this problem needs attention not only in respect of my constituent but also in respect of other people who are having the same problem. I refer specifically to this lady whose son is now 20 years old, although when she approached me just prior to the Christmas break he was 19 years old. Up to that date he had been attending a school and his mother had just been informed that at 20 years of age—which he now is—he could no longer continue to attend that school. In itself, this is of no great consequence because the lad himself was starting to say to his mother that it was time he left school and moved on to something else.

This lady's son is very severely disabled, and his epilepsy is of a nature that he cannot concentrate on a particular occupation for any great length of time without having severe difficulties. Apart from wishing to see the best possible occupational activity for her son, his mother is also in need of some relief from the constant attention that she must give him. I can understand this because the December edition of *Family Matters*, published by the Australian Institute of Family Studies, contains an article which refers to parent fatigue.

Parent fatigue is a well documented problem, and it has been documented in the book *A bit of a struggle; coping with family life in Australia* by Jean McCaughey. This is a 1987 Penguin book based on institute research on Geelong social support networks. In this publication, Jean McCaughey refers to the stress which is involved, on both the mother and the father, with the coming of a new child.

I acquaint the problems of my constituent to those of parents who are continuously attending to a child because the analogy is very similar. In fact, I would go so far as to say that the stress situation in looking after a disabled person full time is probably greater than the stress situation reflected in the advent of the birth of a baby.

So, it is understandable that my constituent would wish to have some sort of relief from time to time in looking after her son. It is not as if she has not been trying to do something about this problem, because she has been to the IDSC, which has referred her in turn to the day care coordinator for therapy centres. She has been to the Orana workshop, and they could not offer her any part-time employment for her son. She has been to the Phoenix workshop and he is unable to cope with the requirements of the output that they expected of him. She has been to Bedford Industries, and her son is so disabled that he is unable to cope with the situation at Bedford and, in any event, Bedford does not have any part-time work.

She has also been to other institutions like Katuni, and that has been unsuccessful. Bearing in mind that she lives in my electorate of Henley Beach she has been to Barcuna out at Elizabeth. However, they do not have any part-time occupation, and Minda does not accept clients unless they are residents of Minda. She has also been to Strathmont and had a look at the workshops there, but they do not accept clients unless they are members of Strathmont.

It has been suggested to her that she try some of the Catholic schools, and she tried to look at the special schools at St Annes, Ashford, and her son actually attended Kensington for 1½ years with a view to sheltered workshop requirements. This was tried for one year and one term. However, the stress this put on her son was such that he suffered a lot of seizures, and the doctor seemed to think it was due to travelling to the Kensington centre and that he was just unable to cope with any capabilities with the situation they placed on him—

Mr Becker: Did you contact the Epilepsy Association?

Mr FERGUSON: Yes, my constituents are members, and the association speaks highly of the member for Hanson, I might say. For her situation, it has not been for want of trying to be able to place her son in a sheltered workshop. Her son, I might say, has been described as a terminal case, and he probably has no longer than two years to live. The Adelaide Children's Hospital and the welfare departments have absolutely nothing to offer, especially on a part-time basis. Also, there is no day therapy centre or occupational basis for this lady's son. I understand that she has been to the Epilepsy Association and has spoken to them, but they are not in a position to offer her anything.

Wherever she has been she has received sympathy and caring; notes have been taken in the same way that I have

taken notes; but nothing has eventuated from the visits that she has made. Her own thoughts are that it appears that her son is a hopeless case and that nothing can be done for him. She has been to her local church, her local doctor and anywhere she can possibly think of. I hasten to add that there are many other people in the same situation. Apparently, there is a fairly long waiting list for sheltered workshop employment. Residential care has been offered to her, but she is not prepared to allow her son to go into residential care and there is nothing that one could describe as a halfway house that could assist her.

As the situation stands, there is nothing to look forward to and she has come to me in desperation to see whether there is any way that I can be of assistance to her as her local member. I naturally took up this matter with the Minister of Health and he has sent correspondence back to me suggesting that the lady concerned contact the Chief Executive Officer of the Intellectually Disabled Services Council in the western region to see whether her specific requirements can be met. I certainly hope that something can be done to assist her. She, in a sense, has already been down that track. She has contacted the IDSC and the first time around the council was unable to find anything that could meet her requirements.

I hope that this impasse can be overcome because I believe that, in respect of these specific cases, as a society we should assist in alleviating some of the stress and provide a better lifestyle for the disabled. I have contacted the Disability Officer in the Premier's Department and he suggested that part of the problem is that there is no one organisation responsible for providing relief for the care of the disabled in these situations.

