

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Tuesday 8 August 1989

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

**PETITION: NORWOOD KINDERGARTEN**

A petition signed by 357 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to maintain the Norwood Kindergarten as a playgroup venue was presented by the Hon. G.J. Crafter.

Petition received.

**PETITION: CONTRACT TEACHERS**

A petition signed by 13 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to abolish the current contract system for teachers was presented by the Hon. R.J. Gregory.

Petition received.

**PETITION: NATIVE TREES**

A petition signed by 252 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to assist rural producers in the planting of native trees as a conservation measure was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

**PETITION: MARINELAND**

A petition signed by 6 839 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to reconsider the closure of Marineland was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

**PETITION: SENTENCE REMISSION**

A petition signed by 15 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to abolish parole and remission of sentences for persons convicted of armed hold-up offences was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

**PETITION: FULHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH**

A petition signed by 401 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to establish a Neighbourhood Watch scheme for the Fulham area was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

**PETITION: HOUSING INTEREST RATES**

A petition signed by 13 residents of South Australia praying that the House take action to persuade the Federal Government to amend economic policy to reduce housing interest rates was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

**PETITION: MURRAY BRIDGE NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH**

A petition signed by 680 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to establish another Neighbourhood Watch scheme in Murray Bridge was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

**PETITION: KENO**

A petition signed by 390 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to allow the Elizabeth City Brass Band Club to operate the proposed game of keno on its premises was presented by Mr M.J. Evans.

Petition received.

**PETITION: ARDROSSAN AREA SCHOOL**

A petition signed by 322 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to upgrade the Ardrossan Area School was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: BUDGET**

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I wish to report to the House on the outcome of the 1988-89 State budget, and announce certain revenue measures to be introduced by the Government which will take advantage of that budget outcome. The favourable outcome means that State long-term debt has been contained, and benefits can be extended to the community in tax relief measures. The Government has achieved a 1988-89 Recurrent Account surplus of \$83 million—\$27 million more than our forecast surplus.

The Capital Account shows a result equal to the budget forecast. The Government has therefore been able to achieve its budget goal of a balanced Consolidated Account with the major achievement of reducing its financing requirement by \$27 million. In relation to revenue in 1989-90, there will be no tax increases in the coming State budget. In fact, major tax cuts will be extended to first home buyers, to those paying land tax, and to businesses liable for payroll tax.

Together, these measures will provide benefits of some \$55 million for South Australian families and employment-generating business during the current financial year. The budget result has been achieved through sound financial management by the Government and stronger than anticipated growth in general economic activity.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Since coming to office we have worked to ensure that the State's financial base is strong, secure and able to pay for the services that all South Australians require. We have rejected the easy solutions which impose debt burdens on our children, and generations beyond. Government has no inherent right to spend tomorrow's money. It should practise diligent economic management which protects the resources of the State while

providing a fair distribution of services at the lowest possible cost to taxpayers.

The 1988-89 budget anticipated a financing requirement of \$226 million. In fact, this requirement was reduced to \$199 million. This improvement alone—a \$27 million reduction in the budget financing requirement—is in itself a significant achievement, but much more than this has been achieved in the 1988-89 budget.

The original budget estimates provided for a SAFA contribution of \$300 million from its 1988-89 surplus. The actual draw on the SAFA surplus has been reduced to \$220 million. This has allowed \$60 million to be transferred to the 1989-90 budget, with the balance being allocated to provisions and general reserves. SAFA's retained profit, reserves, and provisions will now exceed a healthy \$225 million.

Looking at the accounts overall, the budget improvement was contributed to equally by increased receipts and by spending controls. On the recurrent receipts side, the total improvement (excluding the SAFA surplus) was \$72.5 million. A number of areas show contributions in excess of budget forecast. Major contributing sectors include the Commonwealth Government general purpose receipts (\$18 million); gambling revenue (\$11 million); payroll tax (\$9 million); and stamp duty (\$44 million).

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The improvement in payroll tax and stamp duty collections provides a clear indication of the strength of the South Australian economy over the past year. In the case of payroll tax, while the exemption level was raised by \$60 000, or 22 per cent, total revenue still increased by 12 per cent on a comparable basis. This is a reflection of the 4.5 per cent growth in total employment in South Australia over the past year, representing some 28 000 new jobs. The property market has also been very strong, both in the number and value of transactions.

To focus just on revenue increases would fail to acknowledge the achievements of this Government in containing public expenditure through greater efficiency and restraint. Total recurrent expenditure was reduced from an estimated \$4 157 million to an actual \$4 123 million. This result includes an additional contribution of \$20 million towards the future cost of superannuation. Together with the reduction in estimated recurrent expenditure, this is equal to a \$54 million saving.

The budget result for 1988-89 means that the Government's major fiscal goals for the 1980s have been achieved and confirmed:

- the accumulated Consolidated Account deficit of \$63 million inherited from the Liberal Government in 1982 has now been fully paid off;
- the Recurrent Account is now in a sound surplus; and
- the State's net debt has been reduced as a share of gross State product from 23 per cent to 16 per cent.

This does not mean that rigorous and efficient management of the State's finances will not continue, but it does mean that the Government can more fully address the issues facing South Australia in the 1990s without resorting to a debilitating program of large scale borrowing.

The details of the Government's programs will be outlined in the State budget, but today it is appropriate that I announce the measures concerned with stamp duty, payroll tax and land tax. Stamp duty for houses costing up to \$80 000 will be abolished for applications received from first home buyers as from midnight tonight. This relief for first home buyers involves lifting the exemption level for stamp duty from \$50 000 to \$80 000.

For example, if the benefit is applied to a \$50 000 home loan over 30 years, the term of that loan could be reduced by up to eight years—at a saving in total repayment of up to \$73 000. At a time when many families are facing hard decisions about first home buying, the Government believes this measure will be of great help throughout our community. It will make the difference, in many cases, between continuing in rental accommodation or moving into the home market.

In the commercial sector, the Government will from 1 October increase stamp duty exemption for rental business—from \$15 000 a year to \$24 000 a year. The value of these stamp duty benefits will be greater than \$4 million. There will be several initiatives where the budget surplus will be applied, in very specific ways, to help business activity and generate employment.

To assist in job creation, payroll tax relief will be further extended. The exemption level will be raised in two further steps, from \$330 000 to \$360 000 on 1 October this year, and to \$400 000 from 1 April 1990. The value of this benefit is estimated at \$10 million. This means that from 1 October 1988 the exemption level for small business will have been increased by 48 per cent.

The Government is committed to ensuring that increases in land tax due to the considerable improvement in property values are not excessive. Therefore, rates applying from this financial year on properties valued between \$80 000 and \$200 000 will be halved, with a maximum benefit of \$450. Higher value properties will have their rate reduced by 16 per cent. In addition, rebates of 25 per cent up to \$200 000 and 15 per cent above this amount will be paid in 1989-90. The total value of reductions in the land tax package, which also includes exemption for shack sites subject to very long-term leases, is estimated at \$41 million.

The Government has consistently reviewed the impact of land tax and in the past four years has given concessions worth more than \$34 million, while increasing the exemption level from \$40 000 to \$80 000. In each of the past three years significant rebates have been provided. For properties valued at under \$200 000, these rebates have represented 25 per cent, with higher value properties attracting rebates from 5 per cent to 10 per cent. These major cuts in land tax will mean that, despite the massive increase in property values, the aggregate increase in tax collection will be contained to about 10 per cent. These tax cuts, based on the successful outcome of the 1988-89 financial year and the overall responsible management of State finances, will help stimulate home buying and job generation. They can be made without detriment to the Government's provision of services, which will be demonstrated in the budget to be delivered later this month.

#### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

- By the Minister of Health (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—  
Modbury Hospital—By-laws—Parking.
- By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—  
National Crime Authority—Report, 1987-88.
- By the Chief Secretary (Hon. R. J. Gregory)—  
Daylight Saving Act, 1971—Regulations—Summer Time.

#### DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

**The SPEAKER:** I notice in the gallery the Hon. Michael Polley, Speaker of the House of Assembly in Tasmania. I

invite the honourable gentleman to take a seat on the floor of the House. I ask the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition to escort the distinguished visitor to a seat on the floor of the House and introduce him.

The Hon. Mr Polley was escorted by the Hon. J.C. Bannon and Mr Olsen to a seat on the floor of the House.

## QUESTION TIME

### HOSPITAL WAITING LISTS

**Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Minister of Health confirm that, for the first time, the number of people waiting for treatment at major metropolitan public hospitals exceeds 7 000? Contrary to the Minister's claim in this House last Thursday that 'things are moving extremely well in the metropolitan public hospitals', I have obtained during the past 24 hours from within the Health Commission figures which show that 7 046 people are now on our hospital waiting lists. This does not include more than 700 children waiting for treatment at the Adelaide Children's Hospital.

It is the first time that the 7 000 mark has been exceeded, and represents an increase of 528 in the number on the waiting list since June last year. The figures I have also show that people are having to wait longer. The number who have been on waiting lists for between six and 12 months is now 1 284, which is 118 more than in June last year; while the number on waiting lists for more than 12 months is 1 188, a staggering 394 more than 12 months ago. That is almost a 50 per cent increase in the waiting list, an increase which raises very serious doubts about the Minister's claim that the average waiting time for elective surgery is about four weeks.

Further grave doubt about this claim stems from figures from the Flinders Medical Centre which give the following median waiting list: general surgery, 66 days; orthopaedic surgery, 121 days, with a maximum wait of 765 days (or just over two years); and ear, nose and throat surgery, 233 days, with a maximum wait of almost 5½ years. The median wait for an adult tonsillectomy is just over one year.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** If the honourable member were seeking surgery in one of our hospitals, what would be of interest to him would not be how many other people were seeking surgery but how long he would have to wait.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition has asked his question. There is no divine right for anyone in here to interject whenever he or she wants to.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** He won't like the answer, Sir, because it won't suit his purposes, of course. The honourable member would be interested in how long he would have to wait for surgery and not how many were on a particular booking list. Things change all the time in hospitals: for example, there is far more day surgery in hospitals than there once was. Generally speaking, the time people spend in hospital has declined, is continuing to decline and will continue to decline—and there is a good reason for that. Hospitals are now more efficient, so there is no reason why a person should spend in hospital five minutes longer than is necessary. The result is that the actual cost of treatment is being reduced and inconvenience to the individual is also being reduced.

I checked with the Health Commission this morning, which confirmed that 50 per cent of people who have

elective surgery at Adelaide's major metropolitan public hospitals undergo their surgery within a month of being placed on the booking list.

*An honourable member:* Within a month?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** That is right—within a month of being placed on the booking list. I take it that the honourable member understands what a median is, because last week one of his colleagues did not understand what an average was.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Will the honourable Deputy Premier please direct his remarks through the Chair.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I know that, you, Sir, understand what an average is and what a median is but, obviously, members opposite do not. People become upset when they are given a particular date which is cancelled, rescheduled, cancelled and once more rescheduled. That is a matter for the various hospitals and the proper management of the booking lists. All the Government can do is provide the funds and ensure—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I am not sure what the waiting lists are at Pinnaroo—perhaps the honourable member can tell us. The Government can provide the resources and it is for the administrators, the doctors and the nurses at the hospital to manage their booking lists in such a way as to ensure, first, that the amount of time that people have to wait is as brief as possible and, secondly, that that time frame is as predictable and as firm as possible.

If that is done early in the financial year, our hospitals will not get into the sort of financial problems that one or two of them got into earlier. Let the honourable member understand the way in which these figures are treated. Let him consider the waiting time for surgery in hospitals and the way in which that has declined in terms of the time that people spend in a bed. It is the other side of the problem and that is something that the honourable member does not want to take into account. He carefully ignores the fact that our hospital system is very efficient indeed.

### HOUSING TRUST RENTS

**Mr DUGAN (Adelaide):** Is the Minister of Housing and Construction planning to increase Housing Trust rents by \$11.50 per week? Is the South Australian Government in breach of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement? In the *Sunday Mail* recently the member for Hanson was reported as saying that, in order to comply with the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, the Government would either be selling hundreds of houses or increasing rentals by \$11.50 a week. This claim that pensioners would either have no house or face rent hikes of 50 per cent or more has brought an avalanche of queries from Housing Trust tenants in Adelaide, North Adelaide and Walkerville, particularly from people in older flats and houses who are understandably alarmed by these extravagant claims.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I thank the honourable member for his question. I can state categorically that after the next election or at any time rents under the Bannon Government will not increase by \$11.50 a week. What we read in the *Sunday Mail* from the member for Hanson was the usual scaremongering tactics for which the honourable member is well known. Having watched his career over the years, we know that that is his style. When the AIDS debate was at its height in this country and in this State, the member for Hanson put out his usual story that all the seagulls in his electorate of Hanson were dying because they were swallowing condoms. That is how he looks at the

situation. That is typical of the member for Hanson and the Liberal Party, in particular, which has no policy on housing, apart from the abolition of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. The Opposition has yet to refute that it will abolish that agreement if it ever gets into office in Canberra or in this State. Instead, the Opposition resorts to frightening trust tenants.

I am happy to say that in the main trust tenants have become too sophisticated to fall for the member for Hanson's bully-boy tactics, upon which he often embarks. Two years ago this Government embarked on a 20 per cent real increase in rents for trust tenants over a two-year period from 1986 to 1988. When the last instalment of that increase was paid, I made a statement in this House that trust tenants had paid more than their fair share in meeting the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement in respect of the ability of State housing authorities to meet the terms of that agreement. I said then, 'Enough is enough; they have paid their share.' I said that they would not be paying anything further outside inflation increases and I still stand by that statement: trust tenants under a Bannon Government would not pay more than the rate of inflation in respect of people paying full rents. I remind the House that under a policy of this Government 65 per cent of trust tenants pay a reduced rental, at a cost to the community of \$91 million in this financial year.

That is not a mistake but a conscious act by this Government as part of its social justice policy, and we make allowances in our rent setting procedures to meet the needs of the 65 per cent of our trust tenants who are financially disadvantaged. Those tenants who pay full rent clearly understand the policy of this Government.

I say again, for the benefit not only of the member for Hanson but of all trust tenants in this State, that under a Bannon Government they will not pay rents of the order of an extra \$11.50 a week to meet a so-called problem that only the member for Hanson perceives. The rents that this State charges trust tenants are the lowest in the country. We do that deliberately; so they should be and so they will continue to be. We will not have a situation such as is occurring in New South Wales under the Greiner Liberal Government whereby rents are increasing in some cases by more than 100 per cent. That is the kind of situation that the member for Hanson is quite happy with. If he wants to join with me in condemning Greiner and his friend Joe Schipp for putting up rents by more than 100 per cent, then let him do so here. I will be glad to put my name with his on a press release. I give the assurance that rents will not increase by \$11.50 a week under the next Bannon Government.

*Mr Becker interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

#### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I address my question to the Minister of Health. How will the Royal Adelaide Hospital reduce waiting lists this year when the hospital is telling staff it will not increase the number of patients it admits? The Government's continuing attempts to claim that the pressure on our public hospitals is easing is in stark conflict with the facts. I have in my possession a new memorandum being circulated to staff at the Royal Adelaide Hospital by the Administrator. It is dated 31 July and follows the memorandum of 25 July revealed by the Opposition in our questions last week which showed that the hospital is being forced to ration health

care. While the Minister denied that, this latest memorandum states:

... the general overall level of patient activity will need to be maintained at last year's level.

This means there can be no reduction in waiting lists. Further, the memorandum suggests that emergency admissions will be reduced. It states:

... it will also be necessary to be very firm about emergency admissions ... there is still room, particularly in the emergency area, for further tight assessment of those patients who require to be admitted.

This is yet a further departure from the Labor Party's promises of universal, comprehensive free health services at our major public hospitals under Medicare.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** It is very difficult to sort out from that question what the honourable member was quoting and what were his editorial insertions into the whole thing. Most of his so-called conclusions were his editorial insertions rather than what was actually in the statement itself. I repeat: it is expected that within a week or so the hospital will be up to its full complement of nursing staff. It is committed to reducing the list. Under Dr Blaikie a committee is operating through all the hospitals with a view to attacking this problem on a metropolitan-wide basis, irrespective of which hospital we are working with. In addition, as I say, the advent of day surgery on a very ambitious level certainly enables us, with existing resources, to do much better than has been the case in the past.

The Government has earmarked specific amounts of money, all in the public domain, for reducing the lists. Let us remember the statement that the Premier and I made quite some time ago, well in advance of the normal announcement of funds in the budget for the health area or any other Government instrumentality. We have been praised for doing so by the very administrator and other administrators of the hospital that the honourable member is talking about. The idea of that early announcement was to ensure that the hospitals would be able to gear up. Not only did we provide for full inflation and full restoration of services but also we provided for earmarked extra funds, first, for reducing the booking lists and, secondly, in relation to the levels prior to the two months when the hospitals—

*Mr Olsen interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:**—had to plateau their treatments. Let me continue from where the honourable Leader rudely interrupted me, as he always does. In addition to full restoration—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** Well, he is. I know what people who come into this place think of the Leader as a result of the way he carries on like a galoot. Not only did that statement provide for full restoration and full inflation: it also provided for specific sums for equipment purchase and for reducing the booking lists. All the hospitals know what they have received under that. I made clear to the House last week that the Royal Adelaide Hospital had taken some time to recruit nurses to increase the number of beds to what was needed in order to spend that money. That process is virtually complete and they can get on with the job.

#### WOOMERA ROCKET RANGE

**Mr RANN (Briggs):** Will the Premier say whether the South Australian Government supports a plan to expand the Woomera Rocket Range into a 130 000 square kilometre war games park for international air forces that would involve firing rockets and missiles into Aboriginal tribal lands? In

a recent feature article in the *Bulletin*, a writer (Mr Robert Coburn) claims that objections by tribal Aborigines to the war games plan will be over-ruled by the Federal Government, even though the Aborigines concerned were previously driven off their land to make way for British nuclear tests more than 30 years ago. The article states that on 25 July the South Australian Government briefed 13 Australian and overseas companies keen to invest \$250 million for the development of the range. The writer goes on to say:

... missing from the promotional material is that the western sector of the mega range belongs to a group of Maralinga people. Their land is to be the hot end of things—a cruel irony for the families that have just started to move back to their lands and have yet to be told the full extent of British nuclear contamination.

The *Bulletin* report also states that Aborigines have been given no warnings of firing times or the types of weapons they might expect on their land.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Clearly, the Government does not support that interpretation, and I can understand the honourable member's concern. Certainly, my colleague the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and I reacted with considerable concern when we saw those statements. The article concerned is extremely misleading. It does not cover the facts properly and it is alarmist in its approach to the whole matter. Of course, the Commonwealth and State Governments are well aware of the sensitivity of the Aboriginal people and of the question of land rights. Indeed, it was this Government that introduced the Maralinga Tjarutja Bill that conferred those rights and we would not, on the one hand, confer those rights and, on the other, take them away. So, that issue of access is obviously of prime importance when considering the future of the Woomera range.

The Department of Defence is actively negotiating a special access agreement with the Maralinga Tjarutja and that agreement will obviously respect their rights. It does not involve lobbing rockets, firings and test bombings on their lands. The article suggests that all this is happening without any kind of consultation. On the contrary: there was a meeting and a presentation to the Aboriginal community at Oak Valley in May this year (two months before this article appeared) to discuss a draft agreement between the community and the Defence Department. Officers of my department and the South Australian Department of Aboriginal Affairs were also present, and they will be involved and following those negotiations at all times. The Defence Department has stressed that there is nothing in the draft agreement that is not negotiable. It has indicated a willingness to consider specific assistance in kind to the Aborigines if that is appropriate in respect of certain rights of usage. I stress again that no firing or test bombing will take place in such areas. That is not contemplated.

In fact, there seems to be some confusion about the overall scope of commercialisation of the Woomera range. The range still exists. It is a marvellous resource which has worldwide application. It can be used by us to carry out tests which at present are being undertaken overseas by our services at considerable expense to the Australian taxpayer. It can also be used by friendly participants in exercises and other technological activity, not only in the defence area but in many areas of civilian application.

That is what is envisaged by the proposals that the Commonwealth has put out, with support from the State Government, on the further use of the Woomera range. At the moment, defence and our Government officials are consulting widely on the proposals. The general public, pastoralists with properties in the area, and Aboriginal inhabitants will all be fully advised of the terms and conditions that

will apply to the future use of the range, but the commercial potential of that range is very considerable.

It is quite clear from the expressions of interest that we have already received that it will provide a very important adjunct to our economic development and to job creation in South Australia. Things such as new radar systems, which will be absolutely vital in air traffic control and other purposes around the world, will be, and can be, developed by using such facilities. I believe that we in South Australia should feel very pleased that, as we are on the cutting edge of many of these high tech areas, we can also have facilities that will support the testing and development in those cases. Let me assure the honourable member that what he has read is not correct and that the rights of the Maralinga Tjarutja will be protected at all times.

#### COMMONWEALTH-STATE HOUSING AGREEMENT

**Mr BECKER (Hanson):** Does the Minister of Housing and Construction still expect a new Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement to be finalised by the middle of this month and, if so, in the negotiations what action is he taking to ensure that the agreement does not lead to an increase to 10 years in the waiting time for public housing in South Australia?

The Minister was quoted in the *Advertiser* of 30 June as saying that the new agreement would be reached by mid August. Information I have obtained from the Commonwealth Department of Housing indicates that the basis upon which negotiations have been proceeding will result in total Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement grants available for new public housing declining from \$66 million this financial year to \$26 million in 1992-93.

It is forecast that this will allow only 275 new Housing Trust homes to be built in 1992-93 compared with the current 2 000 houses being either bought or built by the trust. The trust's waiting list is about 45 000 families which is easily the longest on a per capita basis of any State. However, it is estimated that the reductions the Commonwealth is proposing under the new agreement will mean that the current waiting time of between four and seven years could become 10 years by 1993.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** It surprises me that, when the author wrote that question, he forgot to tell the member for Hanson that it was Liberal Party policy at Federal and State level to abolish the current Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. Liberal Party policy pledges to abolish the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. The Liberal Party is inconsistent on all other policy matters, but four spokesmen and two leaders at the Federal level have been consistent on housing policy, in that they have pledged to abolish the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement and to take the public housing aspect out of any form of assistance and to give it to home purchase assistance. I would have thought that even the member for Hanson knew that. Obviously, the author of that question was aware of that fact, but perhaps wanted to make the member for Hanson look a fool.

I often think that before he asks these questions, I should give the member for Hanson briefings on my press releases or newspaper reports about what I have said. To its credit, the Commonwealth Government has tried to address the problem of those States that have not used correctly the funds allocated under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. Queensland is a typical example of a State's not using public housing money efficiently or correctly.

Let me say again that this State has not been charged with that sort of behaviour—we use the money efficiently. The Federal Government decided that it would not pursue the line of argument promoted by Mr Downer when he was the Liberal Party spokesman on housing but, rather, it committed itself to just over \$1 billion for public housing for this financial year on the understanding that there must be a commitment by all State Governments to public housing in line with the agreement.

The member for Hanson takes the best figures, when we were using maximum funds from the Loan Council in 1985-86 compared with what we shall get this year, but he does not tell the House that the funding that we shall get this year in straight-out grants—not loans—will, in the long term, overcome the debt that we have in public housing—the debt that this State shares with every other State in the Commonwealth. That is one of the reasons why the Federal Government has said that the States and the Federal Government need to sit down and consider where we are going, because all States not only have a deficit caused by reduced rents, but are paying out more in loan repayments than they are able to put into capital works programs.

The first move will be ratified some time this year by the Federal Parliament and all the States within the Commonwealth. I assure the member for Hanson and his Leader that I understand the Liberal States will be prepared to ratify the new agreement after the negotiations, which are chaired by this State, have taken place. There will be a long-term commitment to public housing. There will not be a long-term debt which will cripple all State housing authorities. In the long term, those who seek accommodation in the public housing sector will get greater benefit than they are getting now.

I should like to pick up one point that the member for Hanson made about per capita—the number of people on the Housing Trust waiting list in this State compared with other States. The facts speak for themselves. Public housing in South Australia is not a stigma. Those who seek accommodation in the public sector get good quality housing in which they can live with dignity. They are not regarded as second-class citizens, except when the member for Hanson goes off his brain and starts accusing people of being bad tenants—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** In the other States they are subjected to poor quality housing, and, subsequently, they do not put their names on the Housing Trust waiting list. We are proud of our Housing Trust program; and we are proud of what the Government has put into housing. In partnership with the Federal Government over the next 10 years a Labor Government in this State will provide good quality housing for those who wish to go into public housing.

#### BELAIR PARK GOLF COURSE

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Mitchell):** Will the Minister for Environment and Planning assure me and the House that public access to the Belair Park golf course will continue and, further, that such access will be at rates comparable with other metropolitan public courses? An article in the *News* of 1 August sets out details in respect of the signing of a purchase agreement between the existing leaseholder and a Malaysian company, Cheng and Associates. Since that reportage, a number of my constituents have approached me and raised this matter.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I thank the honourable member for his question and give him an absolute assurance

that the Belair Park golf course will remain in public usage. I do so quite categorically because the lease conditions—and I stress the word 'lease'; when one talks about purchase, it is not the purchase of the golf course but the purchase of the lease—are being laid down by my department, which will ensure that the course remains affordable to the public and in public use. In doing so, I think it important to highlight the fact that the department has received numerous complaints about the condition of the course. Therefore it will come as no surprise to members that the new lessee proposes to improve the facilities and the condition of the golf course. That may necessitate a modest increase in the fees that are charged. However—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I am sorry, but obviously some members opposite are either deaf or incapable of understanding my answer, which I will repeat. The conditions of the lease include the following:

Rates for the use of the golf course will be regulated to ensure that they are comparable with other metropolitan public golf courses.

I do not believe that that could be clearer or more simple in terms of being able to be understood. It is the intention of my department and of this Government that the Belair Park golf course will remain a public golf course.

