

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 3 August 1989

The House met at 12 noon pursuant to proclamation, the Speaker (Hon. J.P. Trainer) presiding.

The Clerk (Mr G.D. Mitchell) read the proclamation summoning Parliament.

After prayers read by the Speaker, honourable members, in compliance with summons, proceeded at 12.10 p.m. to the Legislative Council Chamber to hear the speech of His Excellency the Governor. They returned to the Assembly Chamber at 12.45 p.m. and the Speaker resumed the Chair.

[Sitting suspended from 12.46 to 2.15 p.m.]

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

The SPEAKER: I have to report that the House has this day, in compliance with a summons from His Excellency the Governor, attended in the Legislative Council Chamber, where His Excellency has been pleased to make a speech to both Houses of Parliament, of which speech I, as Speaker, have obtained a copy, which I now lay upon the table.

Ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS: MAREEBA CENTRE

Petitions signed by 640 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government not to proceed with the establishment of a pregnancy termination clinic at the Mareeba Centre were presented by Messrs Abbott and Bannon.

Petitions received.

PETITION: AUSTRALIA DAY

A petition signed by 250 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to provide for the Australia Day public holiday to be observed on 26 January each year was presented by the Hon. J.C. Bannon.

Petition received.

PETITION: TEACHER CONTRACT SYSTEM

A petition signed by 29 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to abolish the current contract system for teachers was presented by the Hon. S.M. Lenehan.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: HOUSING INTEREST RATES

Petitions signed by 460 residents of South Australia praying that the House take action to persuade the Federal Government to amend economic policy to reduce housing interest rates were presented by Messrs Allison and Olsen.

Petitions received.

PETITION: ELECTRONIC GAMING DEVICES

A petition signed by 48 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any measures to legalise the use of electronic gaming devices was presented by Mr Olsen.

Petition received.

PETITION: ANDAMOOKA TOURIST COMPLEX

A petition signed by 217 residents of Andamooka praying that the House urge the Government to stop the construction of the proposed tourist complex in the township was presented by Mr Gunn.

Petition received.

PETITION: MARINELAND

A petition signed by 56 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to reconsider the closure of Marineland was presented by Mr Oswald.

Petition received.

PETITION: OZONE HARMING AGENTS

A petition signed by 65 students and staff of Marion High School praying that the House urge the Government immediately to prohibit the production of ozone harming agents was presented by the Hon. R.G. Payne.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Financial Institutions Duty Act 1983—Regulations—Funds Transfer Services.

Superannuation Act 1988—Regulations—Commutation of Pensions.

By the Minister of Health (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

Lyell McEwin Health Service Superannuation Fund—Report, 1987-88.

Controlled Substances Act 1984—Regulations—Prescription Drugs.

Poisons—Pentazocine.

Drugs of Dependence—Pentazocine.

Drugs Act, 1908—Regulations—

Chiropodists.

Pentazocine.

Health Act 1935—Regulations—Nursing Home Staffing.

Physiotherapists Act 1945—Regulations—Registration Fees.

Psychological Practices Act 1973—Regulations—Registration Fees.

South Australian Health Commission Act 1976—Regulations—

Adelaide Medical Centre for Women and Children.

Government Hospital Revocation.

Onkaparinga District Hospital.

Prostheses Fees.

Recognised Hospitals.

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

Animal and Plant Control Commission—Report, 1988.

Soil Conservation Act 1939—Regulations—Districts and Voting.

By the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

Fisheries Act 1982—Regulations—
 Aquatic Reserves.
 Coorong—Mulloway Fishery.
 Exotic Fish, Farming and Diseases—Permits.
 Fish Processors—Registration Fee.
 Lakes and Coorong Fishery—Licence Fee.
 Licence Fee.
 Marine Scale Fishery—Licence Fee.
 Recreational Net and Pot Fee.
 Restricted Marine Scale Fishery—Licence Fee.
 Sales and Protected Fish.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia—Report, 1988.
 Teachers Registration Board of South Australia—Report, 1988.
 Juries Act 1927—Rules—Trial by Judge.
 Justices Act 1921—Rules—Witness Fees.
 Rules of Court—
 District Criminal Court—Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1926—Pre-trial Conferences.
 Local Court—Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1926—
 Forms.
 Interlocutory Judgment.
 Supreme Court—Supreme Court Act 1935—
 Interest Rate Review.
 Motion to Quash and Subpoenas.
 Professional Conduct.
 Acts Replication Act 1967—Schedules of Alterations made by the Commissioner of Statute Revision—
 Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act 1979.
 Correctional Services Act 1982.
 Cultural Trusts Act 1976.
 Police Act 1952.
 South Australian Heritage Act 1978.
 State Transport Authority Act 1974.

Associations Incorporation Act 1985—Regulations—Fees.

Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1966—Regulations—Fees.

Builders Licensing Act 1986—Regulations—Fees.

Indemnity Exemption.
 Indemnity Insurance.
 Sumitomo Aust. Ltd.

Business Names Act 1963—Regulations—Fees.
 Classification of Publications Act 1974—Regulations—Sydney Tramway Museum.

Commercial and Private Agents Act 1986—Regulations—Fees.

Commercial Tribunal Act 1982—Regulations—Fees.

Consumer Credit Act 1972—Regulations—Fees.

Consumer Transactions Act 1972—Regulations—Fees.

Co-operatives Act 1983—Regulations—Fees.

Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935—Regulations—Witness Fees.

Electoral Act 1985—Regulations—Return Date.

Fees Regulation Act 1927—Regulations—Places of Public Entertainment Fees.

Goods Securities Act 1986—Regulations—Fees.

Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act 1973—Regulations—Fees.
 Real Estate Institute.

Liquor Licensing Act 1985—Regulations—Fees.

Local and District Criminal Courts Act 1926—Regulations—Unsatisfied Judgment Summons.

Places of Public Entertainment Act 1913—Regulations—Fees.

Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act 1983—Regulations—Fees.

Trade Measurements Act 1971—Regulations—Fees.

Travel Agents Act 1986—Regulations—Fees.

Trustee Companies Act 1988—Regulations—Returns.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. Frank Blevins)—

Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act 1956—Regulations—Fares.

Temporary Licence Fee.

Motor Vehicles Act 1959—Regulations—

Licence Classifications.

Mass Limits.

Registration and Licence Fees.

Search Costs.

Towing Fees.

Road Traffic Act 1961—Regulations—

Central Eyre Peninsula Hospital.

Declared Hospitals.

Flagstaff Road.

Inspection Fees.

Mass Limits.

Reversible Lane Flow (Amendment).

State Transport Authority Act 1974—Regulations—Conduct of Passengers.

Summary Offences Act 1953—Regulations—Mass Limit Infringements.

By the Minister of Employment and Further Education (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—

Director-General of Technical and Further Education—Report, 1988.

Flinders University of South Australia—Report, 1987.

Amendments to Statutes.

Research Report, 1987.

Dog Control Act 1979—Regulations—Councils and Registration.

Industrial and Commercial Training Act 1981—Regulations—Mechanical Services Plumbing.

Local Government Act 1934—Regulations—Land Use.

Tertiary Education Act 1986—Regulation—Institute of Language Revocation.

West Beach Recreation Reserve Act 1987—Regulations—Definitions, Vehicles and Waste.

Corporation By-laws:

Noarlunga—

No. 12—Playgrounds.

No. 29—Repeal.

Port Lincoln—No. 19—Bathing and Controlling the Foreshore.

Renmark—

No. 35—Dogs.

No. 43—Poultry.

Walkerville—

No. 7—Bees.

No. 9—Garbage Bins.

District Council By-laws:

Blyth-Snowtown—No. 30—Dogs.

Meningie—No. 29—Camping.

Robe—No. 27—Dogs.

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. M.K. Mayes)—

Racing Act 1976—Rules—

Greyhound Racing—Appeals.

Trotting—

Appeals.

Claiming Races.

Compensation and Suspensions.

Fees.

Servicing.

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—

Art Gallery of South Australia—

Report, 1985-86.

Report, 1986-87.

Report, 1987-88.

Northern Cultural Trust—Report, 1987-88.

South-East Cultural Trust—Report, 1987-88.

South Australian Museum Board—Report, 1987-88.

Planning Act 1982—

Planning Appeal Tribunal—Rules—Appeals.

Regulations—Mount Gambier Development.

Crown Development Report on St Agnes Bus Depot.

National Trust of South Australia—Rules—Postal Ballot.

Clean Air Act 1984—Regulations—Licensing and Transfer Fees.

By the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—

- Fees Regulation Act 1927—Regulations—Water and Sewerage Fees.
- Sewerage Act 1929—Regulations—
 - Connection and Examination Fees.
 - Restrictions on Pipes.
- Water Resources Act 1976—Regulations—Fees.
- Waterworks Act 1932—Regulations—
 - Connection and Examination Fees.
 - Meter Testing.
 - Restrictions on Pipes.

By the Minister of Lands (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—

- Bills of Sale Act 1886—Regulations—Fees.
- Crown Lands Act 1929—Regulations—Fees.
- Pastoral Act 1936—Regulations—Fees.
- Real Property Act 1886—Regulations—
 - Land Division Fees.
 - Registration Fees.
- Registration of Deeds Act 1935—Regulations—Fees.
- Roads (Opening and Closing) Act 1932—Regulations—Fees.
- Strata Titles Act 1988—Regulations—Fees.
- Surveyors Act 1975—Regulations—
 - Fees.
 - Survey Areas.

By the Minister of Emergency Services (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder)—

- Police Act 1952—Regulations—Rank, Qualifications and Appeals.

By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder)—

- Gas Act 1988—Regulations—Examination Fees.
- Mines and Works Inspection Act 1920—Regulations—Fees.
- Mining Act 1971—Regulations—Mining Register and Claims.

By the Minister of Forests (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder)—

- Forestry Act 1950—Proclamation—Hundred of Talunga.

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—

- Industrial Relations Advisory Council—Report, 1988.
- Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act 1968—Regulations—Fees.
- Dangerous Substances Act 1979—Regulations—Fees.
- Explosives Act 1936—Regulations—Fees.
- Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986—Regulations—
 - Commercial Safety—Fork Lifts.
 - Construction Safety—
 - Fees.
 - Fork Lifts.
 - Earth Leakage Protection.
 - Industrial Safety—Fork Lifts.
 - Registration of Workplaces—Fee.
- Worker's Liens Act 1893—Regulations—Fees.
- Amendment Workers Compensation Appeal Tribunal Rules—Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986—Deputy President.

By the Minister of Marine (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—

- Harbors Act 1936—Regulations—Grand Prix Power Boat Race.
- Marine Act 1936—Regulations—Certificate of Competency Exemption.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ABALONE INDUSTRY

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Fisheries): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Last year a number of allegations were made about illegal activities associated with the abalone industry, including standover tactics, thuggery, threats with firearms, drug trafficking, and smuggling. The debate escalated in October last year when poachers and an

honourable member in another place alleged corruption amongst officers of the Police and Fisheries Departments.

In October 1988 the Police Policy Audit Division was asked by the Attorney-General to investigate these matters including alleged poaching of abalone by unlicensed divers, drug trafficking in the abalone industry, corruption within the Department of Fisheries, corrupt police officers concerned with the abalone industry, and any associated criminal activity.

Complementary to that investigation, both the Police and Fisheries Departments initiated a number of special operations aimed at particular trouble spots. These included uniformed operations, undercover surveillance, intelligence gathering, and targeted 'blitzes' when required.

I have received a comprehensive report from the Commissioner of Police covering all aspects of this matter. Most importantly the report finds:

No evidence to substantiate claims of corruption within the Department of Fisheries, or police.

I notice that the member for Chaffey laughs at that. In fact, the report highlights that the most public allegation by the Leader of the Australian Democrats regarding poachers allegedly being informed of helicopter surveillance activity was not related to corruption but traced to some imprudent comments by a refuelling agent, following a request for him to arrange fuel for a helicopter to be used in an operation. Other findings of the report were:

A substantiation of organised poaching of abalone by unlicensed divers;

apprehension of six poachers for minor drug offences but no substantiation of accusations of significant drug trafficking in the abalone industry; and

the finding that poachers were involved in a range of criminal activities; in particular standover tactics, assault, and threats against licensed divers in the Yorke Peninsula region.

Resulting from these conclusions, a total of 24 people have been arrested or reported over breaches of the Fisheries Act. I believe that there has been a positive outcome from this episode.