Most organisations have a piecemeal approach. In this sort of situation part of the organisation is available, but unfortunately, in many cases, the disabled do not fit into the available categories. I think that this is something that we should look at seriously not only in the case of epileptic children but also in the case of people looking after patients with severe head injuries, where the same sort of problem occurs. There is no day care centre to provide the sort of relief that is necessary for those people who look after them. I most certainly hope that, in the future, as a community we can do something about this problem.

Motion carried.

At 10.17 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 15 March at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 14 March 1989

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN SUPERANNUATION FUND INVESTMENT TRUST

183. Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition), on notice, asked the Treasurer: In respect of each commercial property owned by the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust—

- (a) which company is the property manager;
- (b) what fee does the company receive for its services as property manager; and
- (c) before appointing the property management company, did the trust invite tenders and, if so, how many submissions were received and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The reply is as follows:

- (a) 101 Grenfell Street, Adelaide, North Adelaide Village, Southern Cross Arcade, Adelaide, 22 Grenfell Street, Adelaide, are managed by Jones Lang Wootton. Castle Plaza Edwardstown, Renaissance Arcade and Tower, Adelaide, and 45 Pirie Street, Adelaide, are managed by Colliers International Property Consultants. Coles Distribution Centre, Gepps Cross is managed by Baillieu Knight Frank. Wakefield House, Adelaide is managed by SACON.
- (b) Overall the fees paid for management represent approximately 2.9 per cent of gross rents. In the case of Wakefield House the South Australian Government meets the management costs directly.
- (c) SASFIT did not call tenders before appointing the property managers. SASFIT does not consider that tendering provides an appropriate basis for selecting managers, preferring to rely on its knowledge of the expertise and resources of the various firms, and direct negotiation.

SASFIT currently employs the three largest commercial property consulting firms operating in South Australia and is able constantly to monitor their performance one against another. SASFIT also receives from time to time and considers submissions from other property management companies. Fees for management services are set and reviewed by direct negotiation and are generally well below published industry scales.

MOTOR FUEL LICENSING BOARD

187. Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition), on notice, asked the Minister of Labour:

- 1. Who are the members of the Motor Fuel Licensing Board?
- 2. On what date was each member appointed and on what date does each appointment expire?
- 3. What particular qualifications of each member caused the Government to recommend their appointment?
- 4. How much was paid in allowances and expenses to each member of the board in 1987-88?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The replies are as follows:

- 1. Members of the Motor Fuel Licensing Board:

Chairman Mr L.B. Bowes
Member Ms D.J. Kenward
Member Ms L.J. Conaghty

- 2. Appointment and Expiry Dates:

Mr L.B. Bowes Appointed 1.7.88-1.7.90
Ms D.J. Kenward Appointed 18.6.87-30.6.89
Ms L.J. Conaghty Appointed 12.5.88-30.6.89

- 3. Mr L.B. Bowes: previous Director of Department of Labour has a good knowledge of the workings of the Motor Fuel Licensing Board.

Ms D.J. Kenward: has had vast experience in an industry that is regulated by licensing. She also has an excellent local general knowledge.

Ms J. Conaghty: has had vast experience in financial institutions. Has had experience in running a small business and is appreciative of the problems of small business. Has a good knowledge in the hospitality and tourism industry, having worked in the industry.

- 4. Allowances and Expenses 1987-88:

	P. McCusker \$	L. Bowes \$	D. Kenward \$	J. Conaghty \$	R. Gehan \$	Total \$
Annual retainer	1 683.00	2 540.50	2 292.76	613.68	111.00	7 240.94
Hearing fees	4 236.03	2 881.17	2 688.77	232.40	78.61	10 116.98
	5 919.03	5 421.67	4 981.53	846.08	189.61	17 357.92

GOVERNMENT VEHICLE

198. Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham), on notice, asked the Minister of Transport:

- 1. To which department is the Mitsubishi Colt UQO 425 allocated and is it a 'pool' car or allocated to a particular person?
- 2. Was any authorisation given for the use of this vehicle on Monday, 30 January 1989?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

- 1. The Mitsubishi Colt UQO-425 is a Government pool vehicle at Glenside Hospital.
- 2. On Monday 30 January 1989, authorisation was given for a nurse to use the vehicle to take inpatients on a planned outing as part of the patients' therapeutic program. The outings on this occasion were a trip to the beach at Glenelg

in the morning with one group of inpatients and in the afternoon the vehicle was used for a trip to the Botanical Gardens with another group of inpatients. Planned outings such as these are a feature of several programs at the hospital and are well supported on clinical grounds.