#### KANGAROO ISLAND GAS SUPPLIES

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** Will the Minister of Marine explain why the sailing ship *Falie* had to be hired today to take liquid petroleum gas (LPG) to Kangaroo Island so that the recently commissioned meatworks can remain open for business? I understand that the *Falie* has been commissioned to do this because of a union ban on shipping the gas on the *Island Seaway*. I am informed that the Kangaroo Island meatworks runs on LPG delivered from the mainland by the *Island Seaway*. Of course, the meatworks needs a reliable supply in order to remain open. I understand that it is not now getting this.

Recently, the meatworks has twice run out of LPG and had to shut down. I understand that, because union officials will not allow the *Island Seaway* to carry the amount of bulk LPG required by the meatworks, arrangements had to be made today to put the LPG on the *Falie*. This action triples the cost of the shipment to the meatworks. I understand that this ban has been imposed even though the *Island Seaway* is equipped to carry the LPG and that, if this situation is not sorted out and the *Island Seaway* permitted to carry the gas, the meatworks will have to drastically curtail its operations, working only one week in two, even though it has been commissioned for only one month.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** The honourable member should understand a couple of things about the supply of gas to Kangaroo Island. The *Island Seaway* makes one trip a fortnight carrying flammable fluids and liquids to Kangaroo Island.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** One trip a fortnight—a special trip on which, for safety reasons, it carries no passengers. I should have thought that the aspiring shadow Minister of Transport—if the honourable member still is that—would understand that.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister has the call—no-one else.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** When I was advised of the delicate problem the abattoir has with the supply of gas, I asked why it did not obtain more gas cylinders.

**Mr Ingerson:** They can't get them over there.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** This smart member opposite thinks that they cannot get them over there. The reality is that the contractor who owns the cylinders does not want to buy any more because they cost a fair bit.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** I don't know why he doesn't want to do it—you ask him. It is a free enterprise business—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister will resume his seat. It was my understanding that the Minister was giving a genuine answer to a genuine question. I ask the Minister not to respond to out-of-order interjections from members of the Opposition and I ask members of the Opposition not to make those out-of-order interjections. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** Apparently, the contractor does not want to buy any more cylinders. However, there is another problem with transporting LPG to Kangaroo Island, and that relates to the special purpose-built trailer. Perhaps the honourable member does not understand that one of the difficulties in carrying the gas is that the containers are too high on the trailers as they are currently built. That causes instability when the ship encounters rough weather. We are having investigated a design for a gas cylinder with such a low centre of gravity that it will be suitable for travelling on the *Island Seaway*.

I want to comment for the benefit of the member for Mitcham regarding the *Island Seaway*. Apparently his understanding of ships is such that he believes that they ought to travel like his car travels on the road. He does not understand that there are waves on water that cause ships to toss and turn. He still does not understand that. He thinks that they ought to be in a millpond all the time. He does not understand that wind occasionally causes the sea to rise, which in turn causes a ship to rock. He obviously does not understand that.

The member for Victoria does not understand, although he walks around in ponds of water, that all ferries which operate in the same manner as the *Island Seaway* encounter the same difficulty. This is not a problem isolated to South Australia: this problem is common to all roll-on roll-off vessels.

Further, there has been a campaign of denigration of the *Island Seaway*, and I will refer to only two instances. I have been advised that a certain member of this House telephoned the press about a mutiny on the *Island Seaway*. Another member told the press about people who had their arms broken on the *Island Seaway* when it was at sea the previous night. But the ship had not even been at sea that night and there had been calm weather as well. Those are the sorts of stories that members opposite are putting around in respect of the *Island Seaway*.

Let me get back to the honourable member who asked the question: perhaps he is dumb and did not hear me the first time. Perhaps he should have his ears cleaned out. I said that there were arrangements for the *Island Seaway* to travel once a fortnight carrying flammable liquids. As the aspiring shadow Minister (and the member for Bragg might not be shadow Minister soon, because the shadow ministry might change), the honourable member should understand that there is only one trip a fortnight when flammable liquids are taken to Kangaroo Island. This is done for safety reasons. The member for Bragg ought to know that the abattoirs is chewing up more gas than there are gas cylinders

on Kangaroo Island, and the contractors do not want to buy anymore.

**An honourable member:** That's not true.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** That is the advice that I have received from people on Kangaroo Island. Certainly, I would rather rely on the people of Kangaroo Island who know about the situation rather than on Liberal politicians who ring up newspaper reporters with wrong advice about broken arms and mutinies when these things never happen.

## WYE INDUSTRIES

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Spence):** Will the Minister of State Development and Technology say what assistance the Department of State Development and Technology has given to Wye Industries to commercialise its CFC-free foam product? Wye Industries is a locally based firm that has developed a product, Kixotal, that can be used to manufacture foam products which are free of CFCs and which have a high level of fire resistance. This product reportedly has potentially huge overseas markets, but the company has recently complained that it may have to sell the rights to manufacture overseas because of a lack of interest in Australia. The company has also complained that the Department of State Development and Technology in South Australia has given it little assistance.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** I thank the honourable member for his question. I note that the member for Mitcham interjected in response to the last statement by the member for Spence, 'That would be true', that is, in terms of the accusation that little assistance had been given by the Department of State Development and Technology. In fact, that is quite untrue, and the member for Mitcham would do well to look much more closely at the considerable work that the Department of State Development and Technology does for South Australia before making such throw-away lines as that. The reality is that in the past couple of weeks the department has been having significant meetings with Wye Industries to assist it in trying to find an investor or investors to meet the financial requirements of the company.

I might say that in the process of that it was only last Friday that the Department of State Development and Technology received a detailed business plan based on the freon free aspect of the product, and officers of the Department of State Development and Technology will be using that document as a basis for further talks with investors.

The situation is that the company is keen to expand manufacturing operations in South Australia of a product that is very exciting indeed and to see that an investor provides funds to enable it to stay in this State. We, as a Government, are keen to see that, too. But, ultimately, the appeal for any investor or group of investors to invest in that company must depend on the attractiveness of the total package of the product and the company's financial and existing equity arrangements.

That has been happening over the past 10 days. One might believe that there had been no previous contact between the department and that company. Indeed, if one listened to the member for Mitcham, one might believe that; and if one listened to the Hon. Ian Gilfillan in another place, one might believe that, given his comments in tonight's *News*, which states:

The Bannon Government has been accused of 'inexplicable, amazing neglect' in not offering venture capital to a local company . . .

The Hon. Ian Gilfillan then goes on to say that the Government is showing 'a lack of vision and environmental responsibility'. What the honourable member then goes on to say is that we should simply be providing the entire \$4 million that is needed as venture capital by this company to help it get off the ground.

The Government's response has been that it is the task for investors to make that assessment. By the Hon. Ian Gilfillan's own admission, that there are investors in other parts of the world who are interested in this company, the facts must be pursued with respect to other South Australian investors, and they are the targets that we as a Government are addressing. In fact, as early as August 1987 some financial assistance was provided by the Department of State Development and Technology under the South Australian Development Fund to that company to allow it to purchase equipment to commence production earlier than had otherwise been anticipated.

Then, in November 1987 the Investment Attraction Branch of the Department of State Development and Technology worked with the company to seek an equity partner to provide extra working capital for the company. In early 1988 Mr Alan Truscott invested significantly in the company, and that is also mentioned in today's *News* article. We understood that that investment provided for the sufficient financial needs of the company to commercialise its products for the foreseeable future.

We were advised that that was not the case towards the end of 1988, and again officers of the Department of State Development and Technology worked with the company to find alternative investors to provide additional capital to the company. But, in January this year we were advised that significant discussions were under way with a financial investor, and the company requested the department not to proceed with any further inquiries seeking alternative investors. From the department's point of view, our activities were put on hold, and that remained the situation until two weeks ago.

So, for the Hon. Mr Ian Gilfillan to take this cheap sideswipe at the work of the Government and the work of the Department of State Development and Technology is quite inaccurate. He should check his facts. When we were advised that there was still a need for investor capital, we were back in there helping that company. It has not been the practice of this Government to invest large sums of money as venture capital in these activities. We believe that that avenue should be taken up by other investors and that what Governments should be doing is seeking to facilitate those investments taking place. It is upon that that we are still working actively.

#### CRESTWIN CORPORATION LIMITED

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** I direct my question to the Minister of Marine. Has the Government received approaches from the Melbourne-based Crestwin Corporation Limited to establish a marina at Marino Rocks? Is this the same company which, according to a report in the Melbourne *Herald* of 6 July, faces winding up procedures in the Victorian Supreme Court, has debts of at least \$87 million and has been delisted on the Melbourne Stock Exchange? If so, what action is the Government taking to ensure the *bona fides* of Crestwin and when does the Minister expect a final decision to be made about this proposed development?

This question is asked following a public meeting on the site of the proposed marina last Friday, convened by the

endorsed Liberal Party candidate for Bright (Mr Wayne Matthew) and attended by the Leader of the Opposition.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. I hope that we will not have too much of this over the next few weeks. The honourable member for Heysen.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The temporary member for Bright, who happened to attend the meeting, would be aware of the serious concerns expressed by some local residents about the lack of any public statement by the Government on the marina proposal. The local residents say that they are completely in the dark and want to hear from the Government about what is proposed.

**The Hon. R.J. GREGORY:** I thank the honourable member for his question, but it has nothing to do with me: it is not even in my portfolio. He should ask his Leader, because I understand that at the recent boat show (and the member for Heysen was there) the Leader said that they would build the marina down there.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the House to come to order so that the honourable member for Hartley can get a fair go. The honourable member for Hartley.

#### LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

**Mr GROOM (Hartley):** Is the Minister of Employment and Further Education aware of proposals by the South Australian College of Advanced Education to curtail languages and interpreting and translating courses at the college and, if he is, what influence can the State Government exert in respect of such proposals? I am informed that clerical staff with language expertise has been reduced from three positions to only one, that the Graduate Diploma in Community Languages was not allowed an intake in 1989, and that there are no prospects for 1990. I further understand that some academic staff who are on contract have been told that their contracts will not be renewed in 1990. I also understand that there are moves by the college administration to dissolve the School of Languages as an administrative academic unit and for the language staff to be assimilated by the School of Humanities and Social Sciences. This has had the consequence of a specialist program in the Bachelor of Education (Secondary Languages), a specialist field, being discontinued from 1990 onwards in favour of a generalist BA degree, which has led to the BA (Interpreting and Translating) course being under threat. I am told of a new proposal from the college's School of Languages to offer some form of rationalised course to meet changing needs. The Bachelor of Applied Sciences has also been blocked by the college administration.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I thank the honourable member for his question. Indeed, his concern in this area is well known, as is that of our colleague in another place (Hon. Mario Feleppa), who has also raised this matter with me. Members of the Italian, Greek and Vietnamese Australian communities have also brought this matter to my attention in recent weeks. I share with the member for Hartley, with our colleague in another place and with the communities their concern about this issue because it is fundamental. It has been important to this Government, and my predecessor has made clear to all institutions, that languages are a major Government priority in tertiary education in this State. I have restated that as a commitment of this Government. The honourable member has been approached by constituents in his district with expressions of concern about



the possible impact of this matter on his community within the language program of this State. I personally feel that it is a matter that must be addressed urgently by the college.

In outlining my powers in this matter, may I say that I have been informed by the college that the associate diploma in interpreting and translating in Greek and Italian will be suspended in 1990 because of the lack of demand. I now have in front of me a program in respect of which I will take up the matter formally with the college. I have already raised the matter informally, but I intend to make a formal approach. I will also ask the South Australian Institute of Languages and the Office of Tertiary Education how best to address this matter so that we do not see what the results that the honourable member has outlined—the possible collapse of the language program within the college.

It is fundamental that we see these language programs maintained and in fact enhanced because, as a Government, we are committed, as are a number of other institutions, to further enrich language programs in this State. This Government is firmly committed to this policy and will continue it in these institutions. As an example, the Government and my predecessor made funds available over the past three years to implement a language program seeking to have it as a priority within the arrangements of the college. Unfortunately, however, SACAE has not seen it possible for its administration to commit itself to the establishment of that language program—the teaching of Vietnamese. That is worrying, because the Government made a firm commitment and set funds aside for that very purpose.

At this stage the college is still indicating that it cannot commit resources for Vietnamese studies in 1990. That worries me greatly, and I am sure that members share my concern. My powers in this area are basically to approve college courses but not to require specific courses to be run. In other words, I have no powers to direct colleges to run specific courses. The Italian, Greek, and Vietnamese communities in South Australia support me in this matter, and we must ask the colleges, especially SACAE, to review their position. As an overall policy we must see that these language programs are reinstated, as a commitment has been given by the State Government and there is also a continued commitment on existing programs, because it could lead to serious deficiencies in our supply of language translators, teachers, and the programs of growth that are supported by the communities through their own general community education programs.

Therefore, it is important that we see that cooperation exists between all the institutions. We must consider carefully the demands for language teaching in this State and to assess them carefully. That would be an important input to the discussions that I intend to have with the South Australian College of Advanced Education.

I thank the honourable member for his question, and I am sure that the community will appreciate his raising it in this House. I am also sure that those members of the House who are vitally concerned with this issue will be interested to know the progress of my discussions with the South Australian College of Advanced Education and with the South Australian Institute of Languages, as well as the planning on which we need to embark in order to ensure that these language programs are continued in this State.

### MILK BOTTLES

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** Will the Minister for Environment and Planning review her eager and blanket endorsement of a proposal by the member for Fisher for

the return of the milk bottle, in view of the information supplied by Farmers' Union Foods Limited, the State's major milk supplier? Recently, the member for Fisher advocated the return of the use of milk bottles, and the Minister eagerly, and with a blanket agreement, said that she thought it was a great idea. The information supplied by the State's major milk supplier shows that milk keeps better in a cardboard carton, taking almost six hours to lose 50 per cent of its valuable vitamin C content when exposed to sunlight, compared to nine minutes in a bottle. Secondly, the information supplied showed that, when milk bottles were taken off the Adelaide market 18 months ago, less than 4 per cent of the population was buying bottled milk and that its withdrawal prompted fewer than a dozen complaints to the major processors.

Milk is one of the basics for most families, especially young families. As a result of the high cost of living, a return to bottled milk would significantly increase the price of milk for the average family.

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I find that this question insults the serious issues facing this community. This is the first Opposition question to me as Minister for Environment and Planning. We face issues such as soil degradation, water salinity and environmental pollution, but what is the first question which the Opposition asks me as the Minister responsible for environment and planning in this State?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** I note that the member for Coles has to interject—she must share the embarrassment felt by some of her colleagues. I am happy to answer this question, but I believe it is important that the people of South Australia understand the kind of commitment, interest and priorities that the Opposition puts on questions that are vital to the preservation and conservation of the environment of South Australia.

I believe that the statements implied by this question say everything and the community will judge the Opposition accordingly. I am quite pleased to answer this question and to set the record straight. In response to some information released by KESAB about the level of pollution in this State which could be directly attributed to milk and fruit juice cartons that are idly discarded into the environment and end up in places like the Patawalonga (and I hope that the member for Morphett will at least acknowledge that is what happens), the member for Fisher attempted to canvass the problem.

Let me remind members that milk cartons and other cardboard cartons are not biodegradable, so they remain in the environment wherever they are thrown or washed by stormwater or anything else. Let me just set the record straight (which is something the Opposition will not like) by stating that the member for Fisher, in his interest and support for the preservation of the environment (which he has demonstrated over a long period), sought to raise for public debate the issue of whether we should consider a return to the use of milk bottles. I would have thought that, in a democracy and in an informed community, it shows a great degree of responsibility for a member of this Parliament to raise an issue and say to the community, 'Tell me what your views are. Do you think that we should return to the use of milk bottles?'

The honourable member spoke to a number of radio stations which then conducted phone polls. All the recipients to the polls supported a return to the use of milk bottles as an environmental measure. Now we come to my part in this and, once again, if the honourable member wants to quote me, would he do so accurately? When approached by the media I said that I welcomed the initi-

ative of the member for Fisher in raising this environmentally sensitive issue and that I would be delighted to look into—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:** Mr Speaker, I find the out of order interjections by the member for Hanson really quite destructive. I can assure this Parliament that the member for Fisher acted completely on his own initiative. I knew nothing about this matter until I was approached by the media and was asked for my response. It would be a disgrace for me as the Minister responsible for the environment not to say that I would look into this suggestion that the member for Fisher was canvassing merely for public discussion.

If the Opposition believes it can gain some kind of cheap political point scoring in this matter, it is very much mistaken. I can assure the House that the feedback I have had on this topic is that the community welcomes the fact that the member for Fisher is not only environmentally sensitive but also prepared to look laterally at some of the questions relating to the environment.

#### ROSEWATER-GILLMAN RAIL LOOP

**Mr De LAINE (Price):** Will the Minister of Transport consider closing the Rosewater-Gillman railway loop near Port Adelaide? This short section of a little-used line seems to have outlived its usefulness and requires maintaining four level crossings, one of which claimed the lives of two elderly people last year. The Leader of the Opposition believes that this loop is in his electorate, but I can assure him that it is located in the electorate of Price. Trains can use the Gillman marshalling line as an alternative to this loop.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** As the member for Price is aware, that line to which he referred is an Australian National line that primarily is used for the carriage of freight. It is an access line to Le Fevre Peninsula's industrial area and to Outer Harbor. Whilst I will take up the honourable member's suggestion and discuss the matter with my Federal counterpart, I point out that it is highly unlikely that Australian National will close this line, given the degree of its use.

Whilst all members would regret the deaths of those two people, I believe it would be productive if I asked Australian National whether there are any other safety measures which can reasonably be taken on that particular line. I will also ask Australian National to ascertain whether crossing signs or other such matters require any upgrading. However, one of the great strengths of this area that is well represented by the member for Price is that, besides being a residential area, it is also an industrial area. That combination makes it a great community. Without the port and its industry, the area would not have the character and social cohesion that it has. I am sure the member for Price agrees with me when I say that, compared with dormitory suburbs, this is a far better area in which to live. This issue is serious. I will have some discussions with my Federal counterpart and with Australian National to ascertain whether, at the very least, the safety measures on that line can be upgraded.

#### SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional committees.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from 3 August. Page 35.)

**Ms GAYLER (Newland):** I have pleasure in seconding the motion that the draft Address in Reply, as read, be adopted. I express my condolences to the families of those former members of this Parliament who passed away before this session was opened. The Government's program for this parliamentary session, announced by the Governor, is designed to launch South Australia confidently and competently into the decade of the 1990s. We plan a future with two key foundations: sustainable and sensitive economic growth and a genuine stewardship of our fragile natural environment.

We will be building on the advances and achievements of the 1980s through responsible caring and stable Government. The groundwork has been laid for the State's future and the opportunities opening up in our more competitive diversified community and economy with the work force better educated and equipped for a technologically advanced future.

Our view of the future recognises that South Australia is a very special State with a quality of life which stands out from the rest. We are not racked by the controversy, division and disruption which plagues other States. Ours remains a great place to raise a family, and the special qualities which make Adelaide such a livable city have been preserved and enhanced, and in Premier Bannon we have the sound and responsible leadership to see the State well placed for the future.

The economic strategy is progressive and futuristic. Education, employment and training rightly have a prominent role to play. The well developed range of community and public services which contribute to our quality of life are given added emphasis in the program foreshadowed. The further development of our public services includes the boost to our public hospitals, child-care places again extended to support families with young children and our housing construction program given further impetus.

The State Government has recognised the pressures on the family budget resulting from exorbitant home loan interest rates. Some Governments and the Liberal Opposition locally have had a lot to say in the press and on television, but words and promises are not enough; and the Leader of the Opposition was smartly rebuffed by his Federal colleagues on his proposed housing assistance measure. His phoney State election campaign was matched by his phoney home loan relief sham.

While the Opposition is casting around with proposals, the Bannon Government has delivered with a tangible and vital safety net of interest-free financial support for families under pressure, especially in areas like Tea Tree Gully with a large proportion of young families with home loans. The home payment assistance of up to \$50 per week offered since March this year means that, if and when families need help, it is there. It is not some vague promise for the future. Of the 2 339 inquiries for that assistance, about 80 per cent of those families are eligible for the relief. It is important that that scheme acknowledges the unfair burden of high interest rates on ordinary families. The protection plan is crucial until we see a substantial fall in home loan interest rates.

The second important measure of concern to new home buyers is the announcement today in this Parliament of the significant assistance to first home buyers as a result of the tax relief package that the Premier announced. The item of

assistance which stands out for young home buyers is in respect of stamp duty. As of midnight tonight stamp duty for houses costing up to \$80 000, will be abolished for first home buyers. That exemption means that families paying up to \$80 000 for their first home will pay no stamp duty. It will save families up to \$1 050 on their initial outlay. Families will not have to borrow as much to meet the deposit gap, and therefore they will save on their repayments. Depending on how this benefit is used over the term of a loan, families could achieve significant savings in their home purchase.

The proposal means a lot to first home buyers in the Tea Tree Gully area. Our median house price is about \$85 000. Until today the stamp duty on an \$85 000 home was \$1 225. The new duty, after today's announcement, will be \$175—a total saving to first home buyers of \$1 050. It is a tax relief measure that will be very warmly welcomed by those entering the home purchase market for the first time. At a time when families are facing hard decisions about first home buying, the Government has acted to bring stamp duty significantly down, and many young home buyers will pay no stamp duty at all on their first home.

The Government's legislative program contains a number of vital initiatives in the fight against crime. When it comes to cracking down on crime, there can be no soft options. Police powers in dealing with serious crimes will be strengthened, and extra measures will be taken to ensure that the profits from crime can indeed be confiscated. This represents a real financial deterrent to those lured by the prospect of fast money.

I am particularly pleased with two radical measures to deal more effectively with young offenders. Juvenile crime often begins with senseless neighbourhood vandalism and wilful damage to property—people's letter boxes, fences, vehicles, local schools and community assets like the public transport system and phone boxes. It may seem petty, but I know from repeated cases in parts of two of my suburbs—Banksia Park and Fairview Park—that that kind of vandalism and wilful damage is very disturbing, particularly to the elderly—and it is often a handful of troublemakers repeatedly offending. They are often involved in under-age drinking, which spurs them on. If it is not tackled when the vandals are teenagers, they are the ones who are likely to graduate to more serious crimes like arson, housebreaking and car theft.

The Government's announcement that young offenders will come under the community service order scheme, so that they can make good the damage that they do, will be widely supported. Where the Children's Court thinks it appropriate, the young offender under supervision can repair the damage to the local school, the vandalism on the public transport system and so on. Alternatively, they can be made to pay up to \$5 000 for the damage that they cause.

The other important element of this reform concerns the parents of young offenders. It is hard to believe that there are parents so lacking in parental responsibility for their children that they virtually laugh off such damage. The Government will tackle this problem by ensuring that the courts have the power to require parents, who have shown that they could not care less, to pay for the damage that their youngsters cause. These new powers for the Children's Court means that young offenders and their parents will have to bear the responsibility for their actions. After all, it is better to be tough on neighbourhood louts when they are young so that they get the right message from the community.

Regular trouble spots near local shops in parts of Tea Tree Gully have meant that nearby residents have been put

through months, sometimes years, of harassment and damage to property from persistent vandals. Provided that they are caught and that the Children's Court judges are serious about applying the new penalties, these reforms will be a big step forward. Two weeks ago I was delighted to hear that my two month campaign to keep our Tea Tree Gully police station as a 24 hour operation was successful. It made no sense to cut back on community policing resources, given the commitment to 24 hour local stations and to putting police officers back on the local beat. I said that my local Tea Tree Gully station would close 'over my dead body'. I am pleased that the ultimate sacrifice on my part will not be necessary.

The Bannon Government has funded the best police to person ratio in Australia with one officer to 399 people in South Australia, 190 new police positions being created since 1983. I welcome the Minister's assurance that the Bannon Government will not be surrendering that pre-eminence, and I look forward to further signs of that in the coming State budget. Also, I am very pleased that in Tea Tree Gully we have been able to expand significantly our Neighbourhood Watch schemes since our first area was declared in 1986. We now have seven Neighbourhood Watch areas, including the suburbs of Banksia Park, Tea Tree Gully and two schemes in Redwood Park. A new scheme is about to commence in St Agnes, and in the new year three schemes will begin in Fairview Park and one in Hope Valley. We want to deter opportunistic housebreakers through improved home security and to crack down on vehicle theft and damage.

I should like to pay tribute to our local Neighbourhood Watch committees, to the area coordinators and zone leaders, and to the police officers who each liaise with an area committee. Their work is appreciated. I especially thank Roger Gordon of the Tea Tree Gully Neighbourhood Watch area, who is also on the State Neighbourhood Watch executive, for his enthusiasm and his efforts. Redwood Park Neighbourhood Watch committee is planning a local awareness day to involve the community. That is a great idea, and I congratulate those people on their initiative.

Tea Tree Gully police tell me that we have one of the lowest crime rates in metropolitan Adelaide. We need to work hard to keep it that way, and to do better. We have much to protect in our area, including our homes, our children's schools and community facilities. By extending Neighbourhood Watch and community crime prevention, we make our city safer and we safeguard our superb lifestyle. Making Tea Tree Gully safe and secure will continue to be a top priority for me.

The Government's legislative program includes a series of important initiatives to protect and improve the environment. Pollution controls are to be strengthened, particularly to deal with marine pollution, and measures to conserve our soil, land and water resources will be given fresh emphasis. Active and progressive fisheries management, which has been a feature of this Bannon Government, will continue. The provisions of the Planning Act dealing with environmental impact assessment are to be recast so that an early indication can be given where development projects are just not on because of environmental considerations.

I am heartened by the explosion of concern for the environment amongst ordinary families, and especially amongst children in our schools. That interest spreads from local issues to matters of worldwide concern such as concern for the ozone layer and for the greenhouse effect. For me there can be no greater challenge for our community than in trying to reverse damage done to our environment. We

have taken too much from the earth and given back too little. Around the world there is growing concern about the vandalism of the earth's ozone layer and the rape of tropical rainforests. With global warming threatening climate changes, rising sea levels and potentially massive crop damage, the greenhouse effect now poses future generations with a threat as great as that of nuclear war.