The Fisheries and Police Departments have established a close working relationship and have been able to significantly reduce the incidence of illegal poaching in the abalone fishery. We are also taking up several recommendations which will enhance our policing of the fishery. I will not make our responses public, but take this opportunity to warn illegal poachers, who are putting at risk a major industry, that they are the target of a determined and coordinated effort to stamp out their activity. This will include the recently announced increased penalties.

In conclusion, this report clearly exonerates all Fisheries Department officers from the allegations made against them, and I am most concerned to ensure that the public is reassured that the future of our common fisheries resource not only is being extremely well managed but also is being policed honestly and diligently.

As I am sure members understand, I will not make this report public or table it in this House because of the confidential nature of much of its contents, including comments and information on future enforcement activities.

However, I am prepared to make it available in my office for viewing by the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Australian Democrats, the National Party member, and the Independents to ensure that they are fully aware of the extent of the investigation that has exonerated departmental officers and the success that has been achieved in addressing the difficult problem of abalone poaching.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the following after session reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Adelaide Entertainment Centre,
Princes Highway (Taillem Bend-Poltalloch Plains)
upgrading and reconstruction,
State Transport Authority—Expansion of St Agnes Bus Depot.

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works' together with minutes of evidence:

Roseworthy Agricultural College Library Resource Centre,
Science Park Adelaide,
South Road—Upgrading and reconstruction—Castle Street to Daws Road.
Ordered that reports be printed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

That a committee consisting of Mrs Appleby, Mr Bannon, Ms Gayler, Mr Hoggood and Mr Tyler be appointed to prepare a draft address to His Excellency the Governor in reply to his speech on opening Parliament and to report later today.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

HOSPITAL PATIENT CARE

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister of Health confirm that the Royal Adelaide Hospital and Flinders Medical Centre are being forced to implement a new policy of rationing patient care, and how will this affect the number of people these hospitals are able to treat this financial year? When the Premier announced new funding arrangements for metropolitan hospitals on 14 June, he said that that would enable the hospitals to restore services and meet increased demand.

This was followed by a statement from the Minister on 7 July referring to a 'temporary' shortage of nurses at the Royal Adelaide Hospital 'this week' and promising staff numbers would be restored 'in the next few weeks'. However, both these statements are in complete conflict with advice the two hospitals are now giving to their staff. A memorandum being circulated by the RAH Administrator, Dr Kearney, states that under the Government's new funding arrangements, the hospital 'is having to limit patient activity to the budget set'. Dr Kearney goes on to explain that this is a 'substantial variation from the hospital's existing policy of providing services to any patient who requires to be treated'.

He also reveals that it will not be until the end of this month before there are any substantial gains in nursing staff, meaning that some beds are still closed, when the Minister had promised the nursing shortage would be overcome by now. I also have an extract from the Flinders Medical Centre Information Bulletin which reveals that the hospital is still under the same serious pressures faced by the RAH. The bulletin reports, 'The Administrator has stated his desire to impose procedures which place a ceiling on activity.' What both of these memoranda reveal is a new and unprecedented policy by two of Adelaide's major hospitals to ration their health services.

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD**: I will confirm no such thing. What the honourable member may have been a little misled by is that there have been some negotiations between medical staff and the nursing profession about admission and discharge policies, which are rather different sorts of things.

Mr Olsen: I will show you the memo.

The **SPEAKER**: Order!

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD**: I have seen all the memos put out by the hospital.

Members interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order!

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD**: The Government has fulfilled its obligations to the hospitals in ensuring that they would be aware of their budgets well in advance of anything that has been fixed in previous years, including any of the years when the honourable member was a member of a Cabinet and, indeed, that the hospitals would know over the next four years exactly what sort of deal they were going to get.

Now it is certainly true to say that the Royal Adelaide Hospital has had some problems in recruiting the full complement of nurses. That is proceeding and my understanding is that by midway through this month it will be back to a full complement of nursing staff. That will enable previous activities to be reinstated. Is the honourable member suggesting that there should be no limit whatsoever on activities in the hospital? Let us remember what the present position is.

Members interjecting:

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD**: Let us see what the present position is: anyone who is an emergency patient gets immediate admission, as opposed to what happens under the Greiner Liberal Government in New South Wales, which is an indication of what might happen here should the people of South Australia ever be so misled as to take on the honourable Leader and his cohorts.

People in South Australia get immediate admission to a public hospital if they are emergency patients. If they are elective patients, then they are put on a waiting list. That is no different from anyone who goes to any part of the health industry in order to get any sort of treatment. How often is the honourable member able to get into his dentist for treatment of his teeth at five minutes notice or see his GP, or anything like that? People go in and are told, 'Will it be convenient for you to come in on 4 July?' That always involves some sort of wait.

Members interjecting:

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD**: The point is this: how long will the wait be? Despite all of the thundering that has come from one or two members opposite (particularly in another place), the average waiting time for elective surgery in this State is about one month; it is about four weeks for elective surgery.

Members interjecting:

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD**: If the honourable member wants me to take up the time of the House, I can bore him and his benches silly with the number of surgical procedures, elective and emergency, that have occurred in all of our hospitals in the past week or the past month. He will see that there is a very high level of activity indeed. To suggest that there should be no limit on activity whatsoever is to suggest that one can walk in at any time and have your piles done without a five minute wait. Is that what the honourable member is suggesting? Is that what he is promising in the event of his ever becoming the Premier of this State? Of course he is not—that would be utter nonsense. The position in the hospitals is that things are moving well. The Royal Adelaide Hospital is still recruiting and it

is recruiting at a time when certain medical procedures are under demand because we are in mid winter and people suffer from ear, nose and throat ailments and those sorts of things.

I can give the House an absolute assurance that in fact things are moving extremely well. One thing I would point out to the honourable member is that during the time that that strange campaign was running in the press, whom did we not hear from in terms of whingeing, cavilling and that sort of thing? The people from whom we did not hear were the patients—we did not hear from the people who had been in the hospital during that period because they got jolly good treatment, and they know it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have not yet called the honourable member for Fisher. I am waiting until the behaviour of the House has reached something approximating an acceptable level.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am determined that this last session of the Parliament will not be a disorderly, discourteous or disreputable one, and if I have to name a member on opening day to achieve that aim I will do so. The honourable member for Fisher.

MORTGAGE RELIEF

Mr TYLER (Fisher): Will the Premier tell the House the response of the public to the Government's mortgage relief scheme and interest rate protection plan and, in particular, say how many people have applied for assistance under the plan?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There has been a high level of response, as far as inquiries are concerned. Since this assistance was established—and one should remember that there is a standard set of criteria, the details of which were announced by my colleague the Minister of Housing and Construction, whose office administers this scheme in conjunction with the financial institutions—a maximum of \$50 per week assistance is available under various criteria.

The 'hotline', which was established to receive inquiries, has in fact received nearly 2 400 inquiries to date. Of the 433 applications received, 198 have been approved and others are being processed. The scheme demonstrates the State Government's willingness to act in this difficult situation to the extent that State resources permit. I suggest that that is in very stark contrast to what we have seen from members opposite, who have been cynically exploiting this situation. For instance, the Leader of the Opposition last week made some spectacular presentation of a letter that he had sent to the Prime Minister—a plan so-called—proposing that mortgage interest payments be tax deductible, and he said that this plan was approved by the Federal Leader of the Opposition. Interestingly, the very same day that the Leader of the Opposition in this State released his plan—this unique plan for South Australia—his opposite number in Victoria released an identical plan in the same circumstances.

Mr Olsen: It wasn't the same.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Premier resume his seat. I warn the Leader of the Opposition that, if he persists in flouting the authority of the Chair, he will be named, regardless of his senior position in the Parliament. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I concede that there were some minor differences of detail in the plan, because just as liaison had apparently broken down with the Federal Leader of the Opposition's office so, too, had liaison broken down with the Leader of the Opposition's Victorian counterpart. The next day it appeared that, in fact, that plan had not been approved by Mr Peacock of the Federal Opposition; he was forced to admit that it had not received his approval. The Leader of the Opposition in this State went on to say, 'What Mr Peacock says is irrelevant.' That is a very interesting comment from the Leader of the Opposition. Perhaps it is a clear admission that he never expects to see Mr Peacock as Prime Minister.

In addition, both Dr John Hewson and the former Leader of the Opposition, John Howard, repudiated this so-called plan, and then we had the Federal Opposition housing spokesman, Mr Tuckey, moving in on the act. As recently as yesterday, the Federal Leader of the Opposition—and note that Mr Olsen is writing to the Prime Minister; he cannot even convince his own Party at the Federal level—distanced himself from the mortgage relief scheme and is reported as denying a claim that he had seen and approved the Olsen plan before it was announced, but—and I am quoting here from the *Australian Financial Review*—he left him with the 'cold comfort comment that at least he should be commended for being concerned'.

Well, Mr Speaker, it is of some concern to raise false expectations and cruelly to play politics with people in need. All I can say on this matter is that the State Government has acted, but the Opposition simply talks.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Chaffey.

HOSPITAL WAITING TIMES

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): How can the Minister of Health claim that there is only one month waiting time when approximately three months ago I put to him the case of one of my constituents who had been waiting for approximately three years for a hip replacement and who has now been advised that an outpatient's appointment has been made for her for January 1990?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Because, Sir, to get an average, what you do is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:—add up the components of a number of elements and divide by the number of elements, and that actually gives the average. Most school-children know that on either side of an average there are those incidents that are shorter in duration and those that are longer in duration, but an average is an average, and it tells us what is happening to the majority of the population who are in these circumstances. I have no doubt that if the honourable member wants to scratch around he can occasionally find an argument to suit his side, just as if I scratch around I can no doubt find some examples of people who wait three days for elective surgery. However, I can guarantee to the honourable member that the average waiting time is one month.

WEST BEACH REDEVELOPMENT

Mr RANN (Briggs): Can the Minister of State Development and Technology advise the House on progress of the

West Beach redevelopment and say whether recent statements by the Opposition have jeopardised negotiations in any way? It has been reported by the media that the Opposition was planning to raise a series of 63 questions about this redevelopment. The media were told that these questions were of the utmost importance and that, if they were not answered, the Government was acting secretly.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question. It certainly is true that the Opposition has been doing its very best to jeopardise and put off this project at the Marineland site involving the Zhen Yun hotel organisation. It would dearly love the project to fail, and it has been following any hare that would run anywhere to try to make it fail. Members opposite have so many different policies on what they would do with respect to that site that it would fill a telephone directory. Despite the torpedoing attempts by the Opposition, discussions are continuing with respect to this proposal. Zhen Yun Hotels Pty Limited, a company now registered in Australia, has deposited nearly \$10 million with the State Bank in connection with this proposal, so that is a sign of its good faith. It is having ongoing discussions with the West Beach Trust about matters to finalise the lease arrangements, and we look forward to construction of the hotel starting in November this year.

Other matters about the dolphins have been well canvassed by my colleague the Minister for Environment and Planning, and that issue is also very much in hand. I noted that the Leader of the Opposition was publicly reported as saying, 'We are asking questions but the Government never answers them.' Well, it is a bit cute if one stands inside a closed room and asks questions, hoping somehow that the people outside can hear them. We have never actually received any formal questions from the Opposition, but we did manage to get hold of some questions from off the back of the proverbial truck from which things seem to fall. We obtained those questions—63 of them—not by courtesy of the Opposition but from another source who told us they were from the Opposition. I understand that it is now 64 questions, but I am sorry that I do not know what the 64th question is; I was rather hoping that it would be asked in Question Time today—maybe that is yet to be done.

I have answered these questions and this morning signed a letter to the Leader of the Opposition with respect to this matter. Some of them are very earth shattering questions. Question Nos 42 and 43 ask: why are the galvanised iron sheds at the Patawalonga golf course not completely painted in environmental green?

Mr Rann: That's their environment policy!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: This is their environment policy. This is green Roger. Then we are asked: whose idea was it to paint the iron sheds silver and green? We are then asked why the bus stops at Marineland. I must say they hit on something there. I happened to be driving past Marineland yesterday, and the Opposition is right: the bus does stop at Marineland. There was a bus waiting to pick up patrons from the camping sites on either side of the Marineland village.