HOUSING TRUST RENTAL ACCOMMODATION

201. Mr GUNN (Eyre), on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: What are the South Australian Housing Trust's plans to build rental purchase and rental accommodation in country areas and does the Government intend increasing the amount of money available for this purpose?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The trust builds accommodation for rental purposes. Most trust homes are, however, available for purchase by tenants. Tenants may use normal housing finance or buy under the rental-purchase

program. During the 1988-89 financial year 129 country projects are scheduled to commence. Future building programs in country locations will depend on the level of funding available and on the strength of housing demand in country towns.

AGRICULTURAL LAND

210. **Mr GUNN (Eyre)**, on notice, asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: What action is the Government taking to prevent loss of agricultural land to housing development in prime agricultural areas close to the metropolitan area and what is the long-term strategy to overcome this problem?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Government completed a major strategy review of long-term metropolitan planning in 1987, and released a number of documents setting out its approach to orderly metropolitan growth. The report entitled 'Long-Term Development Strategy for Metropolitan Adelaide', prepared within the Department of Environment and Planning in 1987, was written in response to a clear need to consider the directions metropolitan growth was heading.

The Government has adopted urban consolidation as the principal strategy for accommodating Adelaide's growth into the next century. Clearly this option has the best potential for retaining prime agricultural land. The State's Development Plan has been amended to reflect the urban consolidation, and associated regulations commenced on 1 January this year. Major urban initiatives, such as the Northfield Project, the Inner West Project and a range of similar schemes, are proceeding. Much work has been done with councils and will not only contribute to wider housing choice, but also protect the agricultural land on the fringe.

While urban consolidation is an important strategy, Government's must plan for fringe growth, not only to provide housing choice but also as a buffer against unforeseen increases in population growth. In its consideration of five fringe options, the Government placed great weight on the advice of the Department of Agriculture in relation to productive land. Accordingly, the Government's urban consolidation strategy, together with its actions to coordinate fringe expansion will, I believe, meet the aims in relation to protection of agricultural land.

MINE EXPLORATION LICENCES

213. **Mr GUNN (Eyre)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. How many exploration licences are currently in operation in the Maralinga and Pitjantjatjara lands, respectively?
2. Is the Government taking any action to encourage or promote exploration in either the Pitjantjatjara or Maralinga lands?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The replies are as follows:

1. There are no current petroleum exploration licences (PELs) in either the Pitjantjatjara or Maralinga lands.
2. Yes, the Government is taking action to encourage and promote exploration in both the Pitjantjatjara and Maralinga lands. A data package has been prepared calling for applications for new PELs over four separate areas of the

Officer Basin, of which three are in Aboriginal lands. A report has just been completed which assesses the mineral and hydrocarbon potential of Maralinga lands. The report concludes that the resource potential of the Maralinga lands is essentially unknown but the limited data available indicate it may be high. Companies will be notified as to the existence of this report through the Department of Mines and Energy's bibliographic database. A similar assessment is planned for the Pitjantjatjara lands.

DISTRICT BUILDING OFFICERS CONFERENCE

244. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: Further to the answer to Question No. 158, at what time was the conference held for District Building Officers and Regional Managers at Adelphi Terrace, Glenelg; and what was the duration of the conference?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The agenda timetable for the one day conference was 8.30 a.m.-5.30 p.m. Several participants had informal discussions at the end of the afternoon session until approximately 6 p.m. The conference was convened to implement a Treasury initiative to pool funding between the Education Department and Sacon. Directors and senior managers from both departments attended under the chairmanship of the Director, Capital Works, Treasury. As both departments conduct decentralised operations, participants attended from Noarlunga, Elizabeth, Murray Bridge, Port Augusta and Whyalla as well as the metropolitan area.

PRODUCT RECALL

245. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction: How many Government departments and authorities have been affected by Pacific Dunlop Batteries Industrial Division's product recall of single point emergency lighting fittings in the form of an 'exit' sign containing any of the following words: Bardic CFL300M; Bardic M10; Bardic S10; Bardic 10SLS110; and Lanson LM10, and what action has the Government taken in relation to the recall?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Information on the extent of use of the products in question, in Government buildings maintained by Sacon, is currently being compiled by departmental officers. Upon receipt of advice on the locality of such fittings, modification will be undertaken by Pacific Dunlop service personnel.

BUILDING INSPECTIONS

277. **Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs: How many building inspectors are currently inspecting house buildings on a full-time basis and how does this compare with staffing four years ago?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFT: Officers of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs in the course of investigating complaints or monitoring compliance with legislation do, at times, inspect house building; however, there are no building inspectors currently inspecting house buildings on a permanent full-time basis, nor were there four years ago.