We cannot wait for future generations to stop the rot: our generation must act. Last month the Prime Minister announced a major program to halt soil degradation and to plant one billion trees. The problems of Murray River salinity will be tackled head on. Mr Hawke also announced that Australia will take the lead internationally in winning agreement to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. These initiatives are welcome, but they are only the beginning. That is why I am pleased that our Premier, John Bannon, has announced that the State Government will plant an additional 100 million trees as part of his ambitious soil conservation strategy. We are keen to involve schools, councils, and service and community clubs in a massive tree planting program, and we need mass community support. This year we have passed important legislation prohibiting the manufacture of chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) which destroy ozone.

There are other important environmental issues. For me, the expansion of our national parks system is crucial. I am proud that, since the Bannon Government was elected, 32 new parks have been created and additions made to 53 existing parks. In 6½ short years we have more than doubled the area of our State committed to parks—from 4.5 million to 11.1 million square hectares. Also, we have taken tough action to preserve native vegetation, stopping 225 000 hectares from being cleared. Our urban environment is also a priority, involving an ambitious greening program, the return of parklands and a genuine commitment, supported by legislation, to preserve our heritage.

I reject the policy of our political opponents who believe in development at any cost. Quite frankly, the Liberals have the wrong priorities. We all know that development is important for jobs, but there must be a balance. New developments must be environmentally sensitive. That is why we have stopped the Jubilee Point, Sellicks Beach and Kingston marina proposals. We are not opposed to marinas, but, to gain support, new developments must be environmentally sensitive.

Since my election in 1985 as local member of Parliament for Tea Tree Gully, I have continued my keen and active support for environmental protection and responsibility locally. In an important victory for Tea Tree Gully residents, I convinced the State Government to make Anstey Hill a park under the National Parks and Wildlife Act, not a massive fun park for private profit. Anstey Hill will be officially declared a park in a few months. Within Parliament I have been active in a number of environmental issues: in pressing for Alar, the chemical sprayed unnecessarily on our fruit, to be banned; in arguing for local heritage protection powers; in urging the prohibition of CFCs—and, I might add, in using non-CFC hairspray myself—and in successfully opposing moves to pass control of the hills face zone to local councils.

I stepped in locally when Houghton village green was threatened with private development, and I negotiated for its retention for future generations. I made plain to Tea Tree Gully council that I will oppose its St Agnes industrial rezoning in the midst of our residential area, and I pressed for the closure of St Agnes dump, with its polluting dust, smell and noise. I convinced the CFS to put an end to the black palls of smoke over our suburbs. The Anstey Hill CFS training with oil burning fires will soon be transferred

to the new Brukunga Training Centre, away from residential areas.

*Members interjecting:*

Ms GAYLER: That is good. When ETSA wanted sweeping powers to brutally lop trees in our suburbs to protect power lines, I was one of the MPs who successfully lobbied for the retention of the trees. Also, I am pressing for the Tea Tree Gully council to change its rubbish collection service to help people recycle household waste. I also believe that we should move to a metropolitan Adelaide recycling plan, with all councils taking part and setting targets for recycling. This would mean less waste, would conserve natural resources and would help protect the environment.

I have also advocated a proposal for identifying environmentally friendly products under a green spot system. I am pleased to note that the Federal Minister for the Arts, Sport, the Environment, Tourism and Territories has decided to raise this issue nationally and look seriously at a national environmental rating scheme for consumer products.

I would now like to turn to a number of superb changes which have taken place in Tea Tree Gully and which give us a bright future indeed. First, I would like to mention the pending completion of the O-Bahn busway to Tea Tree Plaza. The busway will be completed this month and services between the city and Tea Tree Plaza will commence on 20 August, concluding the \$100 million development of our superb rapid transit system to the north-eastern suburbs. The busway will provide a 23 minute trip from Tea Tree Plaza to the city and this brings the City of Tea Tree Gully within close travelling time of the City of Adelaide.

The completion of the O-Bahn system will open up superb new opportunities for Tea Tree Gully. Adjacent to the busway will be the new joint council and Tea Tree Gully TAFE library, and the new TAFE college is to be developed adjacent to the O-Bahn interchange. Construction work on the Tea Tree Gully TAFE college will begin in September 1989 and what is planned is truly a college for the twenty-first century, a college designed with all the appropriate technological aids for fast track learning so that students have the best and most up-to-date learning environment of those in any TAFE college in this State.

The location of the O-Bahn interchange adjacent to the Tea Tree Plaza regional centre opens up superb opportunities for increased office development to create further employment opportunities in and around the regional centre. It is not surprising that the people of the north-eastern suburbs are looking forward keenly and enthusiastically to the opening of the new O-Bahn extension on 20 August.

I would also like to mention some of the other achievements in recent times in Tea Tree Gully. I refer first to Modbury Hospital and the \$8.7 million extensions that were recently completed. I commend the board of the hospital on the way in which it has managed its budget over the past financial year. Modbury Hospital experienced some of the increased demand that other metropolitan hospitals faced, but it handled that increase well. It took an early decision not to cut its patient services, deciding instead that the required trimming of expenditure would be managed by cutting back on non-essential purchases of stores and the like and, with the help of the Health Commission, which provided an additional \$350 000 towards its operating budget, the hospital eventually came in on target. For that achievement I congratulate the Administrator, David Young, and the board and staff of Modbury Hospital.

In education a number of significant achievements have been made in recent times. In the primary sector we have made advances with our focus school initiative where two of my schools—Tea Tree Gully and St Agnes Primary

Schools—operate as focus schools. There are specialties in the 'Awrite' program, which deals with reading, writing and literacy, and the St Agnes Primary School has a science speciality program which is reaching out to other schools in my district, including the Surrey Downs Primary School, to provide primary students with special teaching in those important subjects.

I have also supported and advocated an expansion of the language programs taught in local schools. Child-care services for young children have been improved substantially since 1985 when I was elected. We now have three full-day child-care centres in the Tea Tree Gully area, one of which offers extended care into the evening hours. Most recently the out-of-school hours care program has been extended to four schools in Tea Tree Gully and another, at Surrey Downs Primary School, is to open next term. This program has been welcomed by parents in the work force and people in regular part-time work. They know that their children can remain at the school premises and be cared for in an exciting and well run program. I know that at least two other schools in my district would like to get this out-of-school care program operating and we are trying to get them help to achieve that.

In the area of youth initiatives I would like to mention a number of projects. First, I refer to the Gully Youth Centre. I am pleased that the State Government has supported, by a three year agreement, the operation of the centre and, as we approach the end of the agreement, I am sure that we will see the State Government offering to extend the centre. I hope that the Tea Tree Gully council will be a partner in that and will shortly find the centre a secure site near the Modbury regional centre so that the youth centre can continue in the future.

The AVAGO training scheme for young people is also doing a superb job and I pay tribute to the Federal Government for its financial commitment to that area of youth training. I am pleased to note also that we have finally secured a permanent drug and alcohol worker to work with young people in my area and to also increase our preventive programs to try and assist young people to avoid the pitfalls of drug and alcohol abuse. In the area of homelessness of many young people, many people in the community are not aware that we have two youth centres run under the supervision of a community management committee. Those shelters have been operating successfully for several years and I am pleased to say that they are about to be supplemented by three units, which will be available for young people who are being prepared to take their place back in the general community.

It is important that every local community pursue and contribute to measures to tackle the difficult and serious problem of youth homelessness in South Australia. Regarding housing and employment, I am delighted to hear that house sales in Golden Grove are going very well.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I thank His Excellency the Governor for opening Parliament with his usual dignity. I record my regret at the deaths of the former members of this place—Mr Jim Heaslip, Mr Nicholson, Mr Ryan, Sir Lyell McEwin and Sir Arthur Rymill. I refer particularly to the three past members whom I knew well. Jim Heaslip made a very significant contribution to this State's grain industry. Sir Lyell McEwin and Sir Arthur Rymill were well known to us because they were members of this Parliament when some of us longer serving members were here. Sir Lyell made an outstanding contribution to this State. One can see this not only by his length of parliamentary service but also by the development

of the State in the areas for which he was responsible for many years. Having said that, I find it pretty hard to take the Governor's speech seriously. That, of course, is not a reflection on the Governor—

**Mr Tyler:** It is.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** It is not a reflection on the Governor. He only reads the speech that is written for him by the Government. I remember that some years ago the Governor of New South Wales refused to read the speech. We all know that the Governor does not write it.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** When was that?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Does not that former Minister know that the Government is responsible for the speech and that the political gurus, particularly coming up to an election, vet it? Listen to what the speech says:

My Government is well prepared for the demands which are emerging as part of the economic and social pattern which will shape all our lives into the last decade of the twentieth century.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** What he means is that we have been under seige for the past three years.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Yes. The speech continues:

My Government is working to achieve a confident, vibrant economy which reflects the interests of a progressive, outward-looking multicultural community.

A vibrant economy? I intend talking about the vibrancy of this economy. Our economy is vibrating so much that it has the shakes! Later I will refer to a few economic indicators which show how difficult it is to take this speech seriously. I now turn my attention to paragraph 12 of the speech, which states:

In a wider area of development, my Government's work to realise the potential of the non-metropolitan regions of South Australia will be enhanced as part of a regional development policy this financial year.

All the rural incentives that were operating until about 18 months ago were removed by this Government, which has just presided over the closure of the largest employer in my electorate, the mill at Lobethal, because it was gazumped by the Victorian Government which offered a package with a series of incentives that this Government did not have the wit to contemplate. This Government has done absolutely nothing to foster activity in the rural community and the whole South Australian community is hard-pressed. The case of the Lobethal mill bears testimony to that. Further, the speech states:

Home ownership remains a realistic goal for South Australians—

Who is kidding whom? Further on, the speech states that as a result of high interest rates or other economic pressures through the Interest Rate Protection Plan and the Mortgage Relief Scheme the community will be able to afford housing. When one looks at the number of people who took up the Government's offer for deferred interest payments one realises what a flop that scheme turned out to be. This speech has a rather green tinge to it.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** Green?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Yes, green. Obviously that is the flavour of the month. The speech waxes lyrical on green issues, it seems to me, because the greens have the balance of power in Tasmania. There could be a link there.

I now refer to one indicator which shows where we have been travelling since we have had this Bannon Labor Government, and that is in relation to the operations of ETSA. For a long time the Premier has wanted the public to believe that this State's ETSA tariffs were about the average for the Australian States. In fact, I heard him recite this 'fact' at the annual dinner of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry about 18 months ago. He was reassuring the employers

at that function that all was well in South Australia and that, in relation to ETSA tariffs, we were about mid-range.

This year a publication, from the Industries Assistance Commission, examined the Australian electricity industry. This publication, dated 17 March 1989 and named as 'Information Paper No. 6', gives the complete lie to any claims that South Australia's electricity tariff is mid-range. In fact, page A.9 contains a graph of all the States' electricity tariffs. When this Government came to office in 1982 South Australia had the second lowest average cost of electricity, according to the IAC, whose experts examined all the evidence, statistical and otherwise (Tasmania being way below the other States because it has some hydro-electric power). However, by 1987 this State was and continues to be at the top of the range for electricity tariffs.

**Mr Groom:** What are you—

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I suggest that the honourable member get hold of this excellent publication because it cannot be refuted; it tells us that this State has the highest ETSA tariffs. I would think that the hard-pressed householders who are getting record water bills and now record ETSA bills, when compared with the rest of the nation, would find my statement quite believable. Page D.2 states:

However, New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia have all experienced significant productivity growth since 1984-85. In contrast, total factor productivity in South Australia and in Tasmania has declined in recent years.

I repeat: South Australia's productivity has declined. Page E.2 (an appendix) discusses the possibility of the South Australian interconnection link. We know perfectly well that in South Australia the Trades and Labor Council refuses to allow anything but this opportunity-cost electricity to come via that link. The IAC report suggests that a study should be carried out, if we are interested in the economics of electricity and in filling that line up. Page E.2 states:

This interconnection, to be completed in 1990, will be capable of power transfers of 500 megawatts from Victoria and New South Wales to South Australia, and 200 to 250 megawatts in the reverse direction . . . In addition, studies have also indicated that the interconnection would enable a reduction in system reserve capacity of 250 megawatts, while enabling the maintenance of existing levels of reliability. The South Australian interconnection could allow transfer of base load power on a permanent basis, although the South Australian Government has indicated that it will not be using the interconnection in this way.

And we know why—the Trades and Labor Council will not let the Government even contemplate it. The Labor Party says that it will keep the work in South Australia, but that is false economy. We might keep some electricity jobs in South Australia, but if we continue to maintain the position where we have the highest cost for electricity of any mainland State we will lose probably hundreds of jobs in other industries. To suggest that to save jobs we should keep the work in South Australia, even though we are doing these things inefficiently, gives a completely false picture of how we can benefit the State in the long term. The report of the Industries Assistance Commission continues:

There is some evidence to suggest that such an arrangement could benefit South Australia because its coal reserves consist of low grade coal which are relatively costly for electricity generation. As a consequence, South Australia has become more reliant on natural gas for base load electricity generation. This is considerably more expensive than brown coal in Victoria and black coal in New South Wales. Given the limited life of natural gas from the Cooper Basin and the rising demand for natural gas, fuel problems for South Australia could be accentuated in the near future. In these circumstances, one alternative would be for South Australia to import base load power from the other two States on a permanent basis. The commission is not aware of any detailed analysis of this option by State electricity authorities.

After all, the commission should know, as it suggested earlier, that the Government has turned its back on even

considering that possibility. The report talks about future problems concerning our gas based energy supplies. We should not get too excited about the new unit proposed for Port Augusta. Indeed, activity in South Australia is at such a low level that, rather than the third unit being started within three years as we were told before the 1985 election, it will probably not be needed before the turn of the century unless there is a dramatic turnaround in the fortunes of this State.

That gives the complete lie to the canard for which the Premier has been responsible in his talks to industrialists when he says that our electricity tariffs are in the middle range. Indeed, our tariffs are the highest of any of the mainland States of Australia, and the evidence from the Industries Assistance Commission report plainly illustrates that fact. I do not know what the Government intends to do. The member for Adelaide has been advising members of the public in this State to come to him if they cannot pay their water rates. I do not know what he intends to do in this regard, but he says that people should not be tipped out of their homes if they cannot pay their water rates. So, I know to whom I should send the constituents who come to me complaining about high water rates, but who on the Government back bench will listen to the many people who have come to me complaining about high electricity tariffs? After all, I get many queries from people about their ETSA charges.

Some accurate economic indicators have been developed by the member for Mitcham, to whom I pay a tribute because he has an economics degree and knows what he is talking about in this regard.

**Mr Rann:** He's dumb.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Of course, he is not dumb. In fact, it is the member for Briggs who is dumb. He had his white car picked out, and that shows how green he is. The honourable member was chatting up a driver, but his ministerial number did not come up. Indeed, he missed out twice. I would far sooner put my money on the member for Mitcham than on the member for Briggs. I had always had a grudging respect for the commonsense of the Labor Party, but the member for Briggs, who was so far ahead of himself that he chatted up a ministerial driver to see which ministerial car he would have, was passed over, and it ill behoves him to have a crack at the member for Mitcham, who has a bright future.

The member for Mitcham has published indicators that clearly show where the State has been heading, although heaven only knows where South Australia will get to if Labor continues in office. However, the indicators produced by the member for Mitcham show where South Australia is as a result of Labor's being in office for the past seven years and for 20 of the past 25 years. For example, whereas the Australian population has increased by 9.2 per cent since 1982, the increase in this State has been only 6.1 per cent.

Population projections based on ABS figures indicate clearly that, whereas the other mainland States will enjoy a significant population growth, South Australia is destined to enter the next century with a minimal, if not a zero, population growth. I recall the Premier, when he was part of the doom and gloom duo when in Opposition, saying that population projections were one of the most significant indicators to show South Australia's economic prospects, so on this occasion he must agree with me that my use of these criteria clearly show that South Australia is not progressing. Indeed, in terms of population trends since 1985, South Australia's population has increased by only 3.5 per

cent compared to 5.2 per cent for Australia, our increase being the lowest of any of the mainland States.

**Ms Gayler:** What are the latest figures?

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** These are the latest figures. Since 1982, employment in South Australia has increased by 16 per cent compared to 22 per cent for Australia and, since 1985, employment in this State has increased by 10 per cent compared to 12 per cent for Australia. Indeed, the South Australian percentage for increase of employment is the lowest of the mainland States.

As to unemployment, the number of persons unemployed in South Australia has decreased by 17 per cent since 1982 compared to 27 per cent for Australia, with only Queensland of the mainland States being lower than this State. Since 1985, the number of persons unemployed in South Australia has decreased by 3 per cent compared to 17 per cent for Australia, the South Australian percentage being the lowest of the mainland States. It is interesting to note that youth unemployment currently stands at 17 per cent in this State compared to 14 per cent for Australia as a whole.

These statistics are the consistent picture throughout the life of this Labor Government. They tell the real story and show how stagnant the South Australian economy has become. Since 1985, overtime hours worked per employee in South Australia have decreased by 24 per cent compared to an increase of 16 per cent for Australia over that period. Indeed, our figure in that regard is the lowest of any State. Since 1982, dwelling approvals for South Australia have increased by 39 per cent compared to 103.8 per cent for Australia, our figure being the lowest of any State. Since 1985, dwelling approvals for South Australia have increased by 27 per cent compared to 59 per cent for Australia, the South Australian figure being the lowest of the mainland States. Indeed, since 1982 the percentage increase in dwelling approvals in this State has been little more than one-third of the Australian percentage increase.

No wonder that we have a queue miles long waiting for public housing and that subsidised rents for such accommodation have increased dramatically. Indeed, the Government pays about \$90 million to subsidise rents and talks about it as though it was something of which to be proud, but it only means that the South Australian public housing tenants are so poor compared to the rest of Australia that they must have their rents paid for them. This indicates clearly that many home dwellers in South Australia are in desperate straits when the State has to pay their rent. Surely that is nothing to be proud of: it merely indicates that the position continues to deteriorate dramatically.

South Australia has the worst record of any of the mainland States concerning motor vehicle registrations, and the same applies as regards taxation. South Australia is the highest taxed State in Australia. Since 1982, State and local government charges in South Australia have increased by 56 per cent compared to a 44 per cent increase for Australia. Since 1985, such charges have increased by 28 per cent in this State compared to 23 per cent for Australia, so our figure is well above the Australian average.

We are in the doldrums. It is all very well for the Premier to announce today a series of measures which he hopes will help to re-elect his Party, but that will not wash. We went through this same exercise in 1985, but I suggest to the honourable member that the political climate is quite different now. This Government has been in office for seven years and it has run out of credibility; it is not believed. If members opposite do not detect a mood in the community that it is time we had a change, they must have their ears closed. I suggest that they look at Mr Cameron's polls or whoever does the job for the Labor Party now. Not only

backbenchers but also a number of Ministers would probably be feeling particularly shaky at this time. The grand announcement made by the Premier today will not wash.

In 1985 we were told that during its term of office the Government would solve our economic problems, but the fact is that it has failed miserably. The Government's record is one of abject failure, as demonstrated by the indicators provided by the member for Mitcham. Environment issues seem to be gaining a great deal of prominence. I refer to an article by Jacquie Gillen in the *Council and Community*, which is a local government publication. In that article I believe Ms Gillen makes a very sensible statement.

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** She's a very sensible person.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The honourable member knows her better than I do, but I simply read the article which is headed 'Development and Conservation'. I can make my judgments only on the basis of what she said in that article. Jacquie Gillen, who is the campaign officer with the Australian Conservation Foundation, draws together the threads of the debate about development and conservation. The article, which I believe is eminently sensible, states:

Our current demise is specifically related to a number of inter-related environmental crises (including over-population, land degradation, pollution of our water, air and soil, greenhouse and the depletion of the ozone layer, amongst others) . . .

The article mentions the most significant aspects of worldwide problems, which really are what we should worry about. We are very vocal about local issues which usually concern local residents but, if we are fair dinkum about the environment, we should address the major problems which relate to the whole world. I agree entirely with this article: Ms Gillen has her scale of priorities completely correct. She further states:

Development and conservation—are they compatible? My answer to this question is four simple words. They have to be.

Of course they do. The people who promote no development are, to quote Doug Anthony, advocating that we go back to the trees. The fact is that development must occur, but it must not permanently damage our environment. So Ms Gillen has recognised the real problems.

I was very delighted to hear on a national radio program that the National Farmers Federation and the Australian Conservation Foundation are to work jointly to solve the problem of land degradation. I thought that this was a promising development but that we would have to wait a long time before we saw that sort of cooperation. However, that process has commenced and, therefore, some sensible recommendations about solving that particular problem should be forthcoming. Over the years, as a result of ignorance, some ideas have been developed. There was nothing wrong with the motives of the people who had to come to this country and carve out a living. We would not be sitting here today if they had not done that, but it is ridiculous to suggest in hindsight that they did something wrong.

It is generally recognised that a problem is developing and escalating, and something has to be done about it. The NFF and the Australian Conservation Foundation are working together. However, I was disturbed to note a comment in the *Environment Conservation News*, which local publication is distributed to all members. This article, which is not compatible with the statements made by Jacquie Gillen, states:

The World Conservation Union, IUCN, will consider what can only be described as a remarkable membership application at its June meeting. The Australian Mining Industry Council have applied for membership, and the Conservation Council of SA has written to the Regional Councillor who will attend the union meeting which decides, strenuously opposing the application. Mining is inherently opposed to conservation—minerals and fos-

sil fuels exist in finite quantities and their mining for use is simply exploitative. In the long-term mining is an activity which cannot be sustained—the resource will ultimately run out (hence the high prices for some minerals). Any rehabilitation activities by the mining industry are tokenistic at best.

I was rather saddened to read those comments, because the fact is that the mining industry will not be shut down. The person who wrote that article probably drives a motor car and turns on the electric light and the electric radiator when they arrive home, but without mining they could not do that. I suggest that one could not carry on normal living in this community for 10 minutes of the day without using the products that result from mining. That is a statement of fact, so it is quite unrealistic to suggest that we cannot have any mining developments in that area.

It seemed that there was a golden opportunity for cooperation to develop—similar to that existing between the NFF and the Australian Conservation Foundation—in relation to the major problem of land degradation in rural communities, but in its publication this local group suggests that, because it does not want any mining, it should not communicate with the mining industry in any way. I do not believe that that attitude helps the environment cause, nor does it further the environment debate. Unless there is some compelling reason for environment groups not to talk to the mining industry, it is my judgment that they should discuss operations with the mining industry with a view to ensuring that those operations are acceptable to the environment groups. If such cooperation does not occur, we will simply have this continuing conflict which has plagued all development proposals in recent years.

I believe that the local group has made a mistake by refusing to enter into any sort of discussion, and I commend Jacquie Gillen for her very sensible comments in relation to the real world in which we live. I also concur with her suggestions about what we must do to ensure that we continue to progress in a fashion which is sympathetic to the environment.

As the world population increases, it will demand more energy and, if that energy is not to come from a mine, I am not sure where it will come from. It is not economically viable to provide that energy other than via the technologies we have developed thus far. Even if we are to have a forest of windmills, we will have to have a fair bit of mining. People demand food and energy. I commend Ms Gillen for her priorities as to population, the greenhouse effect, the ozone layer and all these major world environment problems with which we must come to terms.

**Mr Robertson:** Just pass it on, mate.

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am quite sure that the member for Newland will send her speech to the people to whom she referred. She will have a lot of copies to send to a lot of places. I might even send a copy of this to Ms Gillen. Finally, I refer to an excellent article entitled 'John Bannon's Embarrassing Mirage'. The article, which appears in the *Farmer and Stockowner*, states:

It is not very often that desert travellers have reason to smile broadly at a mirage. But that was the case for Premier John Bannon when he recently opened the giant Olympic Dam uranium, copper and gold project at Roxby Downs, near Woomera. After all, it was Mr Bannon, when Leader of the Opposition, who suggested that the project was a mirage in the desert. Some mirage. The Opposition has ensured over the years that the words will come back to haunt Mr Bannon.

The article then makes some further comments. There is a development, but some in the environment community want to close it even now. I am only sorry that the Premier, in his role as Federal President of the Labor Party, showed a bit more courage—

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

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Gilles):** Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker—

**Mr Lewis (Murray-Mallee):** Hello, Jack. How are you?

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Murray-Mallee will be silent. The honourable member for Gilles.

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** It is my pleasure to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and to follow the previous speaker, the sweet-natured Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

**An honourable member:** And the longest serving.

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** As I am reminded, he is the longest serving Deputy Leader of any Party anywhere in the world.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** I am not surprised, given the contribution he made this afternoon. I thank the Governor for his Address at the opening of this Parliament. I think somebody commented that, without doubt, this will be my last opportunity to take part in a debate on the Address in Reply. I do not want to make this a farewell speech, but I want to reflect on some of the important matters that have taken place during the period that I have been a member of this House.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** It will not take long, I am reminded. Before I do that, I want to compliment the Governor not only on his speech in opening Parliament, but on his contribution as Governor of the State since 1981. He was appointed by a Liberal Government. I have always believed it was the best thing that David Tonkin ever did.

**An honourable member:** The only thing he ever did.

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** I am also reminded that some of us believe it is probably the only thing he ever did. I refer to the first couple of paragraphs of the Governor's speech where he referred to members of this Parliament who had passed away since the opening of the previous Parliament. They were Jim Heaslip, Leslie Nicholson, Paddy Ryan, Sir Lyell McEwin and Sir Arthur Rymill. The only person I did not know was Les Nicholson. The others I knew, even though they were not all contemporaries of mine. Nevertheless, I want to take the opportunity to express my sincere condolences to the relatives and friends of those members who have died since the last opening of Parliament.