That is the calibre of many questions. It is true that some of the other questions are much more substantial, and I have endeavoured to provide all possible information. Some matters cannot be canvassed publicly at this stage because of commercial limitations or Crown Law advice, but I have offered in my letter to the Leader of the Opposition that he is quite welcome to have a private briefing on those matters.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Apparently, he has written and he will take up the offer. I look forward to him being truly educated and having a true understanding of this issue so that there can be a unified approach to this matter by the Opposition rather than the present disparity of views and that it will not continue talking down South Australia but, rather, that it will get behind this project as opposed to scuttling it.

HOME LOAN INTEREST

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Does the Premier recall, in a series of statements in 1981 and 1982, calling for tax rebates for home loan interest repayments and, if so, why is he refusing to support similar action now? During 1981 and 1982, when home loan interest rates were no higher than 13.5 per cent, the average house price in Adelaide was only half what it is now, and the affordability ratio was only just over 20 per cent compared with 30 per cent now, the Premier constantly called for tax rebates on interest repayments. Typical of his statements was the following made on 6 July 1981:

It's quite clear that any further round of mortgage rate rises will be another blow to an already flattened South Australian building industry and to the prospects of the average Australian being able to buy a home. Mr Bannon called for home interest rate payments to be made tax deductible.

The Fraser Government in fact introduced tax deductibility when home buyers faced much less tough times than they are now confronted with, yet the Premier has done nothing to pressure the Federal Government to ease their current burden.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier has the call, not the member for Alexandra.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member should well recall 1981-82, because she was a member of the Government which presided over probably one of the worst economic performances South Australia has suffered since the Great Depression. Indeed, at that time our gross State product actually shrank, and it has never done that at any other time since the Great Depression. During the 1981-82 period our public debt was growing at an alarming rate when our national economy was highly regulated.

We were an entirely different and extremely parlous State at that time, and I am amazed that the honourable member would bother to remind the House of that fact. I thought that the strategy was to try to make us all forget that those sitting on the frontbench all had their chance when they were in Government at that time. They have been in Opposition ever since—and rightly so. In the circumstances of those times we were in a situation where a whole range of measures had to be addressed and looked at.

When this issue was raised quite recently I said that it was worthy of examination and, indeed, such examination has taken place through bodies such as the Economic Planning Advisory Council. What was discussed today was the fact that the proposal which the Leader of the Opposition put forward as some kind of solution to the problems of South Australians has been rejected not just by the Federal Government but also by the Opposition—by every single spokesperson of his own Party.

I simply pointed out that, in writing to the Prime Minister and urging on him a policy which the Leader of the Opposition's own Party and his national leadership will not adopt, was a funny sort of approach to attempting to solve the problems of South Australians.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE DEVELOPMENT AND TECHNOLOGY

Mrs APPLEBY (Hayward): Does the Minister of State Development and Technology have confidence in the Department of State Development and Technology and its efforts to attract and encourage investment in and to this State? In several media interviews in recent days the Leader of the Opposition has questioned the work of the department and its integrity in dealing with major investments in this State.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for her question. Like her, I have been concerned about recent comments attributed to Opposition members, in particular, the Leader of the Opposition, which have cast doubts on their view on the role of the Department of State Development and Technology in attracting economic achievements to the State.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Victoria wants to add his name to the list of knockers of what this department has done for South Australia. This is the list of projects in which it has been involved over the years that this Party has been in government. It is a very impressive score. I am advised that since 1982 the department has been involved with some 351 successful projects, comprising a total investment of \$7.6 billion and creating 13 000 jobs. That is not the sign of an incompetent department, a department that is acting under a cloak of undue secrecy, or a department that deserves the comment made in the *Advertiser* on Saturday by the Leader of the Opposition when he says, ominously, that it will continue to look at the role of the Department of State Development and Technology. I think that people will be concerned about a statement like that, because it is an ominous statement indicating that the Opposition, if it had the chance to be in government, would attack and do something against that department.

That department has enabled this Government to achieve many things. It has successfully gone about the negotiations in many projects, and is continuing to do so, including the work that was done on the submarine project. The work done by the Premier, by me, and by other Ministers, supported by the department, indicates that there will be many more achievements. I can identify the work that it has done in the defence and aerospace industry; the development of new industries, such as rare earths processing and manufacture, and the development of the highly successful centre for manufacturing. There are further projects on the horizon, such as the \$500 million worth of work that we will obtain from the frigate project, and others that will be announced in due course.

The Opposition needs to determine whether there is a role for Governments in economic development. We believe there is, and we have a sound department supporting the Government in that work. The Opposition needs to look at itself to determine what it believes should be happening.

HEALTH COMMISSION

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister of Health say whether the Government accepts full responsibility for massive inefficiencies in the central office of the Health Commission, and will the Minister say when recommended action to deal with these inefficiencies will be implemented, and whether they will extend to all divisions within the commission?

While our major public hospitals continue to struggle under the pressure of budget cuts, a major consultant's

report has identified the potential for diverting millions of dollars of funds from the bureaucratic central office of the Health Commission into direct health care where they are most needed today.

I refer to the report provided to the commission by consultants, Speakman-Stillwell. The commission, in June, announced that it was acting on some of the recommendations of the report, but it did not release the report in full—an evasion which becomes understandable when the report is studied. The report investigated the Corporate Services Division of the Health Commission which employs almost 170 people. It identified overstaffing and other major inefficiencies involving the work of three branches which employ two-thirds of the officers in the division.

The report described the Finance Accounting Branch, employing 35 people, as 'overstaffed, inefficient, and lacking in firm direction and purpose'. It found the Administrative Services Branch was 'overstaffed and performing functions . . . better performed at an operational level', while the Information Branch, with 48 officers, lacked 'a clear charter for its activities'.

Based on interviews with commission staff, the consultants also reported a generally held view that 'there is a distinct lack of leadership and direction in the division and the commission as a whole'. The consultants recommended that this review process be extended to other areas of the central office—action which, on the basis of their findings with just this one division, could lead to cost savings of well over \$8 million a year.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The operation through which the Health Commission has gone was initiated by the Health Commission. Over about three years, under successive Ministers, starting with Dr Cornwall, the Health Commission has undertaken a process of evaluating all that it does with a view, where possible, to reducing its establishment and becoming a leaner and more efficient organisation. That has, in fact, happened. There has been a considerable reduction in the number of positions within the commission over a period of time, and that will continue. Some of the recommendations of that report are part of that process.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I do not have the exact figures with me, but I can bring them down.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Absolutely! Those figures will make absolutely clear the extent to which the numerical establishment in the South Australian Health Commission has run down in the past two or three years. That process is continuing. The point I want to make is this: let no-one be under any misunderstanding that there are huge buckets of money available to redistribute around the health system. Let us remember that the health system in this State employs about 24 000 people, while the South Australian Health Commission employs a little over 400. Just how much scope is there for redistribution from the centre to the various units on the periphery? We are taking up what has been recommended in the report but, again, I simply quote those figures.

If we are dealing with a health delivery system which employs about 24 000 people and we have a central planning function comprising a little over 400, then if we got rid of them all, by how much would any one of those hospitals or other health units really profit? Finally, let me make this point—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Is the Liberal Party really advocating that there should be no section for planning at all in the health system? Is it suggesting that there should be no planning for the future, no looking forward?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: That is right—just throw the money in the air and let it fall where it will. I think that it may be, because that is the parlous position in which its colleagues in New South Wales find themselves. If anyone really wants to contrast the record of the Labor Party and the Liberal Party in health areas, let him go to New South Wales and then come back here and breathe a sigh of relief.

TEA TREE GULLY TAFE

Ms GAYLER (Newland): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education outline to the House the construction timetable for the new Tea Tree Gully TAFE college which will serve the residents of the north-eastern suburbs?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am delighted to bring to the attention of the House the timetable for facilities to be built at Tea Tree Gully. I know that the member for Newland is vitally interested in that, because it will service her electorate and the north-east area.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am sure, and I will be happy to answer any question which the honourable member would like to bring before the House, but he has not asked the question so I cannot answer that one.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister not to allow himself to be dragged into a dialogue with out-of-order interjections from the member for Heysen, and I ask the member for Heysen to cease disrupting the proceedings of the House.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Thank you, Sir, and I apologise for being distracted. The commencement date for stage 1 of the project is the middle of September 1989. The project is estimated to require 90 person years of effort in terms of resource planning and project management. It will be a very significant project overall and, certainly, from the point of view of future development and educational needs in the north-east area, will be a very significant educational institution.

The cost, estimated in 1989 dollars, is \$19.2 million. The proposed expenditure in 1989-90 is about \$5 million. The starting date is estimated at September 1989, with completion around January 1992. Regarding the facilities involved—I have had some inquiries from other members of Parliament, and I am sure that the member for Newland will appreciate this—the business and commercial studies area will be one of the significant areas addressed in stage 1, including computing and business and commercial sections. There will be joint use of the library with Tea Tree Gully, as I am sure the honourable member is aware. Members on both sides of the House and in the other place have been very keen to see that sort of facility develop, and I am sure that it will be of benefit not only to the students but also to the residents of the City of Tea Tree Gully.

In addition, there will be hairdressing facilities and, something that I think very important, child-care studies and a child-care facility. A number of members have asked about that. The hospitality industry and the textile and clothing industries will have access programs; there will be literacy and numeracy courses; and, of course, there will be access for the disabled. In addition to that, general studies will be

available. So that is stage 1, for which about \$19.2 million is estimated, and I think that this is very significant for Tea Tree Gully. It will be a very large, two-storey structure.

I am sure that some members have seen the proposed plans. In terms of the future development of TAFE education in that area, this will be a very up-to-date facility with the most modern technology. Stage 2 is estimated to cost about \$7.2 million in 1989 dollars. The estimated cost at completion, given normal escalation, is about \$9.3 million, and the proposed expenditure in 1989-90 is \$75 000, which will be in project planning.

The starting date is set for November 1990, with the completion date around March 1992. The main elements will be a flexible multi-purpose workshop, a technical laboratory complex, and a multi-purpose hall for the use of the college. I am sure that that will also be available for community use. That is a comprehensive outline of the project. In addition, there is a program for child-care for other colleges. One of the highest priorities is Adelaide College, and we are looking at a child-care facility for that college, which desperately needs it. We are seeking Federal funding for that.

TEACHER STRIKE

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): Does the Minister of Education acknowledge receiving a request on Monday from the President of the Institute of Teachers, Mr Tonkin, to meet him to discuss the dispute which will lead to tomorrow's strike? To avert the stoppage, why did the Minister not respond to Mr Tonkin's request before this morning, and is his abdication of ministerial responsibility for becoming actively involved in the current negotiations due to the fact that the Labor Party poll shows that he is trailing his Liberal Party opponent in Norwood, the former President of the Teachers Institute, Mr Bob Jackson?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I will ignore the last comments, because that is what they deserve. I can assure members that there have been meetings with representatives of the South Australian Institute of Teachers this week and, in fact, there have been many meetings over recent months in order to put together a very comprehensive curriculum guarantee package which will not only improve the lot of teachers in South Australia but substantially improve our ability to provide the education we want for young people in this State as we move into the 1990s and the next century. We must make important decisions now in our education system if we are to be able to face those challenges and have a department which is equipped to do so, in particular, within the human resources area.

I have been meeting today for many hours with the representatives of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, and there are many aspects of that curriculum guarantee package on which we can agree, and we are seeking to resolve the outstanding matters. It is a package that will provide a very important series of commitments to our schools on the part of the Government, which will be bound in an agreement which will cover the next term of office of this Government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I point out that it would provide a guaranteed curriculum for students in our schools. That has been stated clearly. For all primary school students there will be the guarantee of learning a language and one other specialist subject in addition to the basic program.

For those highly skilled classroom teachers there will be the opportunity to gain promotion while remaining in the classroom, something that we have been seeking for a long time, in order to reward teachers and to allow them to remain in the classroom and still gain rewards, rather than leaving our schools to get those incentives. That is one of many career restructuring moves. There will also be the removal of promotion barriers currently applying to about 4 000 of our teachers who are three-year trained teachers and who are working alongside other teachers doing the same work but having fewer career opportunities.