Paddy Ryan was the Speaker of the House when I was first elected in 1970. Indeed, he was a notable Speaker—notable in the fact that he had a very loud voice and used it to substantial effect on many occasions. Sir Lyell McEwin and Jim Heaslip were well known to me. Most of my association with Jim Heaslip was through the Parliamentary bowling club, and likewise Sir Lyell McEwin. I wish to express my sympathy to the relatives and friends of those former members.

As I said, I do not want to make this a farewell speech, but I should like to refer to some of the occurrences during those nigh-on 20 years since I was first elected as the member for Gilles in 1970, along with a number of colleagues who will be retiring at the next State election. Since 1970 we have seen a lot of people come and go. All of them made a contribution to this Parliament.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** I suppose we can say there have been good, bad and indifferent members. Indeed, as I



said, all of them have made some kind of contribution in their time in the House, and I hope that I have done the same. I believe that politics is a game for survivors, both politically and physically. It has its demands but, unfortunately, they are not always recognised by the public at large. Probably the greatest demands are made not on a member of Parliament personally but on his wife and members of his family. When I came into this place I had a number of teenage children. They are all grown up now. The wife is obliged—

*Ms Gayler:* The spouse.

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** The spouse, if you wish to use that expression, is obliged to look after the household. The time of a member of Parliament is taken up with meetings and parliamentary duties. As I have said, the demands made on a parliamentarian's time are not always recognised by the public. I want to take this opportunity to express a vote of thanks to my wife who has had to put up with a lot and has shouldered a great burden and responsibility. I am deeply grateful for that contribution by my wife.

As I have said, we are not always recognised by the public at large. Some members of Parliament—not necessarily in this House or State—have not enhanced the reputation of politicians and politics generally. The media are quick to seize on any story or rumour which places politicians and politics in disrepute. Unfortunately, there are some who oblige the media, and in consequence all politicians, regardless of Party, are seen by the public, quite unfairly at times, to be tarred with the same brush. There have been various happenings in other States, particularly in Queensland, with the Fitzgerald inquiry, which gave the media and the public cause for concern. That is not over yet, but from my observations and experience in this House I believe that on the whole politicians are not a great deal different from people in other professions. Most are honest and diligent in their endeavours for their constituents and the betterment of the State and of Australia generally.

A few of my colleagues who have retired from this place have done so with a chip on their shoulder. I do not want that to happen to me. It is not that I feel that way at all, but it is regrettable that they should depart this place with some disappointment.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** It is a disappointment to every politician to be defeated at the poll. It can happen to any of us.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** You are going to take it like a man, are you?

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** It has happened to quite a few of our colleagues on both sides of the House. One never knows, because one of the vagaries of politics is that one has to run the gauntlet of elections. It used to be every two or three years, but now we have a four-year term. Some have left this place regrettably with a chip on their shoulder. Indeed, that does not enhance the reputation of politicians, either.

The electors of Gilles have been kind to me, in their wisdom or otherwise electing me seven times in succession. I do not know whether that is a record majority, but it is a healthy majority. As I said, we have had seven elections—in 1970, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1979, 1982 and 1985—and I hope that the electors of Gilles will give my successor, the Labor Party candidate, Colin McKee, the same support. I cannot for the moment recall who the Liberal Party candidate is for Gilles—he has not surfaced as yet. Actually, we did have Mr Chick Hanson. He was a chicken salesman and, of course, he withdrew from the contest.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** He could have been accused of some 'fowl' practice, but I do not think that that was the case. I think he saw the light, thought that it was a hopeless task, and, as a consequence, the Liberal Party has selected a young trade unionist, I believe, who lives at West Lakes, to contest the election for the seat of Gilles.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** I do not know whether he has found the electorate yet. Nevertheless, he is the candidate for the Liberal Party. I note that the Liberal Party has already indulged in what we might call a 'Clayton's campaign': that is the campaign you have when you are not having a campaign. I was intrigued with the advert on television showing the woman who is distressed and cannot stand the pressure because, probably, the grand piano was to be repossessed!

I was going through some of my memorabilia only a few weeks ago and I came across an article printed in 1982 in a paper called Mary's Own Paper. It contained a photograph of David Tonkin, complete with angel wings and a lyre, on the front page. The headline states:

*Honky Tonk's One Man Band (Limited Season Only).*

The article with which I was most taken was a rundown of the then shadow Ministers, giving a summary of each person. Many of them are still here. This article is written by a person called Billy Burnside, who says about me:

They always said his Middle Australian seat of Gilles was marginal and threw up all sorts of Liberals against him. Each time, he survived due to his proximity to the electorate's lowest common denominator. Will never become President of the United States.

I have had no ambition to become President of the United States. I would be ineligible, as there are two requirements: candidates have to be citizens of the United States and they have to be billionaires to run the campaign, so I gave up that hope some years ago and stood aside for Ronald Reagan.

I have enjoyed my 20 years as a member of this place simply because 17 of them have been spent on this side of the House. In 1979 the people of South Australia had a temporary political aberration—and they regretted it. They elected the Liberal Party to govern the State from 1979 to 1982. I do not want to reflect too much on history. Nevertheless, I believe that it will be a long, long time before they have that aberration again. Despite what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition stated in his address, hope springs eternal in the human breast but, nevertheless, the thing that counts most, as always, in politics is the numbers. The Labor Party has not only the numbers but has the people and the policies. The Liberal Party, as I said, has this Clayton's campaign organised at the moment. It is a little premature. Someone said to me that it is a classic case of political premature ejaculation, and that appears to be the case.

I heard that someone who has been in the public eye was to stand as an Independent, but lost the deposit. I have been pleased to be associated with the Labor Government for 17 years first, from 1970 to 1979 as a member of the successful team during the Dunstan era and, secondly, in the Bannon Government from 1982 for ever more. I have been fortunate to be associated with them both. But I will not be writing a book; I will not be writing my memoirs, so members can rest easy. I will leave that to other people.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** I might write some anecdotes, but not a serious book.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** Yes, that could be part of it—the humorous sayings of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition might be appropriate. I wish to thank all members for their support and kindness over the years.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** That is another point I wanted to raise. I understand that many members have received a certificate. I have not received one yet, although other members have theirs. If they look closely on the back of it, I think they will see a list of political achievements. This is Derek Robertson's, and he has no political achievements. His achievements are yet to come. When he makes his farewell speech in 20 years, he will have a list of political achievements as long as many of us have had over the same period.

Overall, I have enjoyed my time in the Parliament. Politics certainly has its moments, but also has its rewards. As I said, I did not want to make this a farewell speech, although it has turned out as such. Who knows; there may be further opportunities before the election. I support the adoption of the Address in Reply.

**Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham):** I support the Address in Reply. Again, I congratulate the Governor on doing a good job with a difficult problem. What I wish to address myself to this afternoon is the question of the development of this State, which is dear to me. I know that all members on this side of the House, at least, have listened to the people and really understood that they are not satisfied with the performance of the Government. Despite all the rhetoric, the press releases and the mammoth band of people whom the Government uses to spread its message—the propaganda machine—there is eventually an awakening of the population as to whether the Government has performed.

At the end of the day someone will count up and ask whether we have actually advanced as a result of the period under the Bannon Government. Historians will paint the Bannon Government as seven years in the wilderness: seven years of non-achievement, seven years of prevarication, and seven years during which the Government has taken this State backwards. I note that Senator Graham Maguire, who has recently joined the staff of the Premier—and I do not know whether he is being paid double salary for that effort—has been taken on board to assist the Premier in the forthcoming campaign. He is circulating a list of nine indicators which states that South Australia is really doing very well, ladies and gentlemen. South Australia is really on top of the pile, believe it or not.

But people do not believe it, and I will mention a few of the indicators which I believe are important. They are all official and they all measure the performance of the Government. On almost every indicator South Australia has nothing to be proud of. For seven years this State has been falling further and further backwards. And why? Because there is no leadership in this State, and I will address that question shortly.

The Deputy Leader of my Party recently referred to some of the areas in which South Australia has not done particularly well. I will not go over the information provided, but I will tell the House what the impact has been. It has been stated that the rate of population growth in South Australia was about 70 per cent as good as the Australian national average. That simply means that 40 000 more people should have been accommodated in South Australia over those seven years than lived here: 40 000 people have chosen not to come to or stay in South Australia. That is the confidence being expressed by people within and outside our borders, whether they be migrants, people interstate or people in South Australia who have decided to live elsewhere. South Australia's population would be 40 000 more had the State kept pace with growth in the rest of Australia. This has occurred under seven years of Labor Government.

Even if we look at the achievements of the Bannon Government since the 1985 election, we see that our population growth rate is still the lowest of that of the mainland States. No-one has any confidence in South Australia as a result of the lack of leadership by this Government. We have seen the migration figures; the level in South Australia is low indeed. Whilst the level of migration in Australia as a whole has increased by 107 per cent since 1982, when we left office, the net migration level in South Australia has been minus 4.2 per cent.

South Australia is ranked sixth—the last of any State. These are the latest figures, taken from December 1982 to the latest statistics produced by the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

**Ms Gayler:** Which statistics?

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The latest. They may be the March 1989 or December 1988 quarter figures.

**Ms Gayler:** In the last quarter our population increased.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** For the first time our population increased. I thank the member for Newland for reminding me what a dismal effort the Government has been involved in. Regarding unemployment, the Government is saying, 'Look at all the jobs that we have created.' Someone has built it up to 100 000 jobs since the Bannon Government came to power. That is the rhetoric, but what is the actuality? Since 1982 employment in South Australia has increased by only 16 per cent in comparison with 22 per cent throughout Australia—of the mainland States, South Australia ranks last. Our performance has not been good. We should remember that the base for these statistics is 1982, when the Liberal Party left government.

At that time members opposite bucketed the Tonkin Liberal Government for poor performance. If its performance had been so poor and the base so low, even a mediocre performance by the Bannon Government would have brought the State to the top of the statistics list. Obviously, the Government has not told the truth on both occasions.

We are told about job creation and employment, but the fact of life is that, if the nation gets itself into a debt of \$130 billion, of course more jobs will be created. Across the nation there has been an uplift in employment, but we have mortgaged ourselves and the future of our children in the process. South Australia has seen some benefit of that mortgaging in terms of more jobs, but on the overall scale it has done poorly and our kids are still the worst placed in terms of unemployment. The Government has nothing to be proud of whatsoever. In respect of housing—

**Mr Groom:** What are your policies?

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** If South Australia had kept up with the nation's 'job creation' level which has been at a huge cost, 32 000 more jobs would be available today than is the case: 32 000 more people in this State would be employed. Does the Government realise what that means for the economy of South Australia? Can Government members imagine what it would have meant in terms of payroll tax and Government revenue had South Australia kept up with other States? Of course, that did not happen. Instead, the Premier has had to resort to extraordinary taxation measures.

Since 1982 the number of dwelling approvals in South Australia increased by 39 per cent compared with a 103.8 per cent increase throughout Australia; South Australia ranks sixth—the worst of all States. People are simply not building houses. Do Government members know why? It is because people do not have any money to build them. There is not a population dynamic or a business dynamic, so people are simply not building houses. That is a fact of life.

In the case of new motor vehicle registrations, the figure is again bleak. Since 1982 the number of new vehicle registrations in South Australia decreased by 41 per cent compared with an Australian national decrease of 18 per cent. The number of new motor vehicle registrations has decreased for a variety of reasons, such as the increased cost of motor vehicles and certain Federal Government taxation measures. The number of new registrations in South Australia has almost halved, whereas in the rest of Australia the number of new registrations is down by about 20 per cent.

Let me now turn to savings, because everyone recognises that the debate today is about getting Australia on the move, about getting South Australia on the move. One of the themes that has been common to both Parties has been the abysmal level of savings and the high level of household debt. Both Parties agree on one thing: for Australia to advance as a nation it has to increase the level of domestic savings, thereby reducing overseas borrowings, providing more capital and making moneys available for investment in the marketplace.

However, since 1982, savings bank deposits in South Australia have increased by only 41 per cent, compared with 149 per cent for Australia generally. Our State ranking is sixth, the lowest of any State. That means that savings banks in this State have \$3 billion less than they would have if we had kept pace with the rest of the nation. We do not even have a capacity to fuel the State's investment from within its borders.

Since 1982, overseas exports from South Australia have increased by 77 per cent compared with 110 per cent for Australia. We have a State ranking of sixth—the lowest ranking of any State. We cannot even finish in front of Tasmania. Since 1985, overseas exports from South Australia have increased by 18 per cent compared with 37 per cent for Australia—again, a State ranking of sixth. So, even after the last election, we have just continued to go backwards. We simply have not kept up with the rest of the nation. That is because all the dynamics that this State needs are absent, and the principal dynamic that is missing is leadership. Regarding industrial disputes, no-one would deny that South Australia has the best industrial record of any State.

**Mr Groom:** Thanks to the Labor Government!

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Well, just wait a minute: you may not be so willing to claim—

*Mr Groom interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Tyler):** Order! I remind the member for Hartley that interjections are out of order.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The member for Hartley may not wish to be on the record when he hears how the industrial relations record has changed since the Bannon Government has been in power. Since 1982, the number of days lost per employee through industrial disputes has decreased by 57 per cent compared with 61 per cent for Australia. Australia has come back a little more towards the situation in South Australia, and we have a State ranking of fourth there, but we still have a ranking of first regarding our industrial relations record (a leftover from the Playford regime rather than the result of anything done since).

Since 1985, the number of days lost per employee through industrial disputes has risen by 133 per cent in South Australia compared with 17 per cent for Australia, giving us a State ranking of sixth—the highest of any State. So, our once proud record is deteriorating, and that is because we have a lack of leadership in this State. Given time, the rest of Australia will overtake us, as the thing that we believe is one of the great selling points of this State—industrial

harmony—is being slowly eroded by the actions or non-actions of this Government.

Retail turnover is probably the best indicator of market performance, reflecting as it does the confidence of people in spending on normal retail goods and services. Since 1982, retail turnover in South Australia has increased by 27 per cent compared with 34 per cent for Australia. We have a State ranking of fifth, the lowest of all mainland States. That same picture has been apparent since 1985 during which time we have increased our turnover by only 2 per cent compared with 6 per cent for Australia, again giving a State ranking of fifth. That means that the sale of \$27 million worth of goods has been lost to this State per month. How many jobs have we lost in the process because we have not kept pace? How many jobs will we continue to lose whilst this Government is in power? We have been losing \$27 million a month.

Since 1982, the number of bankruptcies in South Australia has increased by 86 per cent, which is equivalent to the rate in Australia generally, giving us a State ranking of fourth. However, since 1985, bankruptcies in South Australia have increased by 126 per cent compared with 82 per cent for Australia, giving us a State ranking of sixth, the highest of any State. So, we have really outdone ourselves on some of the most negative indicators.

Reverting to the housing situation, if we had kept pace with the rest of Australia, we would have almost 500 new dwellings being approved every month, resulting in almost 450 new houses being built per month, but because this Government has shown no leadership that situation does not prevail. If this State's level of prosperity had managed to keep pace with the rest of the nation we would have had almost 2 000 more new cars being sold in South Australia every year.

Members opposite will always cry, 'Negative, negative; negative.' What the Opposition is saying is that there is an answer and a better way, but that will not come about while this Government is in power. This Government has bled the State and has done nothing positive to advance its future. I remind members of what I believe are the ingredients for the non-performance that we have seen from the Premier of this State. Let us go through the check list of items detailing where I believe leadership should be shown. It is important to understand that leaders are not necessarily liked, but they must be respected. I do not believe that deep down anyone respects the leadership that has been shown by Premier Bannon. People may like him as a person; he may be very much a person with whom they feel comfortable but, as a performer and leader of this State, he is a disaster.

Where does he stand on a number of issues on which I believe leadership needs to be shown? What is the state of play as far as marinas are concerned? That issue was important because it signalled to those involved in development that South Australia was simply not interested in any improvement in its facilities.

**Mr Robertson:** What about your position on Wilpena? You were a bit shaky there, weren't you?

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The member opposite talks about Wilpena. I have not heard him talk about Wilpena, but if he were to be true to himself he would say, 'I don't want to have anything to do with Wilpena', because that is what he believes. That is not what I believe. I know that if the honourable member had actually had a voice in this Parliament on that matter and if he had had to debate it he would have said 'No' to Wilpena. I know his background and beliefs. He would not sell out the State for a short-term gain.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr De Laine):** Order!

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The member for Bright should not mention Wilpena Pound. Let us come back to the signal that was sent to those interested in putting dollars into this State for the benefit of its citizens. Mr Bannon said, 'Go ahead, develop at Glenelg and spend all your money,' and then he said, 'I'm sorry, but certain people have got hold of me and I cannot make a decision. I do not think the marina can go ahead down there.' Ever since that time he has been keeping the boating lobby at bay, saying, 'Look somewhere else because there may be an answer.' Either Mr Bannon wants a marina or he does not want a marina. Why can he not say, 'I do not want any marinas'? Or should he say, 'I believe the most suitable site is here and I will go ahead with it'? Why can he not do that?

*The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:*

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** I am not the Government. Why cannot Mr Bannon, when he puts up transport fares and other things through the backdoor, say—

**Mr Robertson:** The member for Morphett went to water over Jubilee Point, too.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Compared with the performance of Mr Bannon, the member for Morphett would probably make a very good Premier.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! Government members will have a chance to have their say later.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** What happens to the Premier when a tough decision has to be made? What happens to the Premier at taxation time—you cannot see him for dust. He simply disappears. When people find that bus fares have gone up Premier Bannon is nowhere to be found. What about cable cars? To the environmental lobby the Premier is saying, 'We won't despoil the environment', and to the development lobby he is saying, 'It's all right: we will allow this development to proceed but we will not do anything to spoil matters before the election because we might have to make a decision.'

What has Premier Bannon done to assist the building development industry in this State? He has sat on his hands and watched some of the greatest rorts and intimidations perpetrated by the destructive element in the building industry, thereby supporting them.

Every member in this House knows that, whilst we have what has been classed as a building uplift or a construction improvement in the past few years, it has been nothing compared to what has been experienced interstate. We also know, as a result of the activities here, that whatever uplift occurred would disappear as fast as it got off the ground. That is because no-one but no-one has any confidence that they can go ahead with a development project and get it finished on time and within cost—and that is because they know that the building unions will take them to the cleaners. And they will take them to the cleaners with impunity, because they are supported by this Government. I will take up the issue of the corruptness of this Government in another debate.

A further point concerns what has happened to the Premier when the citizens of South Australia are suffering from high interest rates. Have we heard the Premier saying 'Mr Treasurer and Mr Prime Minister, your policies are wrong. We want those policies changed, because the people are hurting'?

**Ms Gayler:** What has the Leader of the Opposition said?

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The honourable member keeps talking about Oppositions; let's talk about Governments. That is the problem with the Government: members of the Gov-

ernment are always looking over their shoulder and saying, 'What do you have to say on this subject?' Perhaps as members of the Opposition after the next election members opposite will be able to start posing the same questions.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** The member for Newland won't be here.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Yes, she will not be here. Why do we not have any leadership from John Bannon? Why do we not have any leadership saying, 'The people are hurting; there are now some people who simply cannot afford to buy the normal meals; there are people who cannot afford clothing; there are people going into mortgage sales; there are people lining up on the Housing Trust waiting list; and there are people who are a step away from bankruptcy—and this is because of the policies of the Prime Minister and the Treasurer'? Not once have we heard a leadership statement from the Premier on this. It is no wonder that the people are disillusioned.

Let us now talk about the Timber Corporation. The Treasurer has a vested interest in that. Have we heard the Premier saying to the people concerned, 'I am not satisfied with your performance'? Where was the Premier when indeed the tough decisions had to be made? When was it said, 'Right, all those people associated with the IPL/Timber Corporation venture should suffer for the decisions that they have made and the losses that they have incurred'? Why was the Premier not smart enough in the first place to get someone of substance to actually assess the project before getting involved? But, no, he continues to stand back and to let someone else take the blame, take the heat.

We heard an extraordinary effort today from the Premier. He is obviously very concerned. He brought forward part of his budget, saying, in effect, 'Look, I have ripped you poor people off long enough; it is election year, so I will give some of the money back.'

**Mr Groom:** We are a low tax Government.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** If the member for Hartley believes that we are a low tax State—which was the nature of the interjection—why did the Premier feel that he suddenly had to give back some of the money that people have been taxed? Where was he last year, when we were presenting evidence of Bills which, in some cases, represented 500 or 1 000 per cent increases in land tax? Where was he last year and earlier this year when the debate was raging about the huge imposts facing small businesses, which were struggling to survive? He was nowhere to be seen. Not once did he say that there was a problem. Suddenly, it is election year, so out come the handouts. What about stamp duty for first home buyers? In 1985, he promised that he would ensure that stamp duty kept pace with the price of houses for first home buyers. He did not keep that—

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Tyler):** I remind the honourable member that he must refer to the Premier as 'the Premier' and not as 'he'.

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** The Premier made another promise that he broke. In 1985, he promised that he would look after first home buyers. However, despite the pressures on home buyers, particularly as a result of interest rates, he did not keep his promise until the election was almost upon us. How cynical! How often, when we have been dealing with delicate issues such as lease-back arrangements involving foreign powers, has the Premier said, 'It is commercially confidential'? Where is the leadership in that? It is a neat bit of footwork over a period of time and suddenly it has all become commercially confidential. If the Premier was a leader, he would have the guts to explain to everyone concerned what was actually undertaken.

Of course, I was very amused to find that the Premier has somehow associated himself with the Anzac frigate project. What started out as a very small slice of the cake—\$400 million—has, with the assistance of various members of the Premier's Department, now escalated to \$1 billion in the space of a day. I was fascinated because it seems that the Premier again said, 'Right, we are actually going to do quite well out of this project. I want to be associated with it.'

How many times have we needed the Premier as the leader of this State, to show the way; to keep control of building unions; to make decisions on marinas and cable cars; to stand up for this State when it counts in relation to interest rates; to stop the rorts, or losses of money, such as those associated with ventures such as the South Australian Timber Corporation; to treat new home buyers and people who aspire to own their homes fairly; and to give small businesses a go. Where has he been? That is why this State has gone backwards. The Premier may well enjoy a very high popularity rating—which is falling but is still very high. However, we are interested not in popularity stakes but in performance. In this regard, the Labor Government and the Premier have failed this State.

**Mr GROOM (Hartley):** That was a very disappointing contribution from the member for Mitcham, as indeed was the earlier speech by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the member for Kavel, who is not in the House. However, their speeches follow the familiar pattern of downgrading South Australia for short-term political purposes. Members opposite do our State a disservice, because there is a very different story to be told than the one told this afternoon by the member for Mitcham and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. There is a very positive story to be told about South Australia and its achievements—its sound prospects for the future and its confident economic base. However, the Opposition cannot face the fact that South Australia has been well governed both politically and economically. It is a stable Government and a good economic manager of our State's economic resources.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** Well, the honourable member can joke. He can joke about South Australia if he wants and he can continue to downgrade South Australia, but that is not the sort of leadership that the community in South Australia desires. The community wants positive leadership, not the negative leadership that emanates from the Opposition, time after time, in speech after speech. Members opposite are still paralysed by the strength of the Premier's contribution before Question Time today. There is no doubt about it. As the honourable member for Stuart says, it was a very positive blueprint of achievement, economic development and direction for this State.

That contribution simply cannot be matched by the Opposition, because it has not got the depth of resources or the depth of talent to manage South Australia. The Opposition displayed that between 1979 and 1982, because it is largely comprised of the same people who managed our State detrimentally during those years. Rather than the negative and destructive version that the Opposition peddles at election time when it downgrades South Australia for nothing other than short-term political purposes, there is a very positive story to be told about South Australia. It is quite a sad indictment of the Opposition that that is the best it can do. In the past two speeches from Opposition members, I have not heard one positive policy. One would think that, when approaching an election, it would want to present positive policy statements and that, rather than

downgrading South Australia, it would want to put forward alternative policies.

I now refer to paragraph 3 of the Governor's speech which states:

My Government is well prepared for the demands which are emerging as part of the economic and social pattern which will shape all our lives into the last decade of the twentieth century.

The emphasis in that paragraph is on being well prepared and the Premier's speech today proved that statement. There is no question that the content of the Premier's contribution underlined what the Governor said when opening this session of Parliament. Not only is South Australia well prepared under this Government, but also it is a low tax State. I know that it is painful for members opposite to come to grips with the fact that South Australia is a low tax State and has been maintained as such by this Government. One only has to read an information paper prepared last year by the South Australian Treasury and entitled 'The Finances of South Australia'—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** These are factual matters and not the distortion and manipulation of figures as presented by the member for Mitcham. I am reading from a Treasury paper; I will not listen to political speeches from members opposite, whose motives are quite apparent to all concerned. Page 48 of the information paper states:

South Australia has the second lowest taxation/GSP ratio of the States. This is the combined result of a slightly lower revenue 'burden' (in the sense of comparative tax rates . . .

The paper then provides examples and continues:

According to Grants Commission analysis—

and I think that is sufficiently independent to give strength to the proposition I advance—

the State has an ability to increase the overall tax burden by about 4 per cent before the tax burden would reach the (weighted) average level across the six States.

There is a message in the position presented in the Treasury's information paper. South Australia is a low tax State. We can increase taxation revenues by another 4 per cent before we catch up to the other States. Why do not Opposition members highlight the advantages enjoyed by South Australia because of its low tax status? That low tax status has been maintained for many years—there is no question about that—but it is no good pretending, for short-term destructive political purposes, as does the Opposition, that South Australia is a high tax State and trying, in so doing, to frighten industry away from South Australia and to bring about some economic recession as a consequence. The fact is that South Australia is a low tax State and members opposite should face that fact and highlight the positive attributes of South Australia rather than negatively twisting the sorts of statistics which they present. Paragraph 5 of the Governor's speech states:

My Government is working to achieve a confident, vibrant economy which reflects the interests of a progressive, outward-looking, multicultural community.

The Federal Liberal Party tried to alter the nature of our multicultural community, but underlying that statement which the Governor advanced in his speech when opening this session of Parliament is the statement that 'the Government is working to achieve a confident, vibrant economy which reflects the interests of a progressive' not only multicultural community but also an outward-looking State.

**The Hon. R.G. Payne:** Why don't those opposite support it?

**Mr GROOM:** As the member for Mitchell asks, why do not members opposite support it? Only they can answer that question, and that is why they were defeated in the 1982 and 1985 elections, and that is why they will be

defeated in 1989; they do not have positive policies to advance and they do not speak positively and confidently about South Australia. No community can have confidence in a negative Opposition because you cannot provide leadership from a negative position, and it is no good denigrating and downgrading South Australia in the process. The confident, vibrant economy is again highlighted by the Premier's contribution before Question Time today. One has only to read the Premier's ministerial statement—

*An honourable member:* It was magnificent.

**Mr GROOM:** It was a magnificent statement. Members on this side can be justly proud that the Premier was able to describe such a position today (and I will go through some of it later). There is no doubt that the Opposition is still in shock from the strength of the Premier's ministerial statement. In his speech the Governor said:

Four years ago a set of principles was established as the core for my Government's economic strategy. Those principles—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** I will come to that. The member for Mitcham told a negative story about South Australia. He adopted a very negative, critical, destructive, downgraded position, and I will emphasise this.

*An honourable member:* He's agreeing.

**Mr GROOM:** He is agreeing, because that is the position he put. I repeat the Governor's statement:

Four years ago a set of principles was established as the core for my Government's economic strategy. Those principles have served as guidelines for successful initiatives which are now being linked into the next phase of economic development in South Australia.

Let us look at the past four years. Let us look at some of the aspects of the Government's economic program. Let us highlight some of the positive achievements so that we can feel justly confident and justly proud of our State and we can translate that feeling to members of the South Australian community.

I refer to the Australian Submarine Corporation, which decided that South Australia would be the ideal place for its national headquarters. It did not choose Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland or any other State—it chose South Australia. One of the reasons why South Australia was chosen is because of the very relationship between the community, industry, the trade union movement and this Government. There is no question of that. The South Australian Government was able to offer the Australian Submarine Corporation a strong, stable, well managed and economically viable State. The partnership that this Government has fostered between the community, industry and the trade union movement is, I suspect, unique in Australia. It means that—

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** The member for Murray-Mallee can laugh if he wants to. I think it is a sad indictment of the honourable member when he has to laugh about the achievement of bringing the Australian Submarine Corporation to South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** I know it is painful. Members opposite know that there is no way they could have delivered the Australian Submarine Corporation to this State. The Opposition simply does not have the business acumen. The fact of the matter is that there is a unique partnership in South Australia between the community, industry, the trade union movement, employers and the Government, and it means that in a commercial sense things can be done properly and efficiently in South Australia.

By the mid-1990s the Australian Submarine Corporation will be a formidable company in this State with large-scale

shipbuilding and engineering facilities. It was a great achievement on the part of this Government, South Australia and its resources and, indeed, the Premier to bring this project to South Australia. It is something that honourable members opposite could never have delivered. Let us look at the Formula One Grand Prix. There is no question that it is a great example of how this Government and South Australia get things done.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** The first Grand Prix was in 1985—within the four-year period that I am highlighting. I know it is painful for members opposite to have to face the successes of the Labor Government here in South Australia. Members opposite like parading some negative, twisted version of South Australia's development. When the positives are pointed out, they recoil in horror.

**Mr Oswald:** Bring up something new.

**Mr GROOM:** I will come to a few new things, if the honourable member is patient. The Formula One Grand Prix is a great example of how the Government of South Australia gets things done. All States competed for the Grand Prix, which has a television audience of some 900 million people. There is no doubt that it has raised our national and international recognition.

**The Hon. R.G. Payne:** They've gone quiet.

**Mr GROOM:** Of course they have gone quiet! It has raised pride in ourselves as South Australians: the pride that we possess the business acumen, the capacity and ability to put together a world class event. Every year the Grand Prix has a television audience of 900 million people who see South Australia in a positive light and not in the negative light in which members opposite portray South Australia with the downgrading that they go on about in regard to our State. The fact that every year 900 million people throughout the world see South Australia in a positive light is a great achievement, but let us not stop there.

Those two examples are painful to members opposite because they are successes. In 1984 the State Bank became a major financial source and investment creator. It then had assets of \$4 million. Now, in 1989, it has assets of \$15 billion. The State Bank is a great success story for South Australia. Commercially, it will run the problems faced by all commercial enterprises and, on occasions, have some financial set-backs. That is commercially acceptable. However, we must look at the overall result.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**Mr GROOM:** I know that the member for Murray-Mallee cannot accept that commercial risks are involved. Of course, an enterprise as successful as the State Bank must take risks, but it is a highly successful operation. It started with assets of \$4 million and, in a few short years, it has assets of \$15 billion.

More recently, in April of this year Pacific Dunlop Batteries announced that it would build a \$5 million manufacturing plant opposite the Australian Submarine Corporation site. It is the first new plant to be built in Adelaide as a direct result of the Australian Submarine Corporation. That plant has been attracted to South Australia as a consequence of the efforts of the Premier and this Government and in partnership with industry, the trade union movement and the South Australian community.

I refer also to the automotive industry. Let us not forget that South Australia is still a key centre with Mitsubishi and Holden's based here. Cumulatively they produce about 40 per cent of the nation's cars. Because the Government has kept us a low cost and low tax State, Holden's has just relocated all its Commodore production to South Australia, and a \$500 million program to modernise the plant is almost

complete. That shows a confidence in South Australia. South Australia is a low cost State and is industrially well served. I have already emphasised the taxation advantages. I refer to some matters contained in 'South Australia: A Profile for Investment in Manufacturing' put out only a month or so ago. The member for Mitcham started having a go at our industrial base.

**Mr Lewis:** What about aids?

**Mr GROOM:** If the honourable member wants to debate that, we can do it another time. I want to deal with some of the negative arguments put forward by two speakers from the Opposition. Let us look at what the publication has to say about competing operating costs. On page 2 it states that manufacturing costs in South Australia are low compared with those in other Australian States. I will not wade through the statistics but invite members opposite to analyse whether that statement is accurate: no doubt it is. It goes on to quote figures. It states that in August 1988 average weekly ordinary time earnings for full-time adult males in South Australia were \$469.10 compared with \$504.40 in Victoria and \$503.50 in New South Wales. Currently average weekly earnings in South Australia are 5.8 per cent below the national average. People in South Australia live just as well as people in New South Wales and Victoria, but it is quite clear that we have been able to maintain a competitive cost advantage.

We have only to look at the Sunday papers. Go and buy some interstate weekend papers, look at the real estate section and compare the prices of houses and cars with those in South Australia. It is an elementary task. Do not rely on the statistics; look at the prices. Members will find that average house and car prices are the lowest in Australia.

Let us now look at rental prices for industrial premises. On page 6 this document states:

South Australia has an excellent supply of serviced industrial land in metropolitan Adelaide and at country locations throughout the State.

Under the heading 'Industrial premises' it states:

Rental prices for prime and secondary industrial premises and offices are equal to, or usually lower than, prices in other States. There is a table setting out the cost advantage to South Australia. I invite members to read this objectively.

I heard the Deputy Leader of the Opposition going on about energy prices—gas and electricity. The fact is that gas prices in South Australia are the lowest in the country. I quote from page 4 of 'A Profile for Investment in Manufacturing':

South Australia offers the cheapest gas in Australia.

There is a table showing a comparison between industrial gas prices in South Australia and other States.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition tried to say that we had high electricity costs compared with other States, but that is not supported by the facts. The document states:

Electricity tariffs in South Australia for small, medium and large consumers compare favourably with tariffs in other Australian States.

That does not support the proposition advanced by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Combined with all those advantages, there are large tracts of inexpensive industrial land close to the city. Members should highlight that when they talk to the business community. When they go interstate, they should highlight the positive, not some distorted negative, view of South Australia.

The member for Mitcham went on about our industrial record. When we look at the facts—not the distorted version that he was trying to toss up—we know from ordinary experience that we have the best industrial record in Australia. We do not need statistics to tell us that. One just

needs to get out and talk to the community, the employers and the trade unions. On page 9 of this document, it states:

South Australia has an excellent, stable industrial record with a significantly lower incidence of industrial disputes than any other Australian State.

I will not compare the figures. They are all here and they support that view. The Australian Bureau of Statistics figures are quoted here which support it. It is no use trying to make out that South Australia has deteriorated under this Government, because it plainly is not true. South Australia has continued to be the State with the best and most stable industrial record. It is no good being negative about South Australia.

There are other matters that I could go on about—for example, agriculture—and if I have time, I will come back to them. There is a positive story to be told about South Australia. Since 1982—indeed, over the past four years if we confine ourselves to that period—it is a positive story of achievement, sound prospects, a confident future, a stable Government and a stable economic base.

Let us compare that with the period 1979-82. What did members opposite do when they were in government? I know that the member for Mitcham hates to be reminded of what they did in government. However, I shall continue to remind him of what they did in government, because, by and large, the people who comprised the Tonkin Government are still here today.

That is why I will remind members and the people of South Australia of the past, because in the past six to seven years members opposite have not advanced one positive policy to develop our State into the 1990s and beyond. What we have to judge them on—because they are still yesterday's people—is their record between 1979 and 1982. They inherited a \$1 million surplus from the outgoing Corcoran Government and, within three short years, converted this to a \$63 million deficit and frittered away \$100 million of capital works money. In their August 1981 budget they transferred \$44 million from capital works, resulting in a downturn in industry in South Australia.

They said that their last budget, in August 1982, was a balanced budget—and everyone knew it was not a balanced budget because you cannot take \$42 million from capital works and pretend that it is a balanced budget. They were coming into an election period. They had not managed the State's finances during those years, and the \$42 million for which they budgeted in 1982 to take out of capital works became \$51.9 million, and they had a \$6.1 million accumulated deficit building up in the system. So, within a few short years, members opposite diverted \$100 million away from capital works, and that is why there was a recession in this State, and it is why the State got into economic difficulties. I am very pleased to see that the Premier today, as a result of very sound financial management in difficult times, has finally wiped off the \$63 million deficit from the Tonkin era.

That is a great achievement in itself. I know that it is painful for members opposite to hear this, but not only did they fritter away some \$160 million, they pretended we were a low tax State. If you are not balancing your budget, and taking \$44 million one year from capital works and \$51.9 million in another year, of course you can pretend that you are a low tax State. Anyone can do that. That is sleight of hand, and members opposite know it. That is no way to manage South Australian finances.

Not only did they fritter away \$160 million of this State's money and produce a recession in South Australia, but they increased taxes and charges. The member for Murray-Mallee can back me up on what I will say now because he did some research on us—so he said—but when I researched

the increase in State taxes and charges during the Tonkin years they totalled 194 separate items. Members opposite simply cannot pretend that they know how to manage the State's finances.

When this Government came to office at the end of 1982 it was faced with a very serious predicament, simply because of the total mismanagement of South Australia's finances. It was an economy in recession. I have outlined this Government's achievements. Members can see them reflected in the Premier's statement today—there is a surplus. It is a remarkable achievement of a surplus of \$83 million on the recurrent account for 1988-89, \$27 million more than the forecast surplus. It is a remarkable achievement for any Government.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr GROOM: Of course, the Liberal Premier in New South Wales (Mr Greiner) would not mind it. That is a good example of Liberal administration. As a result of our achievement, we were able to reduce our financing requirement by \$27 million. As the Premier said, in relation to revenue in 1989-90, there will be no tax increases in the coming State budget. That is as a result of very sound economic management. Not only that, but the 1988-89 budget anticipated a financing requirement of \$226 million. This requirement has now been reduced to \$199 million. Not only are we producing surpluses, but we are reducing our overall debt in the economic times that we have had to face.

As the Premier said in his statement, the budget result for 1988-89 means that some quite remarkable goals have been achieved. I emphasise that we have wiped off the Tonkin Government's deficit. The bulk of the Tonkin Government is still here on the Opposition benches today, and they want another opportunity of running South Australia's finances. One has to smile about it, because in seven years they have not produced any blueprint for South Australia's economic development, unlike this Government. This Government speaks positively of South Australia and its sound economic base, and does not indulge in the negative sort of stuff, the downgrading that I have heard this afternoon.

The Premier said that the recurrent account is now in a sound surplus. The State's net debt has been reduced as a share of gross State product from 23 per cent to 16 per cent. I should have expected members opposite to get up this afternoon and say, 'What a great achievement to reduce our debt, to wipe off the Tonkin \$63 million deficit and to bring in a surplus.' Members opposite could not deliver such a result simply because they do not have the strength in their ranks.

The Opposition does not have the foresight; it is not farsighted. It simply cannot manage the State's economy, and there is no doubt about that. One of the great successes of this Government is that it has been a stable, successful Government, and that is exactly what South Australia needs coming into the 1990s: a stable successful Government. This Government has the runs on the board. We also need a stable Opposition and I am sure that members opposite will continue in that role during the next four years.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I have listened with some interest to one of the so-called alternative Ministers in this Chamber. He has aired off his ministerial suit on numerous occasions but, from listening to the honourable member, I believe it is fairly obvious why he is not on the front bench. He has given us a number of platitudes and has recycled a speech that he made a number of years ago. It was inaccurate then and unfortunately each time he recycles it it becomes more and more out of date than it was on the first occasion.

The facts are that this Government is lurching from crisis to crisis and I intend to say one or two things about that. I am not sure whether this is the nineteenth or twentieth Address in Reply speech that I have made since I have had the privilege of being a member of this House. Unfortunately, the majority of those speeches have been from this side of the House, but I am looking forward in the near future to changing sides, because the people of South Australia would have been much better off if there had been more Liberal Governments in this State.

The Labor Party for all its posturing cannot blame anyone else for the predicament now facing South Australia because, for 20 of the past 25 years, it has administered the affairs of this State. Over the past seven years it has done it in tandem with its friends in Canberra. They have done it together: John and Bob in tandem, both on the one pushbike heading us down the road to despair, and aided and abetted by Paul and one or two other characters—and the least that we have to say about them the better.

In his speech to Parliament the Governor indicated the measures that the House will debate. He also referred to four former members of the House who passed away since the House last sat, and I would like to join other members in expressing my condolences to their families. I knew and was associated with some of those members. For many years, Sir Lyell McEwin represented with distinction the area in which I lived and a large part of the area I now represent. I have the privilege of representing much of the area represented, with a great deal of distinction, by Mr Heaslip.

We all knew Mr Ryan, who was a Speaker of this House. Anyone who has served in Parliament with him would never forget him, because he had certain characteristics, such as a powerful voice with which he made himself particularly clear whenever he addressed the Chamber. Although I did not know Mr Nicholson, I did go to school with his son.

The Governor's speech was obviously prepared by a Government that is running out of steam, because there was much padding but not much substance. South Australia requires positive and definite action to solve its difficult economic situation. We have two industries that can help the people of the State, the mining and agricultural industries. Those two industries laid the foundation for South Australia, developed it and created a situation in the early 1950s and 1960s where the people of South Australia had as high a standard of living as people anywhere in the Western world. Reasonable accommodation was built by the Playford Government. We had thousands of kilometres of reasonable roads, we had a water reticulation system and we had people with jobs and whose houses were bought at affordable interest rates.

Unlike the Bannon and the Hawke Governments, the Playford and the Menzies Governments had the interests of the real people—the little people of this country—at heart. They built an economy and a country that was second to none and I challenge members opposite to criticise that record. Together those two distinguished gentlemen led Governments which were the envy of the rest of the free world because they provided for the average citizen. What do we have today?

In 1985 we were told by the Premier and his henchmen that if we voted Labor interest rates would come down—from 13½ per cent they would come down. What has happened? Today, they are at 18 per cent and in the commercial area they are up to 23 per cent. Some business people in my electorate are paying 23 per cent interest. Not only are they paying 23 per cent but the Commonwealth Develop-



ment Bank has been about as difficult as any organisation can be when people are trying to refinance their debts or trying to enter into arrangements that may assist them in solving their difficulties. However, bad as that may be, the State Government then imposes stamp duty on those people when they refinance or rearrange their debts.

Today, the Premier made a number of announcements about what he will do with stamp duties and so on. I call on the Premier to amend the Stamp Duties Act, first, to exempt from stamp duty parents who transfer their farm to their family so that those parents can qualify for social security benefits. They have paid taxes all their lives. Under the existing arrangements, particularly where people are having economic difficulties, it would be beneficial if they could do that.

I have brought to the attention of the Premier a number of cases and I have been waiting patiently for an answer. I challenge the Government to do something positive in this area. It would not cost a lot of money, but it would be in the long-term interest of this State and this nation because, no matter what high technology or other industries the Government races around to try to get—and I will say a bit about Woomera later, because I know something about what is happening, and we will be looking for a headline in the next few weeks—the agricultural, pastoral and mining industries have the runs on the board. All the Government has to do is put in place some sensible policies and those people will deliver. They have delivered in the past; they have the will, the desire, the ability and the knowledge; they will deliver for South Australia and they will deliver without being subsidised as overseas farmers are subsidised.

The farmers in Europe and the United States are farming on the backs of the treasuries of those countries, but farmers are not doing that in South Australia or Australia. However, together the Bannon and the Hawke Governments have made a concerted attack on them. The Hawke Government has made the most vicious attack on the rural community and reduced the amount of money available for technology, the CSIRO and other things. Not only has it done that but it has interfered with the taxation system to prevent people from continuing to update their plant and equipment.

In my electorate, throughout Eyre Peninsula and in other parts of South Australia people are fortunate in having a particularly good agricultural season. That is good for South Australia, good for those people and good for those communities. But unfortunately, that good agricultural season will not solve the difficulties that many of these people currently face. Recently, I was given a document from the Department of Agriculture that highlighted the activities of the rural coordinators who have been appointed by the Department of Agriculture to counsel those people who are facing difficulties. It states:

After four months of fieldwork (eight trips each to Eyre Peninsula) we have referred to, or contacted direct by 30 farmers. It was estimated at the outset that 50 clients per year would be a likely upper limit for the service. Twenty-five of these clients (83 per cent) are Eyre Peninsula farmers.

About three-quarters of our clients are in extreme financial difficulty, frequently rejected for debt reconstruction, others are mainly prospective farm build-up cases. Debts of our clients range from \$40 000 to \$1.2 million. The combination of drought and high interest rates has resulted in high levels of debt-stress by most of our clientele.

Some of our clients have been dependent on unemployment benefits or household support for more than 18 months. About half a dozen cases were living in hardship without accessing welfare of any kind. All these families have been helped to apply for and secure household support (unemployment benefit was not appropriate in these particular cases).

That is the current situation. Anyone who reads the 'For sale' notices in the last *Stock Journal* will see properties

coming on to the market. It is pretty obvious that some financial institutions have decided that, because things look rosy and most of the country appears in great condition, the time is now right to force these people to put their properties on the market. A number of matters with respect to that situation concern me.

First, these people will be pushed off their farms before they have the opportunity to receive anything for the crops they have planted, and I would be interested to know where the financial houses stand on that matter. Will we have more absentee landlords coming to Eyre Peninsula? There are too many now. With these properties coming on to the market, will the value of agricultural land and businesses on Eyre Peninsula be even further decreased? Those questions must be answered. There is a role for the Government in this matter. In many cases, the Government could assist those people to refinance their properties if cheap money up to, say, \$250 000 was made available to them or their families. To make that relief money available for outsiders to come in, buy up, hold the land for a few years and then sell it, making a considerable capital gain, is not the way that it should be used and would not be in the best interests of agriculture or the people of South Australia.

I appeal to the Commonwealth Development Bank and the Government to be more flexible and understanding about some of these difficulties. I appeal to the Minister of Agriculture and the Premier to address urgently the problems of stamp duty where people set out to refinance these properties through the banking organisations, particularly where these propositions are put to people by financial institutions. Further, they should exempt from stamp duty a property that is transferred between family members for the purpose of the older members of that family being able to receive social security benefits, particularly when they are living off the farm. I sincerely hope that the Government will do something about those most reasonable requests.

Equally compounding the problem of downturn in numbers in all areas of South Australia is the effect it has on education, sporting facilities and schools. The list of problems which occur is never ending. I have been made aware of one district that has had to stop watering its oval, and I am told that that is likely to occur at another location, where clubs are getting into financial trouble.

The effect of the Government's new educational structure will, to say the very least, not help people in rural areas of South Australia. Last night I attended a school council meeting and grave concern was expressed to me about the ability of some schools to be able to maintain their year 12 classes. I say to the Minister of Education and Dr Boston (or whoever is calling the shots) that it is all very well to look at numbers and say, 'That is it' but, if the staff numbers and amount of time available in year 12 are reduced, those students will end up doing correspondence courses at the school without adequate supervision. That is a hard enough road for any student to go down. I appeal to the Government and the Minister not to allow that to happen. That matter was brought to my attention very forcibly last night.

Over the past 12 months on Upper Eyre Peninsula, one music teacher was employed to teach music at the Ceduna Area School, at the Lutheran school at Ceduna, and at the Karcultaby, Miltaburra and Wudinna schools. As I understand the situation, next year that position will not be available. What will happen to those students? Will that program be disrupted? It has been well accepted by the parents, some of whom have purchased instruments for their children. It is a well organised program funded, as I understand it, by the CAP scheme through the Commonwealth. Now the Commonwealth wants to hand it over to

the State and the concern is whether or not the State will pick up the tab or whether the program will be allowed to slip off the list and that type of education will disappear on Upper Eyre Peninsula.

I understand that the same problem is occurring in the member for Flinders' electorate. For some time I have been having discussions with the department about the problems at Leigh Creek and in other isolated communities and think it appropriate that I mention one letter that I have received. It states:

Dear Mr Gunn,

The enclosed letter and appendices was forwarded to Dr Ken Boston on behalf of the Leigh Creek Area School Council. This action was taken in response to strong local concern regarding aspects of the curriculum guarantee package. We forward it for your information, and request your support to ensure that area school students are not disadvantaged.

I was very happy to do that. I believe that one of the most important things members of Parliament have to do is publicly support an education system which guarantees people, particularly in isolated communities, equal opportunity. I believe that equal opportunity is not something like Ms Tiddy racing around the country causing trouble, like she did at Port Augusta, in set-ups such as we had there, but guaranteeing—

*Members interjecting:*

Mr GUNN: Yes, she ought to be ashamed of herself. It should be a politician's highest priority to guarantee equal opportunity in education to all sections of the community, but it appears from the sort of nonsense that is emanating from certain officers that that is not the view of some people. A letter I received from the Leigh Creek Area School states:

The Leigh Creek Area School Council met in a special meeting on Wednesday 2 August to consider the impact of the curriculum guarantee negotiation on our isolated school community.

As a school council, we strongly support the concept of a curriculum guarantee for our students, and the concept of appropriate incentives to attract teachers to make a longer term commitment to our school and community.

We are extremely concerned that we had no opportunity to contribute to these negotiations, which will have a major impact on our school. As a parent group, we consider the issues of a guaranteed curriculum are school and community issues particularly relevant to parents of isolated country children, and we should have been consulted.

We believe the package as presented has a number of potentially positive innovations for our school. However, it is clear that insufficient account was taken of the particular needs of area schools. Specifically we are concerned about:

- loss of library time in area schools;
- discounting of school numbers for distance education students;
- administration time in area schools; and
- the country incentive package, as presented.

We have written detailed submissions on each of the concerns and they are attached as appendices.

I am particularly concerned about distance education because that will affect not only Leigh Creek but a number of other areas in my electorate. I believe that this matter should immediately be renegotiated. It is all very well to provide facilities at the Norwood High School, for example, or at the schools where parents can afford to send their children in the private sector, but many people in my electorate and in other areas of South Australia are not in that happy situation and have to accept what is available. It is bad enough that it should be necessary to resort to correspondence; surely the Education Department should be able to assist in distance education.

At the weekend I am going to Tarcoola and it will be interesting to note the attitude of the people in that community who have benefited from itinerant teachers going from homestead to homestead assisting with education, with parents nevertheless already carrying a considerable burden.

If some of these problems were in the marginal seats—where we have these temporary members, like the member for Adelaide and the member for Fisher, and others, who will not be here in a few weeks time—and were brought to the attention of the Ministers concerned, I guarantee that the situation would be different. The member for Albert Park laughs, but I can assure him that it is a fact. Reality is a great thing. We will have an exodus of these temporary members from the Chamber.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr GUNN: I do not need the assistance of honourable members. I will certainly not have the assistance of the member for Adelaide, as he will not be here. He will be spending his time doing other things.

Mr Groom: You may well be surprised.

Mr GUNN: Well, the honourable member has had a few surprises during his time in this House, and I think he is in for a few more—because he will be changing sides.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr Lewis: Albert Park is at risk, you know.

Mr GUNN: I think Florey is at risk.

Mr Groom: You've got to have a few policies.

Mr GUNN: We will come to those later. The honourable member wants to be patient. I do not want him to try to get me off track. I am normally rather shy when I am making these speeches and there are a number of things I want to say.

Mr Rann: You are never biased in your own speeches!

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Tyler): Order! The honourable member for Briggs is out of order.

Mr GUNN: As to any comment made by the member for Albert Park, even if it was criticism, I take it as a compliment, because his knowledge of agriculture or anything to do with things outside the metropolitan area could be written on the back of a postage stamp. The honourable member is particularly good at passing compliments, and obviously as someone who aspires to greatness—

Mr Hamilton: I was brought up on the land, son!

Mr GUNN: The honourable member made a poor show of it—obviously he did not learn anything while he was there or he would not have made the silly sorts of comments that he has made over the past five or six years. However, I want to conclude my remarks in relation to the education component of my speech. I again emphasise my concern about the difficult effects that the proposed new policy will have on people in isolated communities.