There will be the abolition of compulsory country service for teachers and the replacement of that system with a package of incentives for teachers serving in our country schools. Schools will have a stronger say in determining the use of their own resources, including staff, who will be deployed to meet the educational needs of the future—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I am explaining to the House the contents of the package that some members obviously do not want to hear.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: If this package is not accepted by the Institute of Teachers in South Australia, we will have a situation which is very undesirable if we are confidently going to face the challenges that lie ahead. I refer to the element of compulsion in country service, an unacceptably high level of contract teachers in our system, an inability to progress through a responsible and proper career structure for teachers and so on. So, there are big issues at stake and they are being negotiated with the union. I point out by way of contrast what it is that the Opposition is offering on its part to teachers.

The statements that come from the Opposition in respect of education are few and far between. In fact, its silence on this issue and many others is quite deafening. There was a release of some sort by the Opposition on education policy on 8 February this year. The 'Education Policy Release' was a pretty tacky document indeed.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: It indicates that the Opposition will provide an extra \$200, not next year—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: In fact, the offer is a value of less than \$200 but there is a promise, a guarantee of 200 additional teachers not next year but following the first budget that occurs, should the Opposition ever bring down a budget. In the finer print the press release goes on to say that there will begin a concerted campaign by this Opposition Party (should it ever get into Government) to reduce waste in the education budget. Clearly, in the statement that we have just heard there are comments on the Health Commission's central office program and there will be some attempt to remove salaries from one section of education to provide them in another area. That is the tawdry promise of the Opposition in this area.

We have seen what the Opposition has done in other places. We all know what has happened to education in New South Wales. That is legend, but in the last session of Parliament I also read into *Hansard* some of the public statements by the Liberal Party Opposition in Victoria as they appeared in the *Melbourne Age* on 20 September 1988. By its own admission the Liberal Party stated that it intended to reduce education expenditure by \$355 million during its term of office. In fact, the Labor Party's calculations done

by the Victorian Treasury and officers increased that figure to \$467 million.

It is clear to the education community in South Australia that the Liberal Party in this State has policies that are exactly the same as those of the Liberal Opposition in Victoria and the Liberal Government in New South Wales. If one wants to take it further, I refer to the contact that there has been with the Conservative Party in Britain, through the visit of the former Education Minister, Sir Kenneth Baker, to New South Wales and his discussions with the New South Wales Education Department. I invite all members to look at the education system in Great Britain at present and reflect on that before weighing up any comments that the Opposition makes on education.

STREET KIDS

Mr DUGAN (Adelaide): Has the Minister of Youth Affairs received the report of the 'Task Force on Inner City Kids and Their Continuing Need for Accommodation Services'? If so, what action is the Minister and the Government taking to implement the recommendations of that report? The Adelaide City Council and the Lord Mayor, in particular, have raised an enormous amount of money to assist with the accommodation needs of homeless street kids in Adelaide. Also, the Government has allocated large amounts of funding to assist with youth accommodation in the city.

A joint working party was established earlier this year with a request to report on the best use of the combined council and Government funds. Earlier this week when the Adelaide City Council announced its decision, it was greeted with derision by the member for Mitcham who said on radio that the project was a waste of money, that more than 50 children should have been accommodated elsewhere than in the premises in Frew Street, which were being donated by the council and that perhaps the best solution was to buy a farm and shift the young people out.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Adelaide for his question and his interest in this matter, because it is an important issue which is certainly important to the children of Adelaide, particularly in view of the way that the State Government, the Lord Mayor and the council have joined together in this unique opportunity to develop a facility for the street kids in Adelaide. It was with great pleasure that I had the opportunity to join the Lord Mayor on Tuesday to make the joint announcement on behalf of my colleagues, the Minister of Housing and Construction and the Minister of Community Welfare, in respect of this unique facility.

It is the first of its kind where a city council has joined with a State Government to develop a facility which will be run by the community for our street kids. The number of these young people here is considerably fewer than in cities such as Melbourne and Sydney, but we—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Mitcham keeps harping about 16. He ought to listen to what people who work with these young people have to say.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Well, you have not listened very carefully, which is the usual story.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should not respond to interjections and he should not refer to other members in the second person.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Thank you, Mr Speaker, I apologise for responding to that interruption. The position is that the report which was prepared for the community (a

task force report on inner city services for homeless young people) has been distributed widely in the community. It has not been released publicly, but copies have gone to all of the services involved in the city. That involves many of the major private community services such as those provided by the missions and various services to youth and so on throughout the city.

If one looks at the effort that was made to address this issue, one has to turn to the report and the recommendations. The member for Mitcham suggested that we should send these kids to farms in the country. On the contrary, we need to provide them with a safe haven in an environment to which they are accustomed—and that is in the city. We want to gather them in a place where they can be supported and provided with back-up services, and that is what the State Government is doing—providing a conciliation program to bring children together with their families to try to overcome the problems that first caused them to be on the street.

The first recommendation of the inner city task force addressed that problem and was for the establishment of a cluster-type boarding/lodging facility, young people's apartments, in the City of Adelaide, being flexible by providing full board—that is, meals, laundry and related services—and an independent cooking and laundry service and related services. The Lord Mayor (and I congratulate him on his 'Say No to Drugs' campaign) has gathered together significant commitments for donations from business leaders and others.

The State Government, through the Minister of Housing and Construction and the Minister of Community Welfare, is coming up with \$770 000 and the Lord Mayor has committed \$530 000—in total \$1.3 million. We are confident, and I know that the Lord Mayor is confident, that we can build this comprehensive facility for less than \$1.3 million, which will mean that money will be available for the continuation of the Lord Mayor's program and the commitment towards street kids.

I am sure that the House will congratulate the Lord Mayor on his initiative. I am positive that he will achieve a useful facility in our city which will deal with probably three-quarters of the permanent street kids. I am also positive that the member for Adelaide, this project being in the heart of his electorate, will see its benefits. The Lord Mayor will propose trustees who will own this facility, the Service to Youth Council will have the day-to-day running of it and SACOSS, a like provider, will be situated on the ground floor. As I said, this facility will provide a home environment and a safe haven for street kids. Once this facility is established, the young people in it who are able will be required to pay board. This will provide them with some responsibility and they will have some input into its running and maintenance. It is important that we look at how that function and funding is to continue. Ongoing funding will be based on the self-help assistance program of that stand-alone facility, and the trustees and the Service to Youth Council will be responsible for its running. This significant step will help the majority of young people.

The experts from the Central Methodist Mission and other organisations who work with these kids have realised the needs and have strongly recommended that this is the way to deal with the matter, contrary to what the member for Mitcham suggests about shipping these kids to the country. The State Government and the Lord Mayor are delighted to have joined together—and for the first time in Australia—in the establishment of a facility for young people in need in Adelaide. I am delighted that the Lord Mayor

took this initiative and that the State Government joined him in it.

MARINELAND

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I direct my question to the Minister of State Development and Technology. Why did officers of his department, at a hastily called meeting on Saturday afternoon, 4 February this year, insist that three Directors of Tribond Developments Pty Ltd sign an agreement that they would not disclose the fact that, between them, they were to receive about \$600 000 in taxpayers' money as a result of the Government's decision not to proceed with the Marineland redevelopment? Will the Minister explain why he wants this information hidden from the Parliament, which is expected to approve departmental appropriations, and the public who have to pay the money?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: First, the request that there be non-disclosure was to enable discussions that were taking place at the time to be without prejudice to the best possible financial outcome to the Government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I have already indicated that I will make a private briefing available to the Leader, and that will certainly become available then. In addition, I have requested the Department of State Development and Technology to write to all the parties involved asking for their concurrence to make those figures available. When I receive their concurrence to those figures being made available, they shall be made public.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

PETROLEUM EXPLORATION LICENCES

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Mitchell): Will the Minister of Mines and Energy tell the House what has been the response of exploration companies to a call for applications for vacant petroleum acreage in part of the South Australian Otway Basin in the South-East? I am advised that applications for these areas closed at the end of July, and I would appreciate any information that the Minister can provide about the enthusiasm or otherwise in relation to offers that might have been made.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for his question and I acknowledge his still lively interest in this area of what used to be his portfolio. There has been a quite good exploration industry response to the advertising of this acreage. Members may recall that the area available for licensing runs in the South-East from a point a little north of Robe to a point a little south of Lake Bonney and occupies about 3 300 square kilometres of the on-shore section of the Otway Basin. In an effort to maximise the level of exploration activity, the area was split into three blocks.

While the applications are currently being assessed by the Department of Mines and Energy—a process that is likely to take a few weeks—I can say that the three areas have attracted a total of six bids. While the details of such bids and the companies making them are normally kept confidential until the final decision has been made, I can say that on the basis of the work programs that have been submitted we are likely to see a total of 12 wells drilled in these three blocks over the next five years. This will be a highly satisfactory outcome when compared with the eight wells drilled in the whole of the South Australian part of

the Otway Basin in the years 1985 to 1989. As the honourable member has already said, there is no doubt that this high level of interest has been inspired by the promising gas discoveries in the Katnook area of petroleum exploration licence 32, which lies immediately to the east of these three blocks.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: The Katnook one took a while, too.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: It took a while. I hope to announce the successful bidders in the next few weeks.

SCHOOL TEACHERS

Mr GUNN (Eyre): Will the Minister of Education—perhaps we should direct this question to Dr Boston, who seems to—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting before he has started his question.

Mr GUNN: I apologise, Mr Speaker. Will the Minister confirm that his promised country incentives package will not apply to most country schools and that his officers have told the Institute of Teachers that only schools in an area north and west of Port Pirie will be offered the total incentives package?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The honourable member has obviously not understood the detail of the package that was presented. He might like a briefing on it. I admit that a good deal of misunderstanding and misinformation has been spread about the package.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Some people in the education system do not want to accept change and face the realities of the changing needs of our community with respect to the provision of educational services. Our ability to provide educational services to the community is a matter of fundamental importance, and, if we do not come to grips with this issue and face the future with confidence and have the resources within the education system to allow us to do that, we will be the worse off as a community. We do have to take some hard decisions, and we must have an education service that is prepared to give as well as take. There is much in this package that will improve the lot of those who teach in our country schools.

I want to place on record my appreciation of the dedicated service that so many teachers give who serve in the rural areas of South Australia and who have set a very proud tradition of professionalism in the teaching service over many years. We are now offering a package which will eliminate the element of compulsion (that is, sending people to country schools against their wishes) and providing a range of incentives for teachers who wish not only to serve in the country but to stay longer in the education service in those country areas. That applies not only to the cash, leave and other incentives being advanced in this package but also in terms of career promotion and the leadership structure that is being offered. I would invite members who have not understood that package fully or who wish to have more information—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Murray-Mallee that repeated interjections, particularly using unparliamentary language of that nature, will receive their due reward. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The other matter arising from the honourable member's question was the important role that the administration of education is playing in the devel-

opment of this package and in the negotiations that have been proceeding with the Institute of Teachers. Under the Education Act in this State, a very important role is played by the Chief Executive Officer in the department. In fact, we are the only State in Australia that has entrenched in legislation that role in the field of education. From the comments emanating from the Opposition, it is obvious that members opposite do not want the managers whom we employ to manage, but there would be very substantial political interference in the field of education should there ever be a Liberal Government in this State.

We have seen instances so clearly in New South Wales where the Minister there interfered directly in curriculum and a whole range of areas in the field of education, where managers should have been out managing. We would suffer that same political interference in South Australia should there be a change of Government in this State. One also only needs to look at Queensland to see the mess that that Conservative Government has made in a whole range of areas, particularly education, where there has been constant interference for many years. I can assure members that that will not happen in South Australia.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Sessional committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: The Speaker, Mrs Appleby and Messrs Eastick, Ferguson and Oswald.

Printing: Mrs Appleby and Messrs S.J. Baker, De Laine, Ingerson and Rann.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier) brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to his Excellency the Governor's speech:

1. We, the members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.

2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to the matters placed before us.

3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

Mr TYLER (Fisher): I move:

That the Address in Reply as read be adopted.

It is with great pleasure that I have the honour of moving this motion. I thank His Excellency for his contribution earlier today that sets the theme for an exciting venture into the 1990s. I intend to talk about some of those exciting initiatives and explain how we are setting the scene with the Bannon Government's vision for the 1990s. In particular, His Excellency referred to a number of areas that directly affect my electorate, including education, child-care, water resources and health.

We need to contrast His Excellency's contribution with some of the reactionary 'blast from the past' policies that have been issued in recent months by the Leader of the Opposition in South Australia. Quite simply, this Opposition is tired and has no ideas; it is secondhand and second rate. There is no greater example of this than the press release—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr TYLER: If the honourable member would resume his seat and listen for a while instead of rudely interrupting, I will explain to him why his Leader and his front bench are

secondhand and second rate. To illustrate that, there is no greater example than the Leader of the Opposition's press release in May when he made a grand education promise for specialist schools. He claimed that there was only one single sex State school in South Australia, being the Mitcham Girls High School. In fact, once again, the Leader of the Opposition got it wrong: we are becoming used to that, but in the process, unfortunately, he insulted those responsible for some excellent work being done at some of our other senior girls schools, at Gepps Cross High and Port Adelaide High. If the Leader of the Opposition cannot get his facts right on such an obvious educational matter, parents, teachers and students must all question how competently he would manage not only the State school system but the State as a whole.

The reality is that the Opposition would adopt the policies of the New South Wales Liberals where education funds have been slashed, teacher jobs have been lost and where a Government has meddled and interfered in the school curriculum. In replying to an earlier question today, the Minister of Education emphasised that fact very well. The Opposition in this State would adopt the New South Wales approach to education because it has no clear policies of its own. The education policies as enunciated by the Leader of the Opposition in May are certainly only an extension of the action that has been taken already by this State Government to support specialist schools. The Bannon Government supports them in a range of areas, including English, maths, science, technology, languages, music and gymnastics.

It was rather ironic that the Leader of the Opposition's announcement came a few days before the opening by the Premier of the South Australian Technology School of the Future. The opening of this school emphasises this State Government's commitment to specialist education to meet the needs of students as we approach the twenty-first century. The Opposition's commitment to this whole area must be questioned, because on that occasion the Opposition spokesman for education (Hon. Mr Lucas) was invited to the opening but failed to attend.

Another important initiative for the State Government earlier this year was the major initiative in support of children with social and behavioural problems. Members will recall that the South Australian Bannon Government announced that the various State Government agencies in the areas of health, welfare and education would join forces in a \$1.1 million strategy to support families and schools in dealing with discipline and children with social and behavioural problems. State Cabinet approved a proposal for the chief executives involved in health, welfare and education to work together in order to implement a long-term strategy aimed at strengthening school discipline so that all children can concentrate on learning in the classroom. The strategy will provide firm and clear directions for young people with social and behavioural problems.

The details of the major social justice strategy were also announced at that time, and this followed extensive research and community consultation by a team appointed by Cabinet well over a year ago. Its task was to examine how Government agencies can best work together to support children with social and behavioural problems and to assist their school and family. A report by the State Government team indicated that perhaps less than 1 per cent—perhaps 1 000, of the State's 180 000 school students—seriously misbehave in a way that is difficult for the school to control. However, the impact of disruptive children is out of all proportion to their relatively small number.

It is important to recognise that the majority of children in this State who are attending schools, particularly State schools, are very well behaved. Having said that, we cannot tolerate the harm caused by a few disruptive children not only to their classroom but also to themselves. The kind of problems facing children can prompt misbehaviour, and this is all too familiar to teachers and social workers. Inevitably, poverty, family breakdown and child abuse in their various forms take their toll on some children.

In keeping with the Government's social justice commitment to tackle the causes and not just the symptoms of disadvantage, this strategy aims, as far as possible, to involve the children's families and friends in finding solutions to problems. The solutions to the dilemma of how to respond to schoolchildren with social and behavioural problems do not need to be invented—they are already in the system—but they must be broadcast and explained. As a matter of high priority, they must be managed and resourced.

The Bannon Government's action will build on the strong support and commitment of teachers, health workers and welfare workers who are working with families in order to improve social behaviour among a minority of younger people. Parents have a major responsibility for the behaviour and discipline of their children. The prime responsibility of schools and teachers is to educate children and not to take over the role which properly belongs to the parents. At the same time, schools are well aware that they play a major role in supporting families to ensure that children become responsible and caring adults. Action by schools and the Bannon Government to strengthen further school discipline is being taken to support learning and to support families.

It is important that teachers and parents work together for the benefit of children. Having been involved with schools for some time, and having a commitment to education in this State—

Members interjecting:

Mr TYLER:—particularly State education which members opposite find so amusing, I am fed up with the misguided approach from members opposite who continually criticise our State schools and allege that they are lax in dealing with children.

Members interjecting:

Mr TYLER: The interjections from members opposite are a classic example of continual criticism of our State school system. Quite simply, this is not true.

Mr Lewis: What about the area schools?

Mr TYLER: Does the honourable member allege that there is no discipline in area schools and that the teachers are not doing a good job? That is quite an interesting interjection. I believe that the teachers and people involved with our State schools are very dedicated. The sort of criticism we have just heard from the member for Murray-Mallee is really very annoying to all those people who are involved in the State school system.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr TYLER: I hear the member for Mitcham also carrying on. People involved with schools in my electorate will be very interested to read the interjection from the member for Mitcham as well as a contribution a little later.

Teachers tackle discipline in the classroom differently than was the case 30 years ago, but everything else in our society has changed also. It is interesting to note that the member for Mitcham wants to take us back 30 years. School discipline is now developed in consultation with parents through their respective school councils.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr TYLER: Perhaps the school council should talk to its principal, because schools in my electorate have very good consultation with their school council and the parents involved. That consultation is an indication of the quality of leadership in those various schools. As I said before the member for Murray-Mallee interrupted, school discipline is being developed in consultation with parents through their school councils. This approach reflects such values as respect (with which I assume the member for Murray-Mallee would concur), cooperation (which is another important area) and responsibility for action. They are the three cornerstones of the policy being developed in schools.

The result of such a policy is stricter discipline. This approach is more effective than the simplistic concept of order by fear. The new approaches to school discipline have been introduced possibly because we now have better trained teachers and the class sizes are smaller, so that teachers can be more involved with individual students. Misguided criticisms often emanate from those who want simple answers to complex social problems. We live in a world—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr TYLER: We will wait with bated breath for the member for Bragg to outline some of those simple answers which he continues to suggest.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr TYLER: The member for Mitcham can continue to be abusive if he so wishes—that is all he knows anything about. When people attempt to make constructive suggestions, people like the member for Mitcham react by making inane interjections. We live in a world where people want an easy answer to difficult problems involving such things as drugs, violence and vandalism. On too many occasions we want to blame students, their teachers and schools for complex problems.

Members interjecting:

Mr TYLER: That is another example of the member for Mitcham's ignorance when he tries to find easy answers to very complex problems. It is very easy to blame the other person but, as a society, we must look at those problems.

Mr Ingerson: You're blaming them.

Mr TYLER: I am not blaming anybody. The fact is that, as a society, we must look at those areas and try to implement solutions which will create a better society. Children know that the solution is not as simple as that suggested by the member for Mitcham. They know that, in order to succeed and to improve the system, people must cooperate. We must ensure that parents, teachers and young people work together in order to seek solutions to problems which hurt those who are most vulnerable in our society.

If people say that children must be better disciplined, we must look at the question of who is fundamentally responsible for the wellbeing of those children and how those people can be supported. If children watch too much television, roam the streets or misbehave, then it is the adults who counsel them and who must look to their responsibilities. Parents have that primary responsibility, while school and kindergarten teachers provide support for those families by promoting positive learning. I am proud of the schools in my electorate; I believe that they do a magnificent job in this area, and they need our support.

Another important initiative in education was the announcement in May that \$10 million would be given back to schools under an improvement plan so that our State schools might be given an important facelift. The back-to-school improvement plan involves renovation, repairs and improvements to classrooms and other school buildings and grounds. It involves virtually every State school in South Australia. The money to do this is available

as a result of the savings made through restructuring of schools in recent years.

Members will be well aware of that restructuring. They will also be well aware that some of the decisions, such as school closures and amalgamations, have caused pain for some school communities. The parents, teachers and students will reap the benefits of the restructuring as the savings are ploughed back into the schools. Country areas will not be forgotten. The majority of work in the schools will be carried out by Sacon, but, as the Premier has said, the back-to-school plan will involve parents as well as teachers. For example, the \$2.2 million school community fund will enable school communities to obtain special grants to carry out minor school improvements which the communities can identify. The overall back-to-school improvement plan will mean that virtually all 710 State schools can benefit through improvements, such as repainting classrooms, new floor covering, repairs to school heating and cooling facilities and other renovations to school buildings and grounds. In my electorate many schools will benefit from the program, and some schools have submitted applications to obtain grants for improvements.

This \$10 million boost is in addition to the \$28.3 million directed to State schools for minor capital work programs in 1988-89. Under the back-to-school improvement plan the \$10 million will include school community funds. This is to provide school communities with special grants of up to \$10 000 for minor improvements, and that totals \$2.3 million. Cooling and heating replacement works to improve classroom learning conditions in summer and winter tallies another \$2.187 million. Classroom floor coverings for schools tally \$400 000. Maintenance work in schoolyards in a range of junior primary and secondary schools tallies \$1.324 million. Painting programs to brighten classrooms and other internal walls and ceilings in school buildings total another \$1.1 million. Schools involved in restructuring to improve education opportunities for students total \$750 000. School communities have already identified much of the work. That means that work can begin on improving classrooms and schools to provide an even better environment in which the State's 182 000 students and staff can learn and work.

Because of the demographic factors, enrolments in South Australian schools have declined by 45 000 over the past decade. This has created an 'empty classroom' syndrome with education dollars being tied up in under-utilised buildings. This is not a problem in my electorate. All schools in my electorate are booming and exploding at the sides. However, it is a fact of life that in some areas of the State many schools were grossly under-utilised. Empty buildings mean waste of the taxpayer dollar. This is obviously a dilemma, because, as guardians of the taxpayer dollar, it is our job to ensure that the resources for education are used effectively.

The solution means making difficult and often unpopular decisions, such as closing or amalgamating schools. However, the result is improved opportunities for young people in their schooling, and that is the bottom line. That is our responsibility. The funds generated by the capital savings made from these decisions are being redirected to improve the physical conditions in schools. I congratulate and support the Premier and the Minister of Education on their move to ensure that the savings from these closures and amalgamations go back into the schools rather than into general revenue.

Another matter that has been of considerable concern to me since I have been a member is the financial and social security of people who live in what can be termed as cooperative retirement service estates or villages. I know that there has been considerable improvement to their peace of

mind and security in recent years with the Retirement Villages Act, to which His Excellency referred today. However, we should acknowledge that there are problems. I have no doubt that the Government will have to consider tightening some of the provisions in the Retirement Villages Act because problems remain.

What are retirement villages, how do they operate and what are some of the problems? Those were the questions that I asked. Accordingly, I spoke to many people who live in retirement villages in my electorate. I now have a better appreciation of how these villages operate. All the assets of a village estate are owned by the company. Unit licensees have no title to the units, but they have a licence to occupy them on payment of a purchase price equivalent to buying a home unit. The company provides certain amenities—for example, a community hall, library, billiard room, lawn bowls, indoor bowling mats, outdoor barbecues, swimming and spa pools. I know that facilities vary from retirement village to retirement village, but most villages have most or all of those amenities.

The amenities within the villages are usually quite pleasant and residents to whom I have spoken enjoy them. I have visited all the retirement villages in my electorate over the years, and they look pleasant and enjoyable. The residents point out that by far the greater part of the total village investment is provided by the licensees with what could be termed as an interest-free loan to the company. Despite providing the bulk of the money, the ownership of the total village asset is always in the hands of the owner company.

Having spoken to a number of constituents, I know that there are obvious discrepancies, and in some cases unfair conditions apply to licensees of units in the villages. I shall not single out any particular village, because that would be unfair; but one small example which has been made clear to me is where a licensee dies or moves from a unit. Under the agreement, the trustee is under no obligation to relicense the unit as soon as possible. In other words, there is no financial incentive for the trustee to relicense the unit. For example, a licensee, or his estate, will still be required to pay the monthly maintenance fee for an indefinite period until the trustee signs a new agreement. It seems to me that the agreement is loaded in favour of the trustee and discriminates in an unjust and unfair way against the licensee. That is just one small example that constituents have raised with me.

Another is the fact that licensees make up the bulk of the funds that are invested in the retirement village. However, under the terms of the agreement the trustee is under no obligation to produce an audited statement of the complex's financial balance sheet. Nor are licensees consulted about matters affecting the operation of the retirement village. The more I look at this whole area, the more I believe that the Government should address the concerns which have been argued by residents in retirement villages. We need to do it on social justice grounds, if for no other reason.