A number of schools have contacted me expressing concern that the amount of time that principals and deputy principals will have to administer the schools will be drastically reduced. They have been called upon to put more and more time into administering new programs and the schools, but it would appear that they will have less time to do it. That will certainly reflect on the general administration of a school.

In relation to the library question, I believe that one of the most important programs in which the Education Department and the Department of Local Government have been involved, over a long time, has been the establishment of community school libraries. They work very well. They have been popular, but I am concerned that the amount of staff time available for the schools in my area is to be greatly reduced. I think that in itself is a retrograde step.

In most communities the school community library is the best information source available to those communities, and in many cases it is the only information source. This facility is available to people wanting to do research or to look up any information for a project. If the staff administering these libraries have their time drastically cut back,

the facilities currently available to these school communities will certainly deteriorate. At present they are certainly very popular. In areas like Andamooka and Coober Pedy, and other areas, community school libraries have been a real success story.

After the dinner adjournment I want to talk briefly about the Aboriginal police aides scheme and the agricultural sector. Both of those matters are of concern to me, because I have been particularly concerned about law and order matters and the difficulties that some of my constituents have had when confronted by people who have deliberately broken the law and when they have been subject to physical violence or have had their motor cars or homes damaged.

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

**Mr GUNN:** Prior to the dinner adjournment, I was addressing a number of matters of concern to me. The comments and criticisms that I have made of this Government, and indeed the criticisms that my colleagues have made, have been out of a genuine desire to improve the welfare of all citizens of this State. We believe that many things should be done to improve productivity and to make life easier for those who want to employ people and to make it easier for those who want to export goods. The only way that we will solve the problems facing South Australia, and the nation as a whole, is to export more products. That can be achieved only by giving incentives and encouragement, and by removing the many impediments that industry, commerce and agriculture currently face. We need to apply some degree of commonsense to the administration of government in South Australia and the nation as a whole.

One of the first criticisms that people in industry, commerce and agriculture make when they are discussing their problems is that they are getting tied to their desks and offices filling out unnecessary Government forms, answering questionnaires and responding to demands made upon them. It is very unproductive, time consuming and, in many cases, completely unnecessary. Bureaucratic humbug is hogtying this State and nation and it must be reversed.

An Olsen Liberal Government in this State will take the necessary and sensible steps on behalf of the citizens of this State. An Olsen Liberal Government will take two other steps: first, we will institute a review of all statutory authorities and, secondly, there should be a right of appeal against these unfair, arbitrary decisions by Government boards and committees. Not only should there be a right of appeal but also those authorities should be required, by law, to give the reasons for their decisions, in writing, to the people who are affected. In many cases, that does not take place.

For too long the average citizen of this State and nation has been the victim of high-handed and arbitrary decisions. The unfortunate effect is that, unless one has substantial funds, the law is out of reach. One is taken to court by government, or by its agencies or instrumentalities, and it is beyond the financial resources of any citizen to defend himself. That is a disgraceful situation under any form of government, particularly a democracy.

We must therefore take steps to redress that situation. I am looking forward to the enactment of these provisions because not only will such action redress the situation but also it will make those arbitrary decision makers more akin to what the real people are thinking, and they will know that their decisions are subject to an independent appeal. I am confident that many of the decisions will be not only overturned but also criticised roundly by fair minded people who will be sitting in judgment. I am sure that, on a weekly basis, every member of Parliament comes into contact with

people who are at their wit's end in relation to which way to turn when they are confronted with these situations.

In an electorate like mine there are many problems with regard to education and agriculture. As a result of the unseasonably high rainfall we have experienced in recent months, there has been complete devastation of many roads. Many councils in the area have made representations to the Government and the Premier for urgently required funding just to bring the roads back to a reasonable state of repair. I appeal to the Minister of Transport and the Government as a matter of urgency to do something about this matter.

Law and order is a matter of great concern to all citizens of this State. I believe that the time is long overdue for law-abiding citizens to be given some protection when they, or members of their families, are attacked by people who are intent on doing them physical harm, breaking into their homes or stealing their property.

A case has been brought to my attention where a constituent of mine is likely to be charged because he discharged a firearm into the air to protect his son who was being kicked by eight to 10 people who, for some reason, had taken a dislike to him. The boy was on the ground and being kicked. In those circumstances his father was particularly concerned that he would be killed. Previous to this attack, the son had had his motor car stolen on two occasions. When the father came out and saw the situation in front of the house, he knew that he could not do anything physically about it, so he fired a shotgun into the air. That man is now likely to be charged with discharging a shotgun in public. That is a crazy situation. He was merely protecting his son against a group of hoodlums. The son had been too frightened to lay charges against these hoodlums, because he feared further intimidation from this gang which had been terrorising the town. I believe that it is now time to offer those people some protection.

One of my colleagues raised the situation of people who buy dogs to protect their property or themselves. There will be more of those incidents in the future if the law does not treat harshly some of the villains who are intimidating people, stealing cars and smashing property. In my view it is the right and responsibility of a father to protect his family or of people to protect their property against these sorts of villains. However, when a person sets out to defend himself or his property, the law is absolutely stupid.

The member for Alexandra cited the case of a constituent who was charged under similar circumstances. I can really make some headlines—

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

**Mr PETERSON (Semaphore):** In the time allowed me to speak in this debate, I would like to support—

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It's not your last speech though, is it?

**Mr PETERSON:** It certainly will not be my last speech. However, because some members are retiring, they will deliver their last speech on this occasion.

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

**Mr PETERSON:** Sorry, many of them; I misunderstood. In responding to the Address in Reply, I refer to some of the statements made by the Governor when he opened this session of Parliament. Paragraph 9 states:

Environmental issues continue to be a central concern of my Government and the community. This commitment reflected in such measures as controls over native vegetation clearance, will be supplemented by new legislation covering pollution of the marine water of our State and measures to provide for aquatic reserves.

In the nearly 10 years I have been in this place, I guarantee that I have heard more comments in this House about the problems associated with marine pollution than has any other member. This problem has been an unrecognised concern over those years. If West Lakes were a little more to the west, my electorate would be completely surrounded by water.

*Mr Hamilton interjecting:*

**Mr PETERSON:** West Lakes also has its problems, but your electorate is polluting my river and I will back that statement later with some reports. As I said, my electorate is almost completely surrounded by a marine environment, and it is affected by rubbish being pumped into the river and eventually the sea and ocean by other electorates.

**Mr De Laine:** The river is in my electorate.

**Mr PETERSON:** Get your geography right. Semaphore happens to be on LeFevre Peninsula. By definition, peninsulas are surrounded by water on three sides; they cannot be anything else.

**Mr Hamilton:** The member for Price wants to disagree with you.

**Mr PETERSON:** If he wants to dispute the definition of a peninsula, he may, but that is what it is.

**The Hon. J.W. Slater:** It is an isthmus.

**Mr PETERSON:** It is an isthmus protruding into the sea.

**The Hon. T.H. Hemmings:** You're right, Norm.

**Mr PETERSON:** The Minister of Housing and Construction knows I am right because he visited my electorate the other day and he knows what a wonderful electorate it is. We received from the new Minister recently a white paper on the control of marine pollution. Obviously she has seen the problem and will do something about it. I hope that it is not simply an election ploy. There are many instant greenies and environmental people around and I am concerned about some of the things coming out—I hope they are not just for election colouring. I listened to the speech of the member for Hartley. It is one of the vagaries of the Parliament why a man of his talents is not a Minister. I am amazed that a man of his ability is almost sitting back here with me on the crossbench. I am amazed, but I am sure that time will take care of that.

I notice in the Minister's white paper a couple of interesting points: first, thermal pollution will become an offence (if the legislation passes) and, secondly, Government agencies will be liable if they cause any pollution, including thermal pollution. It seems that the major thermal polluters in this State are Government facilities, but I will come to that later.

Over the years I have researched some reports that have come out, one being the South Australian Land Based Marine Pollution Report prepared by Sarah Miller for the pollution management division of the Department of Environment and Planning. The report highlights what I have been saying about pollution over the years. It says that in this State the major point source outfalls of marine pollution contaminated with heavy metals and inorganic chemical species include the sewage treatment works. We have several in Adelaide, including one at West Lakes.

**Mr Hamilton:** No, at Bolivar.

**Mr PETERSON:** Well, in the electorate of Albert Park. We also have the BHAS and the Playford power station. We have a number of saline outfalls, which I will describe later. The report goes on to say that it is not complete in that it does not follow the pollution points up to the source of the pollution but only to the point where it goes into the sea. The types of pollution are also covered in the report. The report states that it is not a complete inventory of the

problems, but it certainly highlights the problems we have. It states that even the pollution running off the road into the sea consists of, amongst other things, solid waste litter—

**Mr Hamilton:** Pigeons.

**Mr PETERSON:** Yes, it says 'pigeons'. It also states that chemicals, air deposit substances, vehicle pollutants and other polluting materials can vary widely in quality and area of distribution. Street surface contaminants consist of heavy metals, nutrients, pesticides, bacteria, dirt and inorganic materials in dirt. It refers to urban run-off from roads and states that 'the most alarming fact about urban run-off is that heavy metal contaminants can be 10 to 100 times the concentration of sanitary sewerage'.

**An honourable member:** The biggest problem is off the road material.

**Mr PETERSON:** Yes, some of the major pollutants can be off the road. I am not sure how we can legislate against that.

**Mr Hamilton:** It goes into the Port River.

**Mr PETERSON:** That is what I said. It is coming out of West Lakes and ruining the river. It also states that major thermal outfalls come from power stations.

**Mr Ingerson:** Who owns them?

**Mr PETERSON:** As I said earlier, they are basically Government-owned. Recently I was at The Levels looking at a readout from a satellite scan. It showed that the hot water pollution from Torrens Island flows around Torrens Island and back into the river and is therefore a major thermal pollutant.

The report also goes on to talk about the outfall from ICI Osborne and ICI Dry Creek. It says that the discharges from ICI Dry Creek have a very high concentration of magnesium salts and, subject to the mangrove die-back in this State, it is interesting to see magnesium in low concentrations is toxic to mangroves. We are pumping it out of there and that is where the die-back has been.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr PETERSON:** Mangroves are very important. There is another paper by Pat Harbison about mangroves. It says that they are extremely valuable and necessary in the food chains for all marine life. The discharge of thermal pollution causes the problem. The paper goes on about the Glenelg sewage treatment works, which are situated on a linear stretch of coast, and dispersal studies show that the incoming tide carries components from the outfall north parallel to the beach. That rides up along the coast, past West Lakes, Henley and all the coastal electorates and beaches in the vicinity of the river. The mass load of oxidised nitrogen from the effluent outfall is about 300 tonnes a year and the corresponding phosphate load is 155 tonnes a year. The sludge outfall has a phosphate load of about 40 tonnes a year.

We are talking about sea grass die-back as well, which is a serious problem in this State. We know where it is coming from. Certainly a lot of the pollutant is affecting sea life, but we have done nothing about it. The Bolivar sewage treatment works is near the Barker inlet, but the outfall is similar. The major discharge of thermal water is from the Torrens Island power station. It gives the details, temperature and so on, and it recognises that there is a problem there. They are pumping out this hot water. As a matter of interest, the Torrens Island area is a marine reserve. It is recognised as a fish breeding area, and we are knowingly pumping this pollution into it.

About four years ago we had an arsenic spill at Gillman. That was run into the river. The area of that spill and the creek it ran along is recognised as a high contaminant area of heavy metals, all running into the sea. This area has been

proposed for a West Lakes type development at Northarm. That area is contaminated. There was a house at Hendon where contaminants from a previous industry made it necessary to dig up the whole block and remove the soil.

**Mr Hamilton:** That's inaccurate.

**Mr PETERSON:** I am going by what was in the newspaper. I understand that there was some removal and sealing of the yards. That block contained contaminant from some years ago—a contaminant that was unknown and unseen. This is the same problem with the river, the backwaters, the mangrove flats and the creeks that run into them. There are sewerage and industrial and domestic outfalls coming into the river. If we can do something about legislating to make it better, it will be wonderful, but it will be a herculean task even to look at the problem.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr PETERSON:** I am speaking of what I am concerned about, and that is pollution. Everybody who has anything to do with salt water and fish knows that the contaminant levels of shellfish in the sea have been recognised in our gulf, which we know, and which the Minister has stated, is the cleanest marine urban environment in Australia. In our own marine environment, where the water is better than anywhere else, the cadmium pollution in shellfish is about 18 times the acceptable level. We are talking about the cleanest waterways in Australia and they are polluted beyond the acceptable level.

The contaminants are building up all the time. This report says that the Northarm Creek is perhaps the most likely region to be polluted by leachates. Northarm Creek is adjacent to what were rubbish dumps many years ago where oil, chemicals, paint and all sorts of stuff that they did not know how to handle was dumped. The operator at the time, Mr Paul, has recognised that the contamination there is very bad.

The report from which I am quoting says that there is no information about the leachates from those areas. So, there we have an unknown quantity as far as those run-offs are concerned. Paragraph 32 of the Governor's speech states that the Government will introduce a Bill to amend the Equal Opportunity Act to make it unlawful to discriminate against a person on the grounds of intellectual impairment in the fields of education, employment, the provision of goods and services and accommodation. For the many years during which I have been in this House I have spoken to consecutive Ministers about my concern over accommodation for the mentally impaired.

As a matter of fact, the previous Minister of Health (Dr Cornwall) had a report prepared about the problems that was released in April last year. Unfortunately, he left the post after that. I see that he has now been appointed as national Director of the Australian Veterinary Association, and I wish him well. I hope he finds contentment in that role. However, while he was Minister he was aware of this situation and was prepared to look at and, I think, act on it, but he left before he got around to it. I see now that we are to look at it again. The report to which I have referred was on psychiatrically and intellectually disabled residents in boarding houses, and it covers the problems very well.

In my electorate I have several of these establishments, and over the years I have had complaints about them. I have here a letter from a person who worked in one such establishment, with a list of drugs which are dispensed in that establishment by people who are not qualified to dispense drugs. This is criminal. It is not legal for anyone unlicensed to distribute drugs, but at the moment we have no way of controlling it. Many people living in these places are unable to control their own affairs. They need help in

varying degrees, from physical help in doing things, to help in reading or understanding what is going on.

In my opinion they have been thrown into the community, out of the places where they have felt comfortable and safe, and many of them wish that they were back in a hostel situation. But we do not have that sort of situation. They are thrown into the community and have to take up accommodation in boarding houses, because there are no other types of houses. Many of these places work very well, but many do not. Some 50 drugs are named on the list given to me. There are a couple of pharmacists here, and I asked their advice. They told me that in the main they are generally acceptable prescription drugs, but they are dangerous if someone is given the wrong drug or an overdose, as can happen with any drug.

These drugs are being handed out by someone with no training. I do not know these drugs. I have their names but I have no idea of their effect. As a matter of fact, some of the pharmacists had to ask each other about them, just to make sure what they were. Doctors are not present at these places, although they have a continual system of medical care. The drugs may be prescribed correctly but given to the patients by people who have no knowledge of them. That is a major concern to me, and I hope that when this legislation comes forward it looks at the standard of care and at the services required by people in these homes.

During this debate so far, we have heard several comments about the development of the State. I would like to tell members about an area of this State which is having more development than any other, and that is the electorate of Semaphore. We have more going on in that area than in the rest of the State put together. The State might be up and running, but Semaphore is leading and going away easily. I will list a few of these projects so that we can see where we are going. First, we have the submarine project where \$4 000 million is being spent.

**Mr Hamilton:** You've done a good job.

**Mr PETERSON:** I have done a mighty job for my electorate. Let me tell the House about the many development projects in the district. The submarine project is being developed on the banks of the Port River. That plant is now being constructed, staff are there and construction of the first submarine is well on line and about to commence. We also have the battery project in connection with that project.

**Mr Hamilton:** So, the western suburbs are not being neglected.

**Mr PETERSON:** Since I have represented my district the western suburbs have gone ahead marvellously. Semaphore has leapt ahead. We have the submarine project and we have the Pacific Dunlop battery plant where \$30 million will be spent. Eglo Engineering is currently making the patrol craft for the Royal Australian Navy and it will be a major part of the frigate project, whoever gets the contract, and that will probably involve \$10 million.

**The Hon. G.F. Keneally:** That's in the district of Price.

**Mr PETERSON:** Do not worry about Price. This is in Semaphore, and you cannot move the boundaries. Adelaide Brighton Cement is one of the most dynamic South Australian companies—probably the most dynamic—and it is spending \$100 million to expand its plant with another oven, boosting production by 50 per cent.

**Mr Hamilton:** Is there any pollution?

**Mr PETERSON:** With the expansion there will be increased pollution control through a better system involving a dry oven. As a result of a takeover, ICI has just changed hands. I was dubious at first about its future, but the new owners have confidence in the plant—a great plant.

**The Hon. G.F. Keneally:** And that is a microcosm of what is happening in South Australia.

**Mr PETERSON:** I am trying to tell you that we are well in front. That is what an Independent can do for a district like Semaphore. We have a brand new fire station. Members will recall the years I spent fighting for a new fire station, and now we have one at a cost of \$1.5 million.

**Mr Hamilton:** What about the flower farm?

**Mr PETERSON:** The flower farm is a council project and it is going well as far as I can see. Only time will tell how well it is going. Also, we are upgrading the oil berths. Members also will remember the time I spent fighting to get the oil berths upgraded. That involves another \$3 million. We also have residential development and, indeed, only about a week ago the Minister of Housing was in the area opening a magnificent housing development. I have a copy of his speech: 'The Affordable Homes Model for Urban Consolidation'.

**The Hon. T.H. Hemmings:** Read it out.

**Mr PETERSON:** I do not have enough time, with only nine minutes remaining, and I have other things to say. Nevertheless, the project is in the forefront of housing development in this State. The Minister threatened to move to the district, but I told him that he would only have one vote if he did and that it was not worth the expense, but he still thought about it. We have several projects, such as the upgrading of Semaphore Road, the building of the Palais on the beach, the \$3 million development at the Royal South Australian Yacht Squadron, the development at Snowden's Beach, and the \$400 000 development at Cruickshanks Corner—the member for Price and I are now trying to get something done there. At North Haven Marina there is a new tavern and shopping area.

**The Hon. G.F. Keneally:** If I did not know better, I would think that this was a pre-election speech for the local paper.

**Mr PETERSON:** It will be much neater and tidier when it gets there—a full page ad. That is what is happening in Semaphore. We are in front. We have done well down there. On top of that development that I have mentioned—and that is only part of it—there is a proposed strategy for development in Port Adelaide and on the peninsula. That development will expand the industrial, recreational and residential areas.

*The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:*

**Mr PETERSON:** This is a development that will considerably change the future of the Port Adelaide area—that includes the Districts of Price and Semaphore. It involves the rezoning of the northern end of the peninsula to consolidate the industrial area. As part of that, the Government is developing an industrial park in the Osborne area.

**The Hon. G.F. Keneally:** Your run might be cut short if Port Adelaide people go to North Adelaide.

**Mr PETERSON:** Don't worry about that; that is not likely to happen. It will expand the recreational areas that will run across the peninsula. There will be a residential and recreational development at Snowden's Beach. In Port Adelaide itself the harbourside project may eventuate. I hope it will, but it has taken a long time to get under way. That plan encompasses the up end of the river.

*The Hon. G.F. Keneally interjecting:*

**Mr PETERSON:** It has in Semaphore because of the insistence and dogged persistence of the local member who fought away until it happened. I do have some doubts about the development in the District of Price—and I am sure that the member for Price will not mind my mentioning it. I am referring to the development on the north arm; I cannot see this development proceeding.

**Mr Hamilton:** Don't worry about it.

**Mr PETERSON:** It is in the District of Price. I am doubtful about that, but I am pleased with the remainder. They will make a vast difference.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr PETERSON:** The speech was well done: 9 out of 10. I wish to propose a concept that I believe the State Government should take up with the Federal Government. I think that a similar scheme has been proposed in New South Wales, but I cannot obtain the detail. The proposal is to fund housing on a tax free basis. I believe there are two groups of people in our community who are concerned about their well-being. One comprises the retirees with a few dollars—a payout of superannuation—who are concerned about where to put the money to get back a few dollars without having their pension affected too much. The other group consists of home buyers. I believe that, if we could use funds from one group to help the other group, we would be able to serve a dual purpose. I suggest we look at some scheme whereby a defined sum could be taken from the retiree. The retirees could have a reduced return, tax free, and that money could be lent to the home buyer as a second mortgage at a reduced interest rate, at two or three points below the going rate.

That does not seem too complex to me, but nobody seems to have picked it up and considered it. It makes sense to me. I would like the Minister of Housing and Construction (who is present now) to look at that. I think there is some logic in that proposal. There are two areas of people who could benefit. It would certainly help the first home buyer and it would bring a smile to the face of retirees who have a few dollars because at the moment they are being taxed at the maximum rate. They are losing their pension concessions and they are paying taxes.

Consider the young man out in the community who has a wife and two young children going to school and who is trying to buy a house and a car. No matter where he is now, he is in strife with the current interest rates, which are not likely to get better quickly. We should look at some scheme to help such a family. Those people deserve some assistance. No-one can tell me that the average tradesman, the fitter and turner who is working on a lathe who has a wife and two young kids and who is trying to buy a house and car, is finding the going easy. By no means in the world is he finding it easy. He has to make house payments, buy furnishings, register and pay for his car, and try to clothe his wife, his kids and himself; he is not finding it easy. Why do we not look realistically at the situation?

Some time ago I saw figures on non-interest bearing funds in banks where pensioners, for instance, who were concerned about losing their pension, would put their money in a non-interest bearing account. The asset test has affected that to some degree, but there are still others with nowhere near an amount that would be affected by the assets test who should be able to use that money reasonably. If there was a \$10 000 investment limit for individuals, no financial laws would be broken, but the family man would be helped. It would be like a second mortgage in reverse, because the overall effect would be reduced. A limit could be put on it if a lump sum system was considered. No other ideas are emerging that could help anybody.

**Mr Groom:** There's nothing coming from the Opposition.

**Mr PETERSON:** Take it up, then. The honourable member is well up in finance. Why would it not work? Here is the question I ask the House: tell me why it will not work. Convince me that it will not work and I will shut up and sit down. It seems there is room for some scheme like that in our society. I support the motion.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles):** I support the motion and, in doing so, express my loyalty to the Queen, my respect for the Governor and my condolences to the families of those former members of this House who died since the Address in Reply to the speech of His Excellency the Governor was last presented. I mention particularly Sir Lyell McEwin and Sir Arthur Rymill, two very long-serving members of the Liberal Party. Sir Lyell McEwin particularly had a record without peer as Chief Secretary, Minister of Health and Minister of Mines. It is unlikely that his performance will ever be repeated. Times have changed to the point where for one to spend 40 years in Parliament would be beyond the stamina at least, if not the inclination, of most members in today's political climate, particularly given the demands of the media and larger electorates with more constituents in a more diverse and complex society. Nevertheless, it is inspiring to look at the record of achievement of those members and I feel sure that their families can be extremely proud of what those men did when they represented the South Australian community.

This afternoon during Question Time, the Premier made in effect a pre-election economic statement to the House that contained some statements that cannot go without challenge. One of them was that the budget result—that is, a surplus which will enable the Government to reduce taxes immediately before the State election—has been achieved through sound financial management by the Government and stronger than anticipated growth in general economic activity. In this speech I propose to refute that claim of sound financial management by the Government and to demonstrate that the Government's financial management has, in many areas, been not only less than sound but grossly irresponsible in terms of waste and mismanagement.

The stronger than anticipated growth in general economic activity can, in many areas, be attributed to the effects of inflation, particularly when it comes to real estate values, and the increased land tax, which the Government has been able to generate as a result of those increased values. In fact, if one looks at what the Government has today promised to give away in terms of tax cuts, and at what the Government has in fact taken over the past five years one will find that it is akin to taking one's shirt, pants, socks, shoes and hat and giving back only a few fragments of thread to those who have been virtually denuded.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Members opposite challenge this, but if any of them during the parliamentary break have been—and I presume they have—out in the shopping centres or doorknocking in their electorates they will know that there is real hardship in the South Australian community. Of course, there are pockets of wealth, but there are also large areas of deprivation. Interestingly and tragically, those areas of deprivation are being experienced primarily among those who were formerly the keenest supporters of this Government. I have been doorknocking on behalf of Liberal candidates in many of the marginal seats. The warmest reception I have received has been in what would normally be considered the safe Labor suburbs. In fact, some weeks ago I was doorknocking in Holden Hill—

**Mr Hamilton:** How many houses did you do?

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** About 300. At the doors of some houses I went to I got a warmth of reception that I certainly was not anticipating. In fact, one particular response stuck quite vividly in my mind. The door was opened and, before I had time to identify myself, the man of the house said, 'I'm certainly pleased to see you, Ms Cashmore. I've been a Labor voter all my life but I have

had enough.' He did not use the word 'enough'; he used slightly more colourful phraseology, but I have modified what he said out of deference to you, Mr Acting Speaker, and to the House.

There is deprivation, and among those who are traditional Labor voters there is more than a sense of betrayal—there is a sense of despair. I am sure that the ALP's own polling reflects that, and no amount of bravado from members opposite will alter that situation. My colleague, the Deputy Leader, in his speech gave a quite graphic account of the failure of South Australia and its Government in relation to comparative economic performance. On the substantial economic indicators—retail sales, unemployment and bankruptcies—South Australia is doing worse than most, if not all, of the other States.

When it comes to taxes and charges, this Government, which has managed to come out with funds that it can now proceed to give back, has, in the past financial year alone, increased 171 individual State charges. One will find, if one examines them individually, that most of them rose well above the CPI. For example, during the life of this Government, public transport fares in Adelaide have risen more than in any other capital city and this State has the second highest electricity tariff in Australia. Of course, this is partly because the Government is not prepared to confront the unions, whose practices are to some extent responsible for the excessive costs of the Electricity Trust. That is known and acknowledged in Government, but no-one in the Government has the tenacity and nerve to tackle that matter in the interests of all those people in the electorates who are suffering.

The waste and mismanagement of the Government has been documented many times in this House but, in order to set the framework for what I intend to say, I want to make some reference to the sums of money that have been virtually thrown away because of a failure to plan and to manage. On 2 May this year, the Leader of the Opposition released a substantial list of waste and mismanagement items relating to the State Government which indicated that the sum of \$160 million had been wasted—virtually \$1 million a week—since the Government came to office. Without itemising everything on that list, I shall refer simply to a few of the major items.

The reorganisation of the Education Department—which has been of such minimal success that last week we witnessed the biggest strike by teachers that has ever taken place in this State—cost \$7 million. The spending on vacant office space and vacant teacher rental housing cost \$2 million. The America's Cup challenge—and this is going back a little while now, but it pays to refresh our memories with some of these matters—cost \$1.8 million. The cancellation of a contract (and this is just the mere cancellation) to resurface the Olympic Sports Field cost a little over a quarter of a million dollars. The State Transport Authority—which figures quite substantially in this list—failed to meet its staff ceilings and the blow-out in the wages bill amounted to \$4 million. The failure by the Government to implement recommendations to use private contractors for school bus operations amounted to \$3 million. The failure to implement reductions in the TAFE central office cost half a million dollars.

The construction of the *Island Seaway* was a big ticket item: the original cost was estimated at \$10 million in 1985, while the actual cost in 1988 was at least \$21 million; that is to say, there was a gap between the estimated cost and the actual cost of \$11 million. The introduction of the Crouzet ticketing system by the State Transport Authority was estimated to cost less than \$5 million, but it actually

cost \$11 million—a blow-out of \$6 million. There was a similar cost of \$6.5 million for the introduction of a new computing system by the Motor Registration Division. It was estimated to cost \$4.5 million, and that was what was approved—but the actual cost was \$11 million. There was a failure to implement promised cuts in employment of public servants in administrative and executive officer classifications. That has cost us \$4 million a year. There was a blow-out of \$1 million in the cost of fitting out the new Health Commission offices.

The implementation of the Justice Information System really makes the rest pale into insignificance. The original estimate was \$21 million in 1985. The revised estimate in 1989 is \$75 million—a mere discrepancy of \$54 million. There was a failure to control sick leave abuses in the public sector, with an estimated cost in lost productivity of \$10 million per year. That amounts to \$50 million if we look at the whole span of the life of this Government.

The provision for loss on investment in the New Zealand timber mill by the South Australian Timber Corporation currently stands at \$10 million. The blow-out in the cost of the Scrimber project, another venture of the South Australian Timber Corporation, is \$10.5 million. As I say, taking all those, plus the others to which I have not referred, into account, that amounts to \$160 million—which, at \$1 million a week, is a pretty fast way to run away with other people's money. Yet, in his statement today the Premier said:

Government has no inherent right to spend tomorrow's money. It should practise diligent economic management which protects the resources of the State while providing a fair distribution of services at the lowest possible cost to the taxpayers.

How could the Premier stand there unblushing today and make those statements, in the light of his knowledge of the truth of that \$160 million down the drain—some \$160 million which could otherwise have employed 300 more nurses in hospitals that are badly understaffed, 300 more policemen in a Police Force which is badly understaffed, and 300 more teachers in an education department which is crying out, together with parents and schools, for a more effective education system in this State? The record of that waste should be seen alongside the promises—these very overdue and unfulfilled promises—that the Premier made today.

I refer again to the Premier's claim that his Government has achieved sound financial management. I refer in passing to three of the items on that list of waste, or cost blow-outs. I mention the \$54 million for the Justice Information System, and most particularly (because it fits in to the analysis that I am about to make of the Government's other ventures) the provisions for loss on investment in a New Zealand timber mill—\$10 million—and the \$10.5 million blow-out in the cost of the scrimber project. Those latter two items are projects which would normally be expected to be the function of private enterprise. Investment in a New Zealand timber mill is not normally an activity with which one would associate a Government of a relatively small State, in a country some thousands of miles away from the site of the investment.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** The investment was also unwise as private enterprise had rejected the proposition as an unviable one.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Private enterprise had looked at the prospect and rejected it as being one that was unlikely to be rewarding. With those examples in mind, one should be asking 'What is the role and function of Government?' As the Liberal Party sees it, the role and function of Government is certainly not to become involved in activities which are rightly the province of private enter-

prise and for which private enterprise is well equipped. These are activities for which private enterprise, and not the taxpayer, pays the price if risks are taken and if that activity fails. On the other hand, the State Government has other priorities, the primary one being the provision of human services, notably, education, health and public safety. Anything that diverts a Government from that principal constitutional administrative role is to the detriment of the people, as can be demonstrated.

If one looks at some of the Government's involvements in private enterprise activity over recent years, we see SAMIC, a company which was formed by the Government in 1985 as a venture capital company operating under the provisions of the Management and Investment Companies Act, and which has lost \$5 million since it was established. In 1987-88, the South Australian Government Insurance Corporation lost \$5.6 million. As I mentioned earlier, the South Australian Timber Corporation has accumulated losses of \$16.8 million under this Government. The State Clothing Corporation (one might say that it is pretty small beer compared to the others, and so it is) lost \$460 000. We then go on to a couple of very venturesome activities undertaken by this Government which have demonstrably fallen flat on their face. I refer to Enterprise Investments, which has an accumulated loss of \$2.7 million and SA Ventures, which has had an accumulated loss over the past three years of \$1.5 million.

Not in the least bit deterred by those two losses—Enterprise Investments and SA Ventures—the Government has now wound up those two companies and established a new Enterprise Investment Fund with no less than \$28 million capital supplied by the South Australian Financing Authority. One gains the impression that this Government not only will never learn but also has no wish to learn.

**Mr Meier:** In other words, it's total economic mismanagement.

**The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE:** Total economic mismanagement and a total commitment to the notion that it is appropriate for a Government to make substantial investments in, and provide substantial financial guarantees to, a number of financial and commercial undertakings operating not only in South Australia but also, as we have demonstrated, outside South Australia which can be of no possible benefit to the State but which are draining away precious taxpayers' funds.

The Government sometimes claims that these investments and commitments are required to stimulate and encourage the overall development of the State's resources. It sometimes claims that the investment is required where particular businesses with profit and growth potential cannot raise adequate capital or a loan elsewhere. Sometimes the Government says that it is forced to become entrepreneurial in order to sustain the required volume of public revenues with the help of the yearly income derived from these investments.

We then witness the Government getting into operations like craft shops which it opens in direct competition with private free enterprise craft shops in the City of Adelaide. We see the Government competing in the catering industry, through the South Australian Convention Centre, with established private enterprise caterers. We see all these things occurring on unequal terms because the Government venture is financed by the taxpayer; its losses are borne by the taxpayer and it enjoys tremendous benefits that the businesses with which it competes do not enjoy. Of course, that is all to the detriment of the South Australian economy.

When things do go wrong, the interesting thing is that the Government does not accept responsibility. The Gov-



ernment finds it most convenient to sheet home the responsibility to others, to the people whom it appoints to the boards of these hapless undertakings or, worst of all in the Westminster system, to the hapless heads of departments who may have some form of administrative responsibility but who certainly cannot accept—and should not be asked to accept—the political responsibility inherent in the original decision to embark upon these ventures.

By way of illustration, I will just outline to the House the story of SAMIC, which was formed in 1985 as a venture capital company operating under the provisions of the Management and Investment Companies Act. Shareholders in companies formed under this Act receive a tax deduction for the amounts they subscribe as share capital, so there is an incentive for companies and individuals to be involved. This incentive is granted as a concession in recognition of the higher than normal risk of investment in companies with small business which have plans to market and develop products involving the use of new or modified technological processes.

The story of SAMIC is as follows: at 30 June 1988 its capital was \$15.9 million, and that was held by a combination of Government institutions, private business interests and individuals. At that date the principal shareholders were the State Bank group (\$2 523 400); the SGIC (\$2.4 million); Southern Farmers Coop Ltd (\$1.2 million); and FH Faulding and Company Limited (\$1 million), giving a total paid-up capital of \$7 183 400.

The four shareholders held 45 per cent of the capital and the Government's interest was just over 30 per cent. The operations of that company produced the following results: for the year ending 30 June 1986 the profit was \$180 805; for the year ending 30 June 1987 the profit took a nosedive to \$16 430; and for the year ending 30 June 1988 the company showed a monumental loss of \$5 668 865. That disastrous result incorporated an operating loss of \$83 000 and a write-down of \$5.8 million in the value of the company's investments. So, in the space of two financial years the company had lost one-third of its capital and its staff was reduced to three people.

In the company's dismal report for the year ended 30 June 1988 the directors advised that at balance date and after providing for losses the company still held shareholders' funds equal to \$10 million, which were debt free. That was out of an original capital subscription of almost \$16 million. One would have thought—and in fact it would be reasonable to think—that any private enterprise company with that result would have admitted defeat and handed back the remaining funds to shareholders to enable them to be used profitably in their own businesses. But, no, the directors announced that they intended to locate suitable investment opportunities to provide a return and 'restore the underlying value of the company's shares in a reasonable time frame'. They proposed to use the residue of the original capital, namely—\$10 million—and borrow another \$10 million so as to consider investment proposals in the vicinity of \$20 million.

In all of this one must bear in mind that the Premier is a 30 per cent shareholder in this misconceived and failed enterprise and he appears to be satisfied to endorse the concept. He is so satisfied, in fact, that he has undertaken, as treasurer, an instruction to the South Australian Financing Authority to inject \$28 million capital into two other failed companies established by the Government—namely, SA Ventures and Enterprise Investments (S.A.) Ltd and a new company, Enterprise Investment Limited.

Why is it that year after year the Government is willing to see companies it has established participate in activities

that are not the role and function of Government, to lose money consistently and keep backing them and paying up guarantees? I do not have the time this evening, but at a later stage I will elaborate on other ventures in which the Government has become involved and the manner in which it is turning a blind eye to accumulated losses whilst virtually encouraging them to write off those losses, regroup and to establish fresh companies. It is injecting those new companies with fresh capital from the apparently bottomless pit of the South Australian Financing Authority.

I simply pose the question: how far should a Government engage in the provision of commercial and financial services that are already supplied on competitive terms by private interests, and how far should the South Australian Government commit substantial public funds and guarantees to this end? In light of the Premier's statement today, in light of his almost thieving of land tax from businesses as a result of inflated property values whilst today mockingly announcing that he proposes to give some back like a latter day Robin Hood, and in light of his hypocrisy, he will be judged by the people of South Australia at the coming election.

I believe that that judgment will not be to his credit. I assure the Premier that in the weeks to come during the budget session a careful analysis will be made of his stewardship of the South Australian Treasury. Despite his claims that that stewardship has been virtually impeccable, the evidence indicates otherwise.

**Mr DUGAN (Adelaide):** I have pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Governor opening the fifth session of the forty-sixth Parliament. In doing so, I should like to acknowledge the contribution that has been made by the Governor during his term in office and the role that he has performed on the occasion of opening each of the five sessions of Parliament that I have had the privilege of attending. The Governor's speech was very comprehensive, outlining the activities and programs of the Government for the forthcoming year. I believe that it sets a charter for South Australia for the future which will give it the confidence to be able to deliver to the people of South Australia a series of financial measures and legislative packages and a variety of social programs which will improve the well-being of nearly all South Australians.

I should also like to acknowledge the contributions that have been made to the South Australian Parliament and, through the Parliament, to the community of South Australia by those former members of Parliament—both of this House and of the other—who have died since the fourth session of the Parliament was opened. Each of them has been referred to by other members in this place and their records of contributions to the community and the Parliament have been commented upon. Like other members, I extend to the families of those former members my condolences on the passing of their loved ones.

Before moving on to the main substance of what I want to address in this debate, I should like to pay a compliment to the Speaker of this House and to the President of the other Chamber for the arrangements that were made for the centenary celebrations for the whole of the Parliament. The celebrations were to mark the centenary of the House of Assembly and the jubilee of the Legislative Council.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** What about the issue of those certificates?

**Mr DUGAN:** I have yet to receive mine. I think that the arrangements were due and proper and mark important events in the social and political, if not the architectural, life of South Australia. It was important to have that event. Certificates were issued, as the member for Alexandra has

indicated, to all members, and certificates were issued to all members of the staff of the Parliament in recognition of the role that they performed in the lead-up to those celebrations and on that particular occasion.

I suppose that the only regret I have is that the occasion of the one hundredth anniversary of this Chamber and the fiftieth anniversary of the Legislative Council were not marked by a major commitment to the facilities and a modernisation of the whole of the Parliament, as those occasions were marked in the past. Every member and every person who works in this place will be aware that much work could be done in providing facilities for staff and members to increase access to Government information and to improve communications with other Parliaments and the bureaucracy, using modern information technology to keep abreast of policy and legislative changes.

Also, it is important to note that the facilities offered to the staff who are being called upon to provide an increasing range of services to members are also quite basic, particularly when compared with some of the facilities available in other Parliaments throughout the country. One hopes that we do not have to wait until the two hundredth anniversary of this building before the facilities for members, the public and those who serve the Parliament are raised to the appropriate level. Nonetheless, the arrangements made by the Speaker and the President were very good. I offer my congratulations and, I am sure, the congratulations of all members for the arrangements that they made and for the effort put in by the staff on their behalf.

In recent months there have been several meetings of Neighbourhood Watch committees in the electorate of Adelaide. They have been in the form of annual general meetings, which tend to occur at this time of the year, but there have also been a number of general meetings of the zone leaders and, perhaps most importantly from my point of view, two inaugural meetings of Neighbourhood Watch programs have been held in the electorate of Adelaide.

Of the two new programs established, one is in the south-east corner of the city. It is the first established in the city in an area that includes a complicated mix of residential, commercial, retail and light industrial activities, making the nature of the surveillance to be undertaken and the responsibility of the zone leaders somewhat different from what applies in a predominantly suburban or residential area. Nonetheless, that program has been established with a tremendous amount of community support. Over 140 people attended the inaugural meeting, and the program has got off to a fine start.

Similarly, a meeting held in the Prospect Town Hall last week established Prospect No. 3, a Neighbourhood Watch committee covering Fitzroy and various parts of Prospect, some 800 homes in all. That scheme was sought for some time by the residents of that area. The two new schemes join six other programs which are already operating in the area and which have achieved their joint objective of reducing crime and involving the community in the surveillance of crime and in the work of the police.

The six programs to which I refer are in Walkerville, North Walkerville, Gilberton, Medindie, Prospect and North Adelaide. The involvement of the community and the active participation of the Neighbourhood Watch zone leaders and their committees in pursuing the objectives of the programs have made those communities safer. The Neighbourhood Watch program is an essential ingredient of both the community policing strategy of the South Australian Police Force and the crime prevention policy of the Government.

The Neighbourhood Watch program works, people feel happy with it and it is one of the major success stories of

the community policing strategy of the Police Force and the crime prevention strategy of the Government. The demand for Neighbourhood Watch programs continues. There is an extension of its use into many parts of the metropolitan area, into country areas and into other specific areas of our community such as schools and commercial premises.

In the District of Adelaide the demand continues with at least two more programs planned and applications for two others. I would hope and expect that by the middle of 1990 the whole district will be covered by such programs. In addition to achieving the objective of reducing crime, perhaps the most important aspect of the Neighbourhood Watch program is that it brings the police and the community into much closer contact with one another. This is good for the community, for the zone leaders involved in the programs, and for the people living in the community. People in areas covered by a Neighbourhood Watch program are pleased to know that one of their neighbours close by has direct links straight through to the police command headquarters where the police crime taskings are controlled for the area.

It is also good for the police to know what people are worried about, so that those involved can work in concert to make communities safer, and so that people will feel secure in the knowledge that the neighbourhood is safer. The other advantage to the police as a consequence of this greater contact and discussion is that the police are becoming more involved directly in other community activities that would not on the surface seem to have such an obvious crime prevention aspect to them.

This is extremely important because it adds to that feeling of security that people have as well as to the security in the neighbourhood, by people knowing and seeing that the police are involved in school organisations, in YMCAs, in scout organisations, in various fairs and fetes conducted by local communities, in youth programs, in visiting senior citizen programs, and so on.

In addition, the community policing program has been extended. The community policing philosophy has seen a number of changes, many of which would have been noted by members in various districts. There has been an extension of foot and mounted patrols, and a greater involvement of police in victim services, helping people who are victims of crime, whether it is crime against the person or crime against property. The role of the Crime Prevention Unit has been extended, with more police officers going out into the community to talk to groups about the role of the police and the action that individuals can take to provide greater protection for their own person, home and car.

As a result of the community policing philosophy of the Police Force there has also been a greater participation by the police with other levels of government in a variety of crime prevention measures. In this respect I refer to a Housing Trust publication which I picked up when passing through Kingston on a recent visit to the South-East.

At one roadhouse I found a Housing Trust pamphlet dealing with the establishment of tenant advisory committees which will provide tenants in Housing Trust areas, whether of predominantly single, detached or attached dwellings or whether of medium density, with a greater degree of control over the way in which that estate is managed, the way it is governed and the way it looks. On the back of that pamphlet was an example of a Housing Trust area that had suffered a high degree of petty crime, usually vandalism but also where people are frightened as a result of a number of personal attacks against individuals.

In association with the tenants, the Housing Trust has redesigned a large number of its units to provide for its

occupants greater security and of privacy in both the front and rear gardens. This feeling of security, which came as a result of delineating where one person's private space starts and another person's begins, has given the people in those units a greater feeling of security, ownership and belonging. Two things have happened as a result of that: first, a greater feeling of community and ownership by all the people in that housing complex and, secondly, a substantial fall-off in the number of reported crimes against property and crimes against persons. These two things are not unrelated. It is not a coincidence that they both happen at once.

One of the interesting characteristics of many of the crime prevention programs undertaken successfully by Governments in Europe is the rebuilding of communities, the rebuilding of people's commitment to their local neighbourhood and to each other. As a direct consequence of that, people are taking more responsibility for themselves, for their neighbours and for their community. As a consequence, they feel that they own the whole area. The crime rate drops as a result of that closer knit community.

The role of the police being involved with Government agencies is extremely important. In Britain, the Crime Prevention Unit of the London Metropolitan Police is now appointing police architectural liaison officers to a number of local housing authorities. These officers negotiate with the housing development authorities and the local council to identify ways by which, architecturally and through design measures, people in a housing development can achieve a greater sense of community where communication between neighbours can be improved, where ownership of particular parcels of land can be better identified and where people have a sense of order, a sense of belonging and a sense of neighbourliness.

It has been found that design measures—this method of designing out crime—has had a substantial and dramatic effect. That is the result we are seeing with a number of Housing Trust programs. I would like to acknowledge publicly the work that has been done and the cooperation that exists between the Police Force and the Housing Trust in that sense. I mention that in relation to a number of features of the community policing programs.

Finally, I refer to the opening of 24-hour police stations. My colleague the member for Newland mentioned the 24-hour police station that is operating in her district. The Bank Street Police Station, across the road from Parliament House, is now operating on a 24-hour basis. It provides police services in and around this most populous entertainment area of Adelaide and it provides security to a large number of people. By virtue simply of its existence at the street level in a shopfront environment, it provides people with an alternative route to travel from Hindley Street through to the Casino and entertainment area of North Terrace.

Bank Street has now become a very safe thoroughfare, a place used particularly by young and older women on their own, and people are encouraged to use Bank Street as the main link between the Hindley precinct area and North Terrace. The station has certainly served its purpose. The police in Bank Street are not simply sitting in their glass-fronted premises waiting for people to enter. As I mentioned earlier, the other feature of the community policing program is that police are undertaking more foot patrols. They are out on the beat, walking around, and people can see them. They are participating in a number of the youth and Aboriginal programs that are operating in Hindley Street. The police presence has become a permanent, obvious and increasingly less threatening feature of the whole of that area.

These programs and initiatives of the Police Force are endorsed and supported by the Government both in principle and in kind. In principle, these programs are in line with the crime prevention policy and approach of the Government. The Government has allocated to the Police Force, through successive budgets, resources which have been directed towards increasing police manpower and facilities and the sorts of community programs to which we have referred. That direct and obvious realistic support for police resources and manpower will continue.

There is no doubt that an increase in police numbers is important. It is important to have more police to fight the war against drugs, a war that will go on vigorously for as long as is necessary to rid the community of this evil. Resources are needed to fight the war against organised crime and fraud. Recently the Police Commissioner announced the establishment of a group within the Police Force to combat organised crime and fraud. It is obviously necessary for a group to develop specialised skills in this area so that detection arrangements can be established by people with sufficient skills in accounting, the use—and, perhaps more importantly, the misuse—of computer technology and the manipulation of financial records that is so much part and parcel of organised financial crime and fraud. The Police Commissioner will continue to allocate resources to these programs. Resources will be allocated by the Government in acknowledgment of the efforts and initiatives being taken by the Police Commissioner.

Resources are also needed to attack the serious crimes against person and property which, unfortunately, continue in our society at a fairly substantial rate. Also, police resources are required to make our roads safer and our neighbourhoods more secure. Perhaps the most important point about all this is that the task of making our cities safer does not, cannot and should not fall to the police alone.

It is important to recognise that, despite the resources that go into the Police Force and the efforts made by the police in a variety of areas—by the establishment of special task forces on organised crime, drugs, fraud, and offences against the Licensing Act; and despite the police's substantial efforts in the area of community policing, by being more visible and becoming involved in the community through Neighbourhood Watch programs, and so on—the police on their own cannot overcome or alter the nature of crime patterns in our community. That has to be a community effort. We have to talk about crime prevention in terms of the role that all of us can play—not only the role that the Police Force can play.

The Governor's speech referred to a number of specific statutory measures that the Government will be taking in terms of crime detection and prevention. It also talked about a number of diversionary programs in relation to young offenders and specifically dealt with the establishment of programs for restitution by offenders direct to the community or to the victim. These are important and essential elements of a total crime prevention package. However, it is still important that we acknowledge that the criminal justice system on its own, whether with or without those laws, cannot overcome the problem of crime without the individual support of every member in this place, in the community and elsewhere.

The criminal justice system can deal with one end of it; our responsibility as a community is to make our community much safer. We must re-establish the notion of communities, because a safe community is a secure community; a safe community is a community that has no crime. A community without crime is a community where people

care about and look after the interests of one another without being stickybeaks and unnecessarily interfering in one another's affairs; where they care about their neighbours properties, their community resources, and the wellbeing of individuals who may be living alone in the community. There is no place where crime can develop with that sort of care or notion of community.

I will take the opportunity on another occasion of examining some of the various criminological and sociological theories that underpin various crime prevention programs in other countries. The countries undertaking the most important of the crime prevention programs that are based on this notion of the whole community contributing are the United Kingdom, France and the Netherlands. Each one of them accepts this basic premise that the whole of the community must make a contribution to the overall exercise. Interestingly, one of those three countries has a Government of the left; another, of the centre; and the other, of the right. Irrespective of the political leanings of those Governments, each accepts the responsibility to take a community and broad-based attitude to crime prevention, ensuring that the criminal justice system, or the police on their own, are not seen as the panacea to the ills of the community; that everyone must work more closely together. As I say, that is recognised by Governments right across the political spectrum.

The other interesting feature about those Governments is not only that they themselves recognise it but also that they are working closely with people who would otherwise be their political opponents in many other areas of Government activity. These Governments have decided that crime and crime prevention are not a partisan issue, that it is something people on both sides of politics have to accept as being a community responsibility, and that to overcome crime they must work together collectively. The development of crime prevention strategies in those countries is, I think, singularly successful because of that.

We really need to change the way in which we think about crime. Understandably, people look to the formal criminal justice agencies—the police, the courts and prisons—as their shield against crime, but we must not overlook the enormous and largely untapped potential for preventing crime which exists among ordinary citizens. Crime is not just wished upon us from outside; it has its roots in the values and standards—or lack of them—in neighbourhoods throughout the community.

Preventing crime is a matter for us all. It has a moral and a social dimension in addition to the practical business of fitting proper locks and bolts and remembering to use them. We need to look to individuals, to parents, teachers, broadcasters, and to institutions, like the family, schools, churches, and the media, to help us rebuild those values and a sense of individual responsibility which will prevent crime from taking a hold in our community.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** First, I join with colleagues in acknowledging the deaths of former Parliamentarians, and I extend my own condolences and those of the House to their relatives. I am pleased to support the Address in Reply. While I intended to launch straight away into a more formal address this evening, I must say that I listened with considerable interest and with even more considerable surprise to the monologue of the member for Hartley, who spent more than a fair amount of time trying to sheet home the blame for all the ills of contemporary society to former Liberal Governments. I simply remind members of the House that the Labor Party in South Australia has served, as we have been told so many times by proud

members on the opposite side of the House, in Government for 20 out of the past 25 years.

The Tonkin Government has been maligned I think quite enough this evening, and I thought I would set the record straight not by manipulation of figures but simply by straightforward reference to the Government's own statistics. Some 20 years of those statistics would have been compiled under Labor Governments and five years under Liberal Governments. These are from the Auditor-General's Reports. I acknowledge one thing that the member for Hartley rightly claimed, and that was that in recent years the debt to income ratio has been reduced—and that is a good thing. However, let us have a look back to 1975 when the Dunstan Government was in power. In that year the Dunstan Government revenue was \$899 million and the State's indebtedness was \$1.88 billion, which means that we were over a billion dollars in debt in excess of annual revenue. By 1979 the Dunstan Government had receipts of \$1.167 billion and the debt had gone out to \$2.281 billion. Those were the figures which the Dunstan Government left in 1979 when it brought down its first Corcoran (handed over to Tonkin) budget. The income plan for that year was \$1.385 billion and the debt was \$2.663 billion—in other words, the debt was about double the receipts for that year.