I have read two of the agreements that residents in my electorate have signed at two separate retirement villages. To be honest, I believe them to be inequitable and unjust. I should like to urge the new Minister for the Aged to take up this matter with Dr Adam Graycar, the Commissioner for the Ageing. I, and quite a few hundred of my constituents who live in retirement villages, would appreciate it if the Minister could initiate action in this area. I should point out that, although I have constituents in retirement villages which have problems, not all retirement villages in my electorate should be put into the category of being unfair to residents.

Some of the retirement villages are well managed, and residents are very contented with their lifestyles. However, while saying that, we should always acknowledge that some people are not being treated fairly and we need to have the matter looked at. I know that the Minister is well aware of this, and I have spoken to him privately about it. However, I thought it was important to draw to the attention of the House some of these problems facing our citizens who, in many cases, have just retired and who are looking forward to not having any hassles of this sort. I believe that it is incumbent on us to make sure that retirement is as enjoyable and worry-free as possible.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

Mr TYLER: I am interested that the member for Victoria should raise his head. What I was saying was that there are some flaws in the contracts that were being signed.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

Mr TYLER: No, people were not forced to go into them. What I am saying is that people of advanced years who have just retired or want to set up their retirement do not want to have to worry about going through a contract in the fine detail which the honourable member, perhaps, might do with one of his companies. I believe that it is incumbent on us as members of Parliament to make sure that people who sign these documents and invest quite a bit of money in retirement villages should be looked after. I believe that that is my job as a member of Parliament: I am sorry that the member for Victoria does not think so.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

Mr TYLER: We will see at the next election, as the member for Victoria points out. This is one of the reasons why the Bannon Government will be returned: we care about people. The honourable member opposite does not give a damn about ordinary citizens of this State, and this has been reflected once again in his interjections in this House. I intend to draw it to the attention of people living in retirement villages in my electorate that one of the senior members of the Opposition, a person aspiring to take over as Leader of the Opposition after the next election, does not give a damn about residents of retirement villages. I am sure that they will be very interested to read that.

I want to talk about water quality, which is a major issue in the southern suburbs. I am happy to say that it is an issue that will not be around for very much longer, because one of the Bannon Government's major priorities when it came to office was to accelerate the construction of the Happy Valley water filtration plant. The Happy Valley reservoir is off-stream storage which derives its water from the Onkaparinga River catchment. The principal storage of this catchment is the Mount Bold reservoir, which can be supplemented by Murray River water from the Murray Bridge/Onkaparinga pipeline.

Over recent years domestic development in the Adelaide Hills, in such areas as Stirling, Aldgate, and Bridgewater, together with more intense use in horticulture and agriculture, with increased reliance on fertilisers, has greatly impaired the quality of water from the Onkaparinga catchment. The water quality in the Happy Valley reservoir may even be further impaired in future by the greater use of Murray River water to supplement demand. The poor quality of water in the southern suburbs results in many complaints to members of Parliament and to the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

As a local resident, I acknowledge this. I have been resident in the southern suburbs since 1976 so, over a number of years, have had the opportunity of observing the very poor quality of water which local residents have had to put up with. It is now necessary to provide advanced warning

to the public of impending poor quality water coming out of the Happy Valley distribution system. Residents of the southern area will be very familiar with the various advertisements in the newspaper informing residents of that impending water problem.

The Bannon Government has not just left it at that. When it was elected to office in 1982, the Bannon Government was firmly committed to the building of the filtration plant in the Happy Valley reservoir. That is why the Government accelerated the program rather substantially. The Happy Valley water filtration plant is located in the Happy Valley reservoir reserve on a peninsula between the two tunnels which supply water to the Adelaide Hills. The design of the water filtration plant incorporates, basically, the same treatment processes previously used at other metropolitan water filtration plants, with the exception of sludge treatment and disposal.

If members get a chance, I invite them to come and have a look at the Happy Valley water filtration plant. It is a most impressive, indeed spectacular, construction in many ways. It is a credit to the work force employed on the project. It is great to know that this year the first stage of the project will be commissioned. Those residents who live to the north-west, west and south-west of the reservoir—some 70 000 people—will be part of the first stage. It includes about half of the electorate of Fisher.

The vast majority of the remainder of my electorate will receive filtered water when stage 2 is commissioned. Although stage 2 is not due to be commissioned until 1991, it is a couple of years ahead of the original proposal. If the Liberal Party in this State had had its way back in 1982, it would have been towards the end of 1994 or 1995 before residents in the Flagstaff Hill, Happy Valley, and Aberfoyle Park area received filtered water. I have asked for some time that this second stage be brought forward even more than has been proposed. However, I have been told by engineers associated with the project that putting more money into the project would not mean that stage 2 could be completed any sooner.

They assure me that the timetable has to rely on contractors who make the component parts of the filtration plant. Once those component parts are made, they must be installed in a particular order. However, the project is well advanced. Clean water is about to flow through to the taps of those residents, like myself, who have had to put up with smelly and dirty water in the past. It will certainly be a relief. It will be enjoyable to be able to do the washing and know that clothes will actually come out of the washing machine cleaner than when they went in. That will be quite an achievement as, in some cases of which I am aware, and in the experience of my family, clothes have been spoiled by the dirty water people have had to put up with in the past.

While I am handing out accolades, I would like to put on record my sincere thanks and congratulations to the former Minister of Transport (the member for Stuart), and the present Minister of Transport, the Commissioner of Highways, and the work force who have been doing such a great job in tidying up some of the problems we have had on Flagstaff Road. Members will be well aware that in the past I have referred to the reverse flow lane proposal which I put to the previous Minister of Transport some 12 or 18 months ago. Members will also be aware that we had a trial period on the road, which was an outstanding success. A few weeks ago, the present Minister of Transport and I turned on the lights on this road, so that we now have overhead lights (supported by gantries) which indicate which lane of the road is open to traffic.

I invite members to take a look at this initiative, because it could be that some of the roads in their electorates might be suitable for this sort of reverse flow concept. It is not a unique scheme by any stretch of the imagination, and when I posted it originally I freely acknowledged that the idea was borrowed from one which operates in the Eastern States and overseas. It is a flexible and smarter way, if you like, of adapting our roads to suit the traffic conditions during a particular peak period. In this day and age of tight monetary control it is also a cost-effective way of using our resources.

Having said that, I should acknowledge also the work that people are doing in the Highways Department on the concept plans for widening Flagstaff Road. Plenty of discussion has been going on within the local community about the plans to turn the section of Flagstaff Road from Boneyview Road to Black Road into four lanes, and I understand the concerns of some of my constituents living adjacent to the road concerning access, noise, and the ability of pedestrians to cross the road.

I assure them and the House that, in my view, their environment is very important and we need to protect their lifestyle. However, it is a fact of life that the road will be built, and it will become a four-lane road. Failure to upgrade the road will mean the Government ignoring the fact of the population explosion in the southern area of Adelaide, and the demands and pressure that this road has been placed under. Not to upgrade the road would be irresponsible.

I know that the Liberal Party is playing a few little games in the area. For instance, residents who live in Skyline Drive, adjacent to Flagstaff Road, have advised me that they have received a message from the shadow Minister of Transport (the member for Bragg) saying that if he was in Government and was Minister of Transport he would not widen Flagstaff Road. To be honest, I cannot believe that the shadow Minister would make that statement. However, I challenge the member for Bragg to state once and for all his Party's policy in respect of that road.

He cannot play politics with this issue, and he should not be allowed to sit on the fence and play both sides off against each other. In the meantime, I am sure that everyone in my electorate will recognise that the State Government's policy is clear and on the record. Plans are well under way to widen Flagstaff Road, and we hope to do this with the minimum disruption to residents who live close to that road.

I would now like to turn to another matter that has aroused considerable public comment in the past few weeks. It clearly demonstrates the Opposition's hypocrisy. I refer to our hospital system and its budget. This matter was raised during Question Time today also. In South Australia we have the Leader of the Opposition and his health spokesman (Hon. Martin Cameron) making much noise about this issue. I invite them to look at what their Liberal counterparts are doing in New South Wales. Some press articles—

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

Mr TYLER: The member for Victoria does not like it, yet he is one who supported the Greiner Government, and is a member who has proudly stood up and supported that Government. He has said that that is the way that we have to go in South Australia. Let us be under no illusions.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Gayler): Order! The member for Victoria will have his opportunity in this debate.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I rise on a point of order, Madam Acting Speaker. The member for Fisher claims that I said something, but I did not. He claims that I am lying to the House.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The honourable member will have an opportunity to make his own contribution in debate or, if he wishes to pursue the matter further, he can make a personal explanation at the appropriate time.

Mr TYLER: On a point of order, Ms Acting Speaker, during his interjections the member for Victoria said I was lying to the House, and I ask him to withdraw that remark.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The words are unparliamentary and, if they were used, the member for Victoria should withdraw them.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I claimed that the member for Fisher claimed that I was lying to the House. Nothing was said about him. Let us get the facts right, Madam Acting Speaker. It is clear on the parliamentary record—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Fisher claims that the member for Victoria said that he was lying. I believe that that is what the member for Victoria said, and that is unparliamentary. The honourable member will withdraw.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I withdraw, but I reserve the right to look at the *Hansard* pulls—

The ACTING SPEAKER: The member withdraws his remarks without reservation. The member for Victoria.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I withdraw.

Mr TYLER: Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker. I do not want to continue debating, but it is obvious that the member for Victoria is confused. Either he supports the Greiner Government or he does not. It will be interesting to hear how he gets out of that. The Opposition's hypocrisy on this whole health scene is obvious. If we look at some of the articles in the *Sydney Morning Herald* we see that the public hospitals in that State are experiencing budget overruns in the same way as the hospital system in this State. It is not a unique problem that is evident in South Australia only.

I acknowledge the political environment that we are in and the fact that the Liberal Opposition in this State would want to make a bit of political running and cheap politics on this issue. Why did it not offer any solutions to the problem? It is because the measures taken by the Liberal Government in New South Wales were similar to those taken here. For instance, in New South Wales the Government temporarily closed beds, shut down operating theatres, and limited elective surgery. The New South Wales Liberal Minister of Health publicly stated that public hospitals had to live within their budget allocations.

Also, the New South Wales Government released its waiting list for elective surgery during the period that the Opposition made such play here. Those New South Wales figures showed 40 000 people in that State were waiting for surgery, and in some hospitals the waiting list had increased by up to 54 per cent. Before members opposite and the member for Victoria in particular start running off at the mouth and try to make a few cheap points about this, members should bear in mind that in South Australia there were about 6 500 people on the booking list in South Australian hospitals to the end of March 1989. This represents a reduction since January 1988, and it appears that we are doing much better than New South Wales with our hospital waiting lists.

It is also a fact that 50 per cent of people in South Australia have their elective surgery within a month of being added to the waiting lists. I wonder whether the Hon. Mr Cameron and the Leader of the Opposition would describe the Greiner Government as being heartless and non-caring about elderly people in the same way as they have described the South Australian Government. Some of their wild claims have been quite extraordinary. For instance, I can recall one statement where the Opposition claimed that the hos-

pitals were turning away hundreds of South Australians desperately in need of surgery.

This was a completely untrue statement which caused unnecessary alarm and concern in our community. The Leader of the Opposition was pursuing a deliberate policy to generate fear for his own cynical political purposes. I refer to the press advertisement that the Liberals ran which grossly distorts the situation in South Australian hospitals. People requiring urgent surgery are receiving that surgery, and they will continue to receive it. In addition, 50 000 South Australians will also receive elective surgery in the 1988-89 financial year. It is quite disgraceful of the Liberal Leader and his Party to suggest otherwise. As a result of this scaremongering, many people—especially the elderly—genuinely believe that they will not receive treatment if they fall seriously ill.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

Mr TYLER: The member for Mitcham once again interjects and puts his foot in his mouth. He demonstrates the scaremongering tactics that the Opposition is using. The Opposition is scaremongering, and many people, especially the elderly in this State, are concerned. Of course, the Opposition statements are not true. Coming from a Party that purports to be the alternative Government—from a Leader of the Opposition who puts himself up as the alternative Premier of this State—that is unbelievable. This is the same man who was so keen to portray himself as a man of compassion. Why was the Leader of the Opposition so silent on the John Shearer crisis where there was the potential for 300 people to lose their jobs?

Yet, the Leader of the Opposition's sole contribution to the Shearer's debate was to issue a cynical press statement blasting compulsory unionism—a public release almost word for word as was produced by John Shearer's public relations firm. Randall Ashbourne, writing for the *Sunday Mail*, exposed the sinister role that the Opposition was playing in the Shearer's debate—a role that was quite disgraceful and went against the interests of South Australians.

The Leader of the Opposition's desire to effectively shut down the State Clothing Corporation's factory in Whyalla, throwing 50 women out of desperately needed jobs, is similarly callous. It is a measure of the Leader of the Opposition's lack of substance that while the Premier was working to save Shearer staff from the dole queues the Opposition Leader was posturing in front of the Royal Adelaide Hospital deliberately misleading South Australians about the state of our hospital system. The whole hospital debate could have been summed up by the Chairman of the South Australian Health Commission (Dr McCoy) who said, 'Given a total expenditure of \$974 million, it is difficult to comprehend how an over-run of much less than 1 per cent can be interpreted as a crisis.'

I now turn to the Bannon Government's record with regard to State Government taxes and charges. In June the Premier announced a charges package which saw a decrease in the cost of registering and insuring a family car, a freeze on some bus and rail concessions, and small increases in water rates, electricity, and some transport fares. I congratulate the Premier on ensuring that all these increases were below the cost of living rises for the past year. I am sure that members opposite can work out for themselves that these lower increases represent a reduction in real terms.

I make a few assumptions in anticipating the Opposition's contribution to this debate, and offer to lend my calculator to the Leader of the Opposition because he obviously does not have a calculator and relies on his old grey matter. Although that might be regarded as a sarcastic comment, somebody has to expose this Opposition as being shallow

and simplistic. During my speech I have highlighted a number of areas where this is the case. The Opposition continues to foster and exploit the myth that State charges are increasing in South Australia when the figures clearly show that about \$53 million will remain in the pockets of South Australians as a result of the Government's not imposing the full cost of living increase of 7.1 per cent on all State charges.

I do not know of any other organisation, particularly private organisations, that are in the business of providing a service which do not pass on the full CPI rise. The member for Victoria, who is now in the Chamber, is a director of a number of companies. He would throw his hands up in horror at the thought of keeping charges below the CPI. Yet, this State's Premier has done that, and he has done it because of his clever handling of this State's finances. This has enabled him to pass on savings to all South Australians. Instead of being congratulated by the Opposition the Premier is criticised, and the Liberal Party tries to create the myth through television advertising that the Premier does not care.

I repeat, for the benefit of members opposite, that \$53 million will remain in the pockets of South Australian families because the Premier has not imposed the full cost of living increases on State charges. Let us contrast this—

Mr S.J. Baker: He imposed them before.

Mr TYLER: That interjection is interesting. Let us contrast this Government's actions with the previous Liberal Government's record. I know that the member for Mitcham was not a part of that Government, so he is probably not aware of the record. The previous Liberal Government, of which the Leader of the Opposition and most of the front bench were Ministers, raised State charges in every budget whilst in office. That is quite a record.

For instance, in 1979 the Liberals increased the cost of electricity by 20 per cent. In just three years under the Liberals electricity charges rose by 54.4 per cent when infla-

tion was only 34 per cent—an increase in the real price of electricity of 15 per cent. Over that same period the Liberals increased public transport fares by 61.5 per cent, or 22 per cent per annum. Why does the Leader of the Opposition and members of his Party—people like the member for Victoria and the member for Mitcham—keep saying that charges have increased above the inflation rate when the Opposition has this record. As usual, the Leader and the members of his Party get it wrong. Members opposite distort figures; they add in State taxes, even fine collections, and conveniently forget to mention that State taxes are tied to economic development. Why do they forget that important point, which is very significant?

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

Mr TYLER: If the member for Victoria were to listen, he would appreciate my point. Perhaps the Opposition does not want to admit that our economy has grown by 35 per cent since the Bannon Government came to office. The member for Victoria would acknowledge that because most of his companies have flourished in the time of the Bannon Government. He has become quite a wealthy man as a result of the Bannon Government; his companies are doing quite well. Only by taking into account the 35 per cent growth in the economy and inflation can one get a true picture of our State taxes and charges. During 1988 the New South Wales Liberal Premier, Mr Greiner, was elected on the same low tax and low charge rhetoric that our Leader of the Opposition espouses.

I have details of a comparison between the Greiner Government's record and the South Australian Bannon Government's record. In every case, it is apparent that Mr Greiner's Liberals have increased charges for electricity, water, sewerage, public transport and motor vehicle registration by staggering amounts. I seek leave of the House to have a purely statistical table inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

COST COMPARISONS

	New South Wales		South Australia	
	Increase %	Additional Cost to N.S.W. Average Family	Increase %	Additional Cost to S.A. Average Family
Electricity:				
1 July 1988	9.1	61	4.9	32
1 July 1989	5.0	34	2.5	17
		95		49
Water/Sewerage:				
1 July 1988	12.0	60	4.4	22
1 July 1989	6.5+\$80	112	6.5	33
		172		55
Transport:				
1 July 1988	11.7	70	—	—
1 July 1989	7.0	42	4.0	24
		112		24
Motor Vehicle Registration 1989	—	110	—	—12

Mr TYLER: The Liberal Party has been telling us that there is an answer; however, South Australians will need more than shallow rhetoric to be convinced. The South Australian Liberal Party's record speaks for itself and offers no hope for people wanting lower State charges. The South Australian Liberals are modelling themselves on the New South Wales Greiner Liberals. The Leader of the Opposition even sent one of his senior staff members to New South Wales to study the Greiner approach to politics.

The Leader of the Opposition of this State is on record as saying that Premier Greiner has shown a great lead to

other aspiring State Liberal branches, such as that in South Australia. Make no mistake about it: the Leader of the Opposition in this State is making the same promise as was made by Mr Greiner. The member for Victoria laughs—is he denying that? Is he denying that the Leader of the Opposition in this State is following the Greiner approach? Are the Liberals going back on the commitment that was made just after Mr Greiner was elected in New South Wales? Are they back-peddalling? Are they watering down their support for the Greiner Government? It is a very interesting question.

However, make no mistake about it—the Leader of the Opposition in this State is making that same promise. We will need more convincing than that. The reality is that a Government under Olsen's Liberals would not be any different from the New South Wales Greiner Liberal Government, which has demonstrated its capacity in relation to high State Government taxes and charges. They have caused massive job loss and chaos in education and health activities as well as in a whole range of other public sector activities. That is the reality behind the rhetoric, and it is what is behind the rhetoric of the Leader of the Opposition in South Australia. It is a reality that South Australians do not want here, I might add. An Olsen Liberal Government would have disastrous consequences in my electorate where there are many young families, and this would relate particularly to the areas of education, job opportunity and social well-being.

Finally, I want to place on record my congratulations to the Australian cricket team for winning back the Ashes and to Alan Border and the team coach, Mr Bobby Simpson. As members in this House would know, I have a particular affinity with the game of cricket. I have sat up most nights until half-past two in the morning watching the fortunes of the Australian cricket team. They have been great ambassadors for Australia.

Mr Becker: What, to see them spraying XXXX beer all over the place?

Mr TYLER: I am surprised that the member for Hanson does not agree with me on this issue. I would have thought that this was a bipartisan issue. I believe that they have been great ambassadors for this country and the way in which they have conducted themselves is a credit to Alan Border and Bobby Simpson. I sincerely hope that they continue their fine form for the rest of the series.

Ms GAYLER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister for Environment and Planning): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): Several years of planning and fundraising at the Walkerville Primary School have this week begun to bear significant fruit. Demolition and earth moving equipment moved into the school earlier this week to remove some of the older buildings that were on the site and to begin the process of what has been termed by the school council a regeneration of the facilities at the school. This planning process has been a long one. In 1986, when it began, a small subcommittee of the school council decided it was important to have a long-term objective for the upgrading of the school's facilities. An upgrading was necessary because the school was built in the late 1890s and the early part of this century and various facilities had been added, albeit on a so-called temporary basis. However, as the population of the area surrounding the school grew, those temporary facilities (as with many temporary facilities) were never removed but became a permanent feature of the school.

The school continued to grow and to provide a range of educational opportunities for the children of young families in and around the area. Nonetheless, there was continuing demand, particularly in the junior primary area, for some substantial upgrading. In fact, the pressures were greatest in the junior primary area from reception through to level 2.

It levelled off a little in the middle to senior levels of the primary school but, nonetheless, overall there was a substantial increase in the numbers attending the school such that it was necessary for the school council to impose a zone of right giving first preference to people who lived in the immediate vicinity. The facilities that were available for the junior primary school were quite basic and this regeneration proposal was designed to substantially upgrade them to the level that new primary schools being built in newer suburbs on the extremities of Adelaide tend to take for granted.

The four curriculum emphases of the regeneration proposal were performing and visual arts; activity-based learning areas for the early years of schooling; a redesigning and repositioning of the resource centre; and specialist teaching areas for the second language, science, physical education and art. These proposals had to take into account that there would be movements in the numbers of children in each of the levels of the school and it would be necessary therefore to achieve a complete refiguration of the school facilities.

The phases of the development that are now proposed are the provision of a resource centre and two classrooms, the provision of an activity area which will have another classroom attached to it and the provision of a performing arts area. There are several pleasing aspects to the regeneration proposal and the design work that has been associated with it.

The resource centre, which, at the moment, is the library but is now having a much wider focus in terms of the use of a number of audio visual pieces of equipment and the use of computers, will become a focal point in the whole of the school. The specialist areas such as music, drama, physical education, science, Italian and art will also be a focus of activity in the school rather than being conducted separately in each classroom. The old stone buildings of the 1890s and 1920s will be enhanced and refurbished, and those facilities will be linked by a building design that is in sympathy with the architecture of that earlier period. The facilities will also provide the opportunity for greater use of the school by the community, and that will ensure that the school not only maintains its role as an active part of the community but also gains financial benefit by leasing various spaces to local groups. The facilities will be finished later this year and will be ready for use in the first term of 1990.

There are a number of pleasing aspects to this redevelopment—or regeneration—proposal at this school. The first is that it is happening at all. It is very much overdue and has been neglected by successive Liberal and Labor Governments. I have found myself in the fortunate position of being able to argue about the condition of the school, to increase its level of priority and to ensure that funding is available to upgrade the facilities. One of the reasons advanced as to why the school was not given benefit in the past was that the former local member and a former Minister of Education found it difficult, because of their positions, to argue that the school get a particular benefit (although they both took an active interest in the school). I have been fortunate to be able to argue the case strongly and, with the support of the school community, obtain grants and funds from the Education Department.

Parents have been extensively involved in the entire planning and design process for this new redevelopment, which is substantial, costing in the order of \$340 000 to \$360 000.

Parents have been involved in all of those planning and design stages. A number of public parent meetings have been called, and the school council has made a substantial contribution in regard to the position of indoor and outdoor facilities and the relationship between the new facilities and other parts of the school area. Similarly, the teaching staff has made a major contribution.

Another pleasing aspect has been the extent of community fundraising involved in this exercise. This regeneration proposal will not be funded entirely by the Government; in a sense, it is a dollar-for-dollar subsidy arrangement with the Education Department. It means that the school community has to raise one dollar or contribute one dollar in kind for every dollar that the Government gives to the new facilities. The school council and the school community have the responsibility to raise \$20 000 each year for at least the next five years, reducing to \$10 000. The school community has made a deliberate and collective decision to raise that money to improve facilities in the school.

Another pleasing aspect of the development is that the school council has been given the opportunity to carry out the contracting work itself, which has led to extensive savings. However, it is being done in consultation with the Department of Housing and Construction, the Department of Education and the various unions that are involved.

It is an innovative way of ensuring that the school community obtains the major benefit of any funds available. I do not wish to suggest that this process is unique, because it is not; it is happening in a number of schools around the State at the moment. However, it illustrates some important educational themes. First, there is a focus on the educational environment of the children and designing educational spaces for particular curriculum programs. I believe that is very important. Secondly, there is an extension of curriculum offerings so that there is a wider choice for the students, and that is associated with an acknowledgment that the community will use the spaces and that, as a result, the school can obtain a financial return.

Perhaps the most important aspect is the role which the parents play in the decision-making arrangements of the school in relation not only to the facilities but also to funding, administration and curriculum offerings that are part and parcel of the arrangements at the school. Again, those things are not peculiar, but I believe that the issue of regeneration of inner city schools, as typified by the Walkerville school example, demonstrates that there can be a greater involvement of parents and that the school community as a whole can benefit from these innovations.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I wish to bring to the attention of the House the magnificent job being done by 11 young people at Marineland, West Beach, who have been working under extremely difficult conditions ever since Marineland was closed on 30 May last year. Their job, which involves supervising and looking after the marine life and birds, has been extremely difficult because of the conflicts which have arisen between the various Government departments and the liquidator, John Heard. Mr Heard's handling of this whole operation has not given him any cause to feel proud.

I am concerned about a report in the *Advertiser* of Saturday 29 July, which states:

The Opposition claims the department declared the Marineland operation not viable, even though the owners of the complex had financial backing through Mr Ellen's company, Elspan Ltd, for an extensive redevelopment project.

Elspan worked on behalf of the previous owners of Marineland, Tribond, securing finance for the redevelopment of Marineland and Mr Ellen was the broker who located the Chinese developer, Zhen Yun Ltd. Mr Ellen has an extensive file on the Marineland project and its subsequent problems.

This includes documents referring to the State Development Department's alleged intervention and cancellation of the Marineland redevelopment for 'political reasons', citing pressure from environmentalists and trade unions.

However, an article in the *Advertiser* of 1 May 1989, under the heading 'Chinese investors ready to open the cheque books in South Australia', states:

The 300-room international standard West Beach hotel and conference facility, which will replace the old Marineland complex, was one of several potential South Australian investments. Mr Arnold [who was the Minister of State Development and Technology] touted to other Chinese investors on a trade mission last November. The proposal was referred to Zhen Yun, which met the Minister and sent a team to inspect the Adelaide site 'within 10 days'.

Two articles, which appeared in the *Advertiser* about three months apart, differed in that one claimed that the Minister of State Development and Technology introduced Zhen Yun to this development at West Beach, while the other article stated that a Mr Peter Ellen was responsible for obtaining Zhen Yun on behalf of the previous Marineland owners, Tribond. I know whom I would prefer to accept as telling the truth in that situation.

I become quite annoyed when a Minister makes a statement, as reported in today's *News*, about this development. The Minister released a press statement in which he criticised the Opposition and said that it was threatening the \$35 million resort and conference centre planned by Hong Kong-based developers Zhen Yun Pty Ltd. The article in the *News* states:

He asked the Opposition to end its campaign of innuendo and to allow negotiations between the trust and Zhen Yun to continue unhindered.

Mr Arnold said a total of \$5.1 million had been paid so far to wind up Tribond, the former Marineland lessees.

He said the new lease, to Zhen Yun, would bring \$50 million into South Australia—as well as the boost to employment and investment activity.

However, when the Minister announced this project earlier this year he said that this new development would benefit the State by about \$100 million. The \$35 million resort and conference complex, which will have a 300-bed international standard hotel and conference centre, is more likely to result in a \$50 million benefit.

However, even more annoying is the fact that the local councils, especially the City of West Torrens and the City of Glenelg, were also reported in today's *Advertiser*, under the heading 'Council slams secretive West Beach Trust', as objecting to the project. Mayors of the two cities stated that their representatives on the West Beach Trust could not answer certain questions put to them by their councils.

So much so, that in the City of West Torrens the Chairman of the Planning Committee, Dr Jennings, placed 63 questions on the council notice paper seeking information about the West Beach Trust. The council could not obtain the answers for Councillor Jennings.

It is a disgrace that we should have an organisation, set up in 1954 by the Playford Government for the benefit of the people of South Australia as a recreation and reserve area, administered by a group of trustees nominated by the local councils and they are not fully informed of the true operations of that organisation.

Glenelg has worked hard to attract and provide international standard accommodation and development. West Torrens is mindful of what is proposed for its area, and similarly the Henley and Grange council is doing its best to attract development at Henley Beach. Yet, private enterprise developers who want to operate in those areas are disadvantaged through benefits which could be given under the West Beach proposals. Under this proposal the operator of the hotel was to be taxed 2 per cent on turnover. But

nobody knows what is happening, because none of the details have been thrashed out or made known to all the members of the trust.

We have a hotel complex replacing Marineland, which has served the South Australian public for over 25 years. It was 15 years ago last Tuesday that the West Beach Trust took over Marineland from the State Government. I campaigned strongly in 1973 and 1974 for the State Government to take over Marineland from the then owner, builder and developer. Mr Boss, after a few years of operating Marineland, threatened, having had enough, to walk out and leave everything. He could not get the cooperation of the West Beach Trust in those days, so it was an extremely difficult operation.

So, Marineland was taken over by the State Government for \$200 500, and it was then sold to the West Beach Trust, which had to borrow the money, and it endeavoured to manage the property for many years. In that period, on only five occasions did Marineland show a profit. When it closed, it had losses of \$726 000 compared with surpluses of \$94 000, so there was a net deficiency of \$632 000.

That is no reflection on what Marineland was designed for. It was developed as a tourist attraction to provide entertainment for the area. It was to supplement the on-site caravans and villas. It was to add to the Marineland Park complex, supplementing the popular Par 3 golf course which was destroyed for the Fisheries Research Station. It was provided in order to keep in the locality those who could not afford five-star accommodation. It was designed for the people, as originally requested by Sir Thomas Playford. It was a holiday playground for the average worker. Well over 1.25 million people went through the Marineland complex to watch the dolphins entertain or perform. They went to see the dolphins.

The dolphins are show-offs and will perform all sorts of antics in the presence of anybody. In fact, if you went down there today, you would see them jumping up and down in the pool. Under the new regime (the State Government) that is running operations at present, the staff cannot talk to anyone. The staff cannot do anything, and they do not know what their future is. All we know is that the equipment is being moved in and has to be in place to transport those dolphins next week.

I warn the Government here and now that if it thinks it has problems in developing that area, and if it cannot make up its mind, it should not try to move those dolphins or sea lions because there is nowhere for them to go. If any of those dolphins die as the result of an attempt to move them or during transportation, their blood will remain on the hands of the Bannon Labor Government for ever and a day.

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): Inspired as I was by the speech of the member for Fisher, and the speech of the Governor, I will take some time this afternoon to relate some of the achievements, as I see them, in my electorate.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr ROBERTSON: I haven't had time to look. I want to examine in the cold hard light of day where Government money goes and the sort of people who benefit from it. I believe the electorate of Bright is a typical example. The general message in this country, and particularly in this State, is that the Government is concerned about its citizens, that it cares profoundly about the welfare of the people, and it does help those who need it most. I will illustrate that by pointing to developments in my own electorate.

In the past three or four years a substantial array of developments has occurred in the Hallett Cove region, fuelled

in the main by funding from this Government and local government. A large and unique school has been constructed at Hallett Cove. It is the only R-10 school of its kind in South Australia. At this stage that experiment has been a success. The senior school runs to year nine, but next year it will run to year 10. Thereafter, senior school-children will go into surrounding schools.

We have a joint development with the Marion City Council for a community gymnasium, a facility which is very much lacking in the Hallett Cove, Sheidow Park and Trott Park communities. We now have a gymnasium that is the envy of the surrounding area. This development will provide by a considerable margin the biggest single undercover venue in that area.

This year a local community health centre, which is an outreach of the Noarlunga Community Health Centre, opened in Hallett Cove for the benefit of local people in the greater Hallett Cove area, including Sheidow Park and Trott Park. Further, several weeks ago a branch of the Marion City Library attracted State funding of \$130 000 to stock it. Previously, people in that area had to depend on mobile libraries and trips to Adelaide.

In Hallett Cove we have a kindergarten which will be officially opened in September. That will cater for the growing number of children in the developing area—particularly in the Karrara section of Hallett Cove. The child-care centre has been there for several years. Like most child-care centres it is full and was so virtually on the second day it opened. The system of prioritising demands for child-care means that the centre does as good a job as possible to meet the needs of people in training, people in work and, indeed, people looking for work in that community. The effect of having that centre in Hallett Cove has spread way beyond the district: it offers services to those who live further south and who commute from the southern suburbs to work and train in Adelaide.

Also in the area, the Karrara kindergarten, which opened four years ago to the day, I think, has been a marvellous adjunct to services in Karrara. However, there is now a need in the area for a primary school, a subject which I hope the Government will address within the next couple of years. The other significant development which has been of assistance to people in the southern community is the acquisition of the new 3000 class railcars, which have proved to be magnificent vehicles. They are slowly replacing the 'red hens' which apparently never die. It is probably fortunate that they were engineered and built as well as they were, because that enables the phasing-in period for the 3000 class railcars to be spread out a little more. They are coming on as funds allow. I am pleased to see that contracts have been let for a further 20 railcars over the next five years.

I also welcome the fact that in the last rewrite of timetables people in the southern suburbs were given access to Sunday morning trains, a service very much missed by people who wanted to come to Adelaide to visit the central business district, to go to church or museums or generally participate in city-type activities on Sundays. Particularly for those people who wished to commute to church, the lack of a train service was an inhibiting factor. That has now been taken care of.

On the subject of local issues, I welcome the addition of a school crossing at the Adams Road lights on Lonsdale Road, because it will give people from Hallett Cove access to St Martin de Porres, the local parish school and, conversely, will allow the residents and children of Sheidow Park (and particularly those children in the secondary com-

ponent) to find their way across the road to the new Hallett Cove school.

I also welcome the advent of a number of out-of-school care programs. Again, Hallett Cove was the first in this electorate to obtain this facility, but we now have two out-of-hours care programs: one at the Hallett Cove school and one at the Hallett Cove South school. They are very much in demand, and the demand for out-of-hours facilities is one which will take a number of years to meet. Again, I am pleased that the Department of Community Services and Health and the CSO put their heads together on this—although not always as well as they might have, perhaps—and they are prioritising the system in a way that delivers the service to those communities who need it most.

I want to turn briefly to some of the coming attractions and developments that have been referred to by my colleague the member for Fisher, and to say that I for one, and certainly the southern community, will very much welcome the construction of a third arterial road when that becomes a reality some time in the early 1990s. The residents of my electorate, I suspect, will not gain directly from that as much as residents of Mawson and other areas. However, it will do a great deal to alleviate the pressure on the southern end of Brighton Road, for example. It will alleviate some of the traffic problems which are beginning to occur there because of simple loading factors.

I also welcome the filtration plant at Happy Valley which will come on stream, not to pun too heavily, in November of this year. That will deliver once and for all a stream of filtered water to residents not just of the southern suburbs but of suburbs as far north as Port Adelaide, and will be very much welcomed. I hope that during this winter the E&WS Department has been carrying out a flushing program in the mains to ensure that, when that filtered water becomes available, we do not have the surges of dirty water we had last summer. Obviously, the flushing program is concomitant with the filtration plant, and that will clearly have to be done over the next few months. On the same tack, Myponga is due to receive filtered water in several

years, which will complete the picture. The whole of the metropolitan area will then have access to filtered water, as I believe it deserves to have.

I want to take the opportunity now to sketch out one or two of my hopes for developments in that area over the next couple of years. I have mentioned the need for a primary school in Karrara. It is quite clearly documented and clear to me that a need exists, and it is quite logical if one thinks about it that, having a kindergarten for four years, it is about time that provision was made for a primary school. The area is growing substantially, and in the four years since the kindergarten opened the number of houses in the catchment area has increased by something in excess of 1 000. Simple arithmetic suggests that there are perhaps another 2 000 children of primary school age due to come along shortly.

I would also like to push, for what it is worth, for an addition to the slip lanes on Lonsdale Highway, as that will allow those local communities better access to Lonsdale Highway, and to advocate again the 80 km/h speed limit on Lonsdale Highway. I believe that should be a necessity on a suburban road, which is what that highway has effectively become.

Also, I would like to take the opportunity to urge Marion council to hurry up with its traffic controls on Ramrod Avenue to avoid the problems that are beginning to arise in the vicinity of the kindergarten and the child-care centre. We clearly need some sort of traffic control to slow traffic. I am sure that the council is thinking about it, but I would urge it to think quickly. As a final parting shot, while I am on the subject of councils, I would similarly urge Brighton council to consider installing traffic control devices outside the Brighton Surf Life Saving Club for the good and simple reason that the whole of the Esplanade at Brighton has traffic control devices, but the Life Saving Club does not.

Motion carried.

At 5.17 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 8 August at 2 p.m.