The Tonkin Government has been accused quite maliciously of mismanagement. Let us have a look at what happened. The Tonkin Government realised that the debt to income ratio was massive, and that the substantial State debt would be a millstone around the necks of our children. However, despite the fact that during those Tonkin years (and Fraser Government years at the Federal level) there was a national drought, which almost brought the country to its knees—and the economies were very lean—the Tonkin Government in 1980, 1981 and 1982, in the three years for which it was directly responsible for budgeting, increased the receipts from \$1.385 billion to \$1.948 billion while during that time the State's overall indebtedness went from \$2.663 billion to only \$2.767 billion.

That means that during the Dunstan/Corcoran years there had been an average increase in the annual indebtedness of about \$180 million to \$190 million per annum. During the Tonkin years, the three-year increase—the sum total of the three years—was only \$104 million. That is almost half the annual increase one would have expected under the previous Labor Party regime.

I suspect that fair-minded members would acknowledge that the Tonkin Government's realisation of the millstone nature of that indebtedness around our own children's necks was one of the most responsible actions to be taken by any Government. I am not denying that the Bannon Government has also acted in attempting to reduce the debt/income ratio. Of course, the member for Hartley acknowledged that fact. However, the fact that the Tonkin Government, in just three years in office, reduced the debt/income ratio by about 50 per cent is surely evidence of sound administration and management. The Tonkin Government acknowledged that that debt blow-out was bad for South Australia and immediately took steps in lean years to curtail the rapidly increasing blow-out in the State's indebtedness.

One other point occurred to me, and I have extrapolated these figures in the short time since the member for Hartley first spoke. I thought I would also check another factor, namely, the interest rates that were payable. Despite the fact that the present Government has, to some extent, reigned in the State's indebtedness—incidentally, that has blown out to about \$4 billion this year, so it is a massive State debt—in 1980-81 we were repaying \$215 million per annum. In 1987-88 that figure had increased—as a result of higher

interest rates—to \$413 million per annum. I suggest to the members of this House that there will be further problems just down the road for whoever next governs South Australia because (again referring to the Auditor-General's figures) in the year 1992, some \$3 billion—that is three-quarters of the State's current debt—is due for repayment. Of course, what normally happens is that debts are not repaid: they are rolled over by arrangement with the Federal Government. However, rolling over the debt that South Australia will owe in 1992 may also mean, if this year is any criterion to go by, that South Australia will be paying an even more substantial interest rate on that \$3 billion rollover.

I hope members will realise, having been given those figures from the Auditor-General's reports over the past 15 years, that the Tonkin Government was responsible in its actions and not only tried but also actually achieved massive reductions in the State's receipts to debt ratio. I also point out that the member for Hartley spent some time commenting about the \$63 million debt which the Labor Party inherited from the Tonkin Government. In fact, the 1982 Tonkin figures showed a slight credit of about \$500 000. That is not much, but at least it was close to a balanced account.

In 1982-83—which is really the budget to which the member for Hartley was referring—the Labor Party played a large part in decision-making, both in relation to increased taxation and to the manner in which it expended the budget in that year. The year that the ALP administered the funds was the year in which the \$63 million blow-out occurred, so the Tonkin Government is being blamed for expenditure for which the Labor Party was responsible. What is \$63 million when one looks at the way in which State budget receipts have, during the past seven years, blown out from approximately \$2 billion to \$4 billion? The \$63 million about which the member for Hartley complains so much was exceeded by one Government department alone—Woods and Forests, Satco and Scrimber. Over \$21 million, one would assume, has been lost as a result of the South Australian Timber Corporation's unwise investment in the IPL(NZ) timber venture.

In defiance of Australian Accounting Standard No. 10, the Woods and Forests Department adds to its income each year the value of the trees which are still growing in the plantations. It is paying dividends to the South Australian Financing Authority on the value of trees still growing in the plantations. As I said, this is in defiance of AAS 10, which recommends that that money be placed in a trust account until such time as the timber is felled, milled and then sold for a profit. However, that has not happened, so some \$40 million per annum of growing tree value is being added into the current account of Woods and Forests which otherwise would show a very substantial loss per annum. During the past two years it showed a loss of \$500 000 and \$250 000 respectively. Had that AAS 10 not been manipulated, it would have shown a loss of over \$40 million.

We all fervently hope that the Scrimber project will succeed, but it has cost about \$30 million with little or no equity from Woods and Forests. In fact, half that \$30 million has been invested in the project by the State Government Insurance Commission but, as members can see, one Government department alone could have exceeded the \$63 million overdraft about which the member for Hartley complained so much. The State's revenue has increased from about \$2 billion to \$4 billion in the past seven years, so the Tonkin-ALP combined deficit for 1982-83 was very small beer when compared with what has happened in the past few years. Incidentally, I have been told by banks this week that the public is using credit cards less frequently,

and perhaps there is a message for the Government in that it should rely less on credit and much more on sound management.

The Governor's speech portrayed the plans of a tired Government which is bereft of imagination and initiatives and which, for the past seven years, seems to have relied on Tonkin Government initiatives—initiatives which it frequently ridiculed and said that it would throw out when it returned to Government but initiatives for which it has been all too pleased to take full credit during the past few years when it saw how profitable they really were. All members are familiar, because the member for Coles and the member for Kavel repeated it this evening, with the Premier's cry of 'mirage' when the Liberal plans to build Roxby Downs were announced. In fact, I believe that we probably lost Government by insisting that we went through with the Roxby Downs initiative. I am sure that the Labor Party would have expected us to go to the people on that issue. The Premier is now pleased to acknowledge the success of Roxby—a project from which he is reaping royalty rewards from copper, uranium, bullion and rare earths. Of course, he was pleased to open the project with some pride.

The O-Bahn rapid transit system from Tea Tree Gully to the city—a Michael Wilson/Scott Ashenden/David Tonkin initiative—will very soon officially be opened by the Premier whose colleagues at the time ridiculed the project and said that we should look instead at light rail. Of course, currently it is being hailed as a world trendsetter, and we are selling off expertise from the State Transport Authority to other parts of the world. This is the same ALP Government that sold off considerable tracts of Adelaide land that it owned—bought by previous Liberal Governments when Murray Hill was Minister—for the establishment of the north-south corridor, a by-pass for the city. Selling off the land was as an act of folly in the quest for a quick dollar—an act which now prevents the construction of a city by-pass, a north-south link, and which will ultimately serve to clog our city's arteries.

The Labor Party both in and out of office has a commendable lack of vision. Another Liberal initiative, the Stony Point/Moomba petrochemical pipeline, is now in production and bringing in considerable royalties from the export of LPG products overseas. Another Liberal initiative was to increase the use of Port Adelaide for container traffic. Allan Rodda was responsible for that. He also encouraged Ego Engineering—a company with advanced technological capabilities—to come to South Australia. It was manufacturing caissons and oil drilling rigs for deep-sea operation. It was quite capable of manufacturing submarine shells and may well be involved in the construction of the Australian Government's frigates when that program gets underway. That company was established in South Australia by the last Liberal Government.

Technology Park is also a source of pride to the Government, but it was a Dean Brown/David Tonkin Liberal initiative. It attracted British Aerospace as one of its first tenants. Technology Park is now at the heart of South Australia's technological development and was a forerunner for the rest of Australia. The former Liberal Government established the South Australian Financing Authority which the Premier said this afternoon is a major contributor to the State's revenue—another Tonkin initiative. In 1982 we also proposed that SAFA utilise Government funds and invest, borrow and lend those much larger sums which the combined Government revenue could provide to the ultimate advantage of South Australia.

In my own electorate Finger Point was first funded in the Liberal yellow pages in 1981-82. The project was stopped

in the first years of the ALP Government and then recommenced by the Premier who honoured the commitment he made when he visited Mount Gambier to inspect the Finger Point outfall. That project will be opened soon by the Premier. The ALP is anxious to steal and robe itself in the green mantle of environmental protection. The international airport was a Tonkin initiative with the ultimate benefits to South Australia and tourism.

Those eight or nine Tonkin initiatives were brought in in three short years, but this Government has initiated very little of its own. As I said in commencing my speech, this Government is bereft of imagination and initiative. South Australia has gone from being the lowest taxed low cost State in Australia to one of the highest taxed States, despite what was said by the member for Hartley. As I said earlier, Woods and Forests has lost almost as much as the 1982-83 deficit—the loss of one Government department off its own bat.

Perhaps we should examine the taxation of South Australia and Australia. No sane member of the public—certainly no-one with a wallet or chequebook—would deny that we are grossly and considerably over-taxed, when the Federal Prime Minister and the Treasurer last year talked about a \$5 billion credit and this year they are talking about a possible \$8 billion surplus.

At State level the Premier, only today, announced that we had a surplus of about \$83 million. While it may be a source of pride to some, the people whose wallets, chequebooks and piggy banks the Federal and State Governments have had their fingers into are crying out, 'We have had enough. We cannot afford to pay any more. Surely it is time this stopped.' Surely, an \$8 billion surplus is a matter for shame rather than self-praise.

The Federal Treasurer has his fingers in pensioners' and children's piggy banks. He is charging provisional tax on children's savings when the children are not earning any other income. He is amassing a fortune while the rest of Australia is literally being broken on the financial rack. He is encouraging the banks to huge profits. All the large banks in Australia have been looking at a half to three-quarters to a billion dollars profit in the past 12 months. The Federal Treasurer is encouraging the banks to huge profits because he is running the country on a high interest policy, relying almost exclusively on a high interest rate to dampen down the economy and to extinguish the spirits of small businessmen and working Australians whose financial reserves are rapidly being transferred into the Federal and State coffers.

A recent survey of small businesses in my electorate, which I conducted, showed that Federal policies are draining tens of thousands of dollars of additional money from all small businesses by way of loan repayments, credit repayments and overdraft facilities, most of them running at about 21.5 per cent. That seems to be a standard figure from the reports that I have had back. That is apart from other charges: wage increases, insurance, statutory and regulatory fees charged by the Government, land taxes, stamp duties, licences—you name it. They cannot employ extra staff and they cannot meet payments. I do not think that it should come as any great surprise to read in the Government's statistics that there were about 1 500 bankruptcies in South Australia alone last year.

I am not surprised at the Premier's announcement today. Although he beat the budget by a few weeks in what one might almost construe as an act of panic, he decided that he had better respond to the cry yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition for some further first home buyers stamp duty relief. Today he raised that relief from \$50 000 to

\$80 000 on the cost of a first home exempt from stamp duty, plus other initiatives: remission of payroll tax to a higher figure and some relief for shack owners who represent a substantial body within the electorate. I believe that was an act of conscience and panic before the impending election takes place. As I said, there must be an element of shame attaching to excessive taxation policies. There is an act of immorality in Governments taking so much in additional funds so that they can boast about massive surpluses—funds taken from constituents who are already groaning under the burden of Government imposed charges.

We also heard the other familiar cry today from the Premier: no more tax increases in the budget. That was almost a recorded message from the 1982 and 1985 election campaigns. Yet what happened then? I ask the electors of South Australia, 'Were you comfortable the following year?' Of course not, because the Government immediately decided that it would recoup the losses of the previous election year by increasing taxes and charges in real terms to make up for that previous year's deficit.

The real picture for this year, of course, is that on 14 June the Government announced that an extra \$51 per annum would be raised on a wide range of Government charges (E&WS, ETSA, State Transport and so on), yet, in promising that, it was conveniently forgotten that there would be a reduction in local government grants. I received information about this from the Hon. Anne Levy, the new Minister of Local Government. Local governments in my electorate have had reduced grants and, looking through, I found it rather interesting that the few local government bodies which had received increased grants included a substantial number of marginal ALP electorates.

Of course, that should not come as any real surprise in an election year, but it does question the values of those grants. That means that there is associated with the Government's own increase in land valuations a substantial increase in water rates, in sewerage rates and in local government rates which, although they might be set at 8 or 12 per cent, are 8 or 12 per cent of an increased local government valuation, because annually the values of the State Valuer are adopted by the majority of local governments. So, the charges and taxes which the Premier says will be restrained this year are, in fact, being increased quite considerably by other means—not devious means, as they have been employed for years, and we all know about them. It is just that statements being made are grossly misleading.

Everyone is feeling the pinch, whether or not the ALP acknowledges it. Literally hundreds of Government charges have also been increased over the past seven years, simply by another concealed expediency—by gazetting them in the *Government Gazette*. They simply go up, you get your bill, and it is never announced. Local government, of course, which has to take money from its ratepayers, also faces increasing problems in the light of declining road grants. The provision of Federal road grants fails to meet the substantial increases in the cost of road building materials and equipment.

There are many other areas in which the Government is currently vulnerable, and my colleagues have been at pains to list a number of them. Education, a portfolio in which I have some considerable interest, having been Minister from 1979 to 1982, despite frequent assurances from the present Minister and his former colleagues that all is well, is having problems. Parents are critical of discipline, of drugs and of educational standards.

The Minister is making calls—the same calls that I made in 1979, incidentally—for national curriculum and testing. He is asking at the Australian Education Council, which

comprises all State Ministers and the Federal Minister of Education, that all States come to some agreement in order to initiate that testing. I suspect that it will fall by the wayside, as it did in 1979, when only fourth year primary school tests were conducted on a random sampling of about 2 000 youngsters across Australia. When Queensland was found to have come out with the best rather than the anticipated worst record for primary school educational tests, the other States decided that enough was enough, and they would not face that sort of competition. Nothing further has been done in the next 10 years. But the cry for help is still the same from parents, from teachers and from the Institute of Teachers which, last week, supported the largest ever strike in South Australia's educational history, with 370 schools coming out.

That indicates the parlous state of the education system, a system on which the current Government, incidentally, spent \$7 million reorganising from 1983-84 to 1986-87—\$7 million which seems to have achieved extremely little. Of course, that reorganisation was the subject of a Public Accounts Committee report, Parliamentary Paper 140 of 1988. I could speak about many other areas, including hospitals, the Housing Trust and unemployment. The list is far from exhaustive but, as the time for my comments is drawing to a close, I will defer further comment until later debate.

**Mr RANN (Briggs):** In June this year I made a brief visit to Washington DC to meet with some of the US foremost experts on what has become known as the greenhouse effect. During my stay in Washington I met with officers of the highly respected Worldwatch Institute. Each year since 1984 Worldwatch has published the *State of the World*, a global assessment of the state of our environment. In effect Worldwatch researchers give our planet a physical examination once a year. The founder of the institute, Lester Brown, says that according to every major vital sign, the world's physical condition has been deteriorating in each of the five year's since the *State of the World* has been published. The world's forests have been getting smaller each year. Deserts have been growing. Topsoils have been thinning. The ozone layer is being depleted. Atmospheric carbon dioxide levels are rising. Biological diversity is diminishing. Toxic wastes are accumulating.

Certainly, the question of global warming, or what has become known as the greenhouse effect, is beginning to impinge on the consciousness of ordinary men and women in industrial societies. But despite its dire consequences to humanity, the nature of gradual climatic changes seems an abstract problem to many people, to Governments and legislators. It is only when the problem is localised that people start talking about the need for urgent action. The warming of the earth's climate is without doubt an environmental catastrophe. Let me quote from Worldwatch's 1989 *State of the World* report, which has just been released and which states:

Global warming has the potential to violently disrupt virtually every natural ecosystem and many of the structures and institutions that humanity has grown to depend on. Although climates have shifted only slightly so far, the world faces the prospect of vastly accelerated change in the decades ahead. Conditions essential to life as we know it are at risk.

It is now clear that the gradual warming of the world's atmosphere could lead to rises in the sea level, more severe hurricanes and cyclones, and dramatic shifts in precipitation that could disrupt present day agriculture. The experts keep using the words 'gradual climatic change'. But this should not be cause for comfort. The five warmest years of the past century have all occurred in the 1980s. It now appears

that the world is warming at twice the rate predicted just five years ago. Scientists now believe that by the year 2030—within the lifetime of some members of this Parliament—global average temperatures will be between 3 and 8 degrees farenheit higher than they averaged between 1950 and 1980, or, put another way, warmer than the earth has been for the past two million years.

But what is the greenhouse effect? The threat of climatic change stems from the increasing concentrations of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases that trap heat in the lower atmosphere allowing temperatures to rise—just as glass traps heat in a greenhouse. Carbon dioxide levels are now 25 per cent higher than they were in 1860 and will keep growing. The burning of coal and other carbon based fuels, such as oil and natural gas, releases carbon as the basic product of combustion, while the large scale clearing of tropical forests adds additional carbon dioxide to the atmosphere. Since 1958, when routine measurements began, the world's CO<sub>2</sub> concentration has risen from 315 parts per million to 352 ppm—the highest concentrations experienced on earth during the past 160 000 years.

Concentrations of other more potent greenhouse gases— notably methane, nitrous oxides and CFCs—are increasing even more rapidly. These gases have as much potential as CO<sub>2</sub> to warm the atmosphere. While the carbon dioxide level has grown at a rate of .4 per cent a year since 1958, these other gases are increasing at an annual rate as high as 5 per cent, and that is why the actions of both this Parliament and the Australian Parliament earlier this year on CFCs was so important.

At present the US is the world's largest contributor to the greenhouse effect, but America may soon be overtaken by the USSR and China. The fact is that carbon dioxide emissions are growing slowly in the industrial countries that contribute two-thirds of the total, but emissions are skyrocketing in the Third World. If recent worldwide consumption growth rates of about 3 per cent per year continue, fossil fuels could contribute 10 billion tons of new carbon annually by the year 2016. Deforestation in the Amazon and other tropical regions is now accelerating to frightening rates.

Weather is, by its nature, erratic and each cyclone, rare snowfall or drought cannot be attributed to the greenhouse effect. It is striking, however, that some of the apparent aberrations in the world's weather in recent times are consistent with greenhouse predictions. These include hotter summer temperatures and more frequent droughts in central regions of China and North America and cooler conditions in Europe and other coastal areas. Climatic scientists estimate that by the 1990s recurrent droughts, heat-waves and other unusual weather may have increased to the point where ordinary citizens become convinced that their climate is changing.

These changes, however, are mild compared with what is expected next century when greenhouse gas accumulation is projected to be double pre-industrial times. Mid-latitude regions, such as much of Australia, the United States and China, may experience temperature rises as high as 8 to 10 degrees. To understand how serious temperature increases of this order would be, it should be remembered that the coldest temperature during the last ice age was estimated at just 10 degrees lower than today's.

Worldwatch argues that if global warming is permitted to continue it may soon affect economies and societies worldwide. The greenhouse effect should be compared to nuclear war for its potential to disrupt a wide range of human and natural systems, complicating the task of managing economies and coping with other problems. Water supply sys-

tems, settlement patterns and food production could all be badly disrupted by a rapid warming. This is not an exaggeration. In Africa or on the Indian sub-continent, two or three drought years in a row could leave millions of people facing starvation.

The Worldwatch Institute claims that as early as the 1990s, recurrent droughts could begin to undermine food producing systems in some areas. Trees and other plant life are adapted to a narrow range of temperature and moisture levels, and cannot cope with the stress of rapid climatic change. A temperature increase of one degree Celsius per decade in mid to upper latitudes will translate into a shift in vegetation zones of 60 miles to 100 miles northward. Worldwatch argues that terrestrial ecosystems cannot migrate that fast and that vast numbers of trees are likely to die.

A temperature rise of only two degrees Celsius in the tropics could reduce rice production by more than 10 per cent. There will also be problems in temperate areas. Researchers based at NASA's Goddard Institute have been using crop growth computer models to predict the effects of carbon dioxide build-up and climate change on wheat. They found that, in a world with doubled carbon dioxide levels, wheat actually grew better in normal years. But in dry years there would be a marked increase in crop failures because of excessive heat. Given the likelihood that heat waves and droughts will increase, no-one can count on better yields.

It is true that some nations are, in fact, banking on reaping the benefits from the greenhouse effect. Some scientists in both Canada and the Soviet Union, a vast land area of which is too cold for large scale crop cultivation, predict that a warmer climate will boost agriculture. The theory goes that eventually the desert in the south-western US will shift into the traditional Grain Belt and the Grain Belt will move northwards into Canada.

But just because climatic conditions conducive to grain cultivation move north, that does not mean that other necessary conditions will be present. Much of Canada, for example, does not have the optimum type of soil for growing wheat and corn.

Wildlife will also suffer. In much of the world, wilderness areas are increasingly hemmed in by development and, when climate shifts, these fragile ecosystems will not be able to shift with it. Plants will suddenly be unable to propagate their seeds and animals will have no place to go.

Perhaps the most obvious effect of global warming will be the rise in the sea level. As ocean water warms it will expand, and warming at the poles will melt parts of glaciers and ice caps. Even if Governments around the world made a massive commitment to slow the warming, we would probably only stall sea-level rises of one to two metres, and a two metre rise would be devastating.

Almost all low lying coral islands would be rendered uninhabitable. For places like the Maldives off the West Coast of India, for some Caribbean nations and many Pacific islands, this could mean nothing less than national annihilation.

Many coastal regions of continents and larger islands will also be threatened. Low lying Bangladesh, dominated by the Ganges delta, is a classic case. It is massively populated and something like one-sixth of the country is threatened with annihilation by the year 2050, displacing more than 17 million people.

This is not a fantasy. United States studies have found that a temperature rise of six degrees would increase sea levels by about three feet. This would hurt most in Asia, where rice is produced on low-lying river deltas and floodplains. Without heavy investments in dikes and sea walls

to protect the rice fields from saltwater intrusion, such a rise would markedly reduce harvests. Large areas of wetlands that nourish the world's fisheries would also be destroyed.

A rise in sea levels would also threaten many of the world's coastal cities. Worldwatch estimates that a three foot rise would threaten cities as diverse as Venice, New Orleans, Shanghai and Cairo. In the United States I visited Charleston—a beautiful but small heritage city in South Carolina. There it is estimated that the cost of adapting to the predicted sea-level rise projected to the middle of next century could reach \$1.5 million—to build sea walls to protect Charleston alone. Other studies reveal that protecting the entire Eastern Coast of the United States could cost as much as \$100 billion. The Netherlands already spends nearly 6 per cent of its gross national product on saving itself from the sea—more than it spends on military defence. The problems faced by the Dutch might soon confront a larger number of nations. Governments will have to decide whether to make a massive capital investment on dikes, sea walls and barrages, or to abandon low-lying areas.

Storms will also become a growing threat to low lying coastal areas. With just a metre rise in sea level, a moderately bad hurricane, of the type that occurs about once every 10 years, would have the destructive impact of the type of storm that occurs once a century. Even as cities become more vulnerable to moderate storms, the intensity of hurricanes may increase dramatically, because the force of hurricanes is closely linked to the temperature of the sea surface.

Securing agreement for world action to slow global warming will be difficult, although international action on CFC damage to the ozone layer gives cause for some hope. Last year more than 300 delegates from 48 countries attended the International Conference on the Changing Atmosphere—an attempt to bridge the gap between scientists and policy makers on a wide range of atmospheric problems, including the greenhouse effect and ozone depletion.

That conference called for a 20 per cent reduction in carbon dioxide emissions by industrialised nations by the year 2005, using a combination of conservation efforts and reduced consumption of fossil fuels. It called for a switch from coal or oil to other fuels. Burning natural gas, for example, produces half as much carbon dioxide per unit of energy as burning coal.

It called for much more funding for the development of solar power, wind power and geothermal power. It called for drastic reductions in deforestation, and the encouragement of forest replanting and restoration. It called for the labelling of products the manufacture of which does not harm the environment, and for nearly complete elimination of the use of chlorofluorocarbons by the year 2000.

Remarkably, this conference spurred some specific promises from political leaders rather than just vague platitudes. The Prime Ministers of Canada and Norway pledged that their countries will slow fossil fuel use and forgive some third world debt, allowing developing countries to grow in a more sustainable way. The political heartache experienced over air pollution and toxic waste disposal in the 1960s and 1970s will appear minute compared with the magnitude of the problems that governments will face in attempting to tackle the greenhouse effect.

Climatic change has so much momentum behind it now that it can only be slowed and not stopped. Worldwatch argues that only the highest level of commitment and far-reaching policy changes can now make a meaningful difference. We will not stop global warming in our lifetime. The challenge is to slow the production of greenhouse gases



immediately in order to avoid the most sudden and catastrophic climate changes. Without policy changes, recent trends suggest that the world is headed towards an 80 per cent increase in carbon emissions in the next two decades.

There is no doubt that the most serious challenge in controlling global warming lies in reducing dependence on fossil fuels. Carbon dioxide contributes 40 per cent of the gases now warming the atmosphere. The one thing that could turn this around is the commitment to improved energy efficiency. While new energy sources take time to develop on a large scale, energy efficiency in the industrialised countries increased at such a pace that by the mid-1980s fossil fuel use and carbon emissions were about 25 per cent lower than predicted.

Today, there are many improved technologies available that use far less energy than those now in place. Most official energy projections assume that worldwide energy efficiency will continue to increase by between 0.5 per cent and 1 per cent per year. But CO<sub>2</sub> build-up is ongoing and cumulative. Even a 1 per cent rate of efficiency improvement would allow an increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide from 352 parts per million in 1988 to about 600 parts per million in the year 2075. An alternative energy scenario developed by Battelle Pacific Northwest Laboratories demonstrates that a successful effort to improve worldwide efficiency by 2 per cent annually would hold carbon dioxide concentrations to 463 parts per million in the year 2075, substantially slowing global warming. The challenge is to improve efficiency in a period of low energy prices.

I was heartened to read a speech by Bob Carr, the Leader of the Opposition in New South Wales, who outlined the program that his Government will implement following the next election. A Carr Labor Government in New South Wales will establish a greenhouse impact commission, a small tightly organised body with a short but intense brief, and overriding powers to set the standards we need—standards in energy conservation, planning and recycling for governments and the private sector.

I hope that the Hawke Government will also establish a greenhouse impact commission, because tackling the causes of the greenhouse effect in Australia will require a national commitment. The Federal Government should join countries like Norway in setting a target of a 20 per cent reduction in carbon dioxide emissions by the year 2005, through a combination of energy conservation initiatives and the reduced consumption of fossil fuels.

Australia should also be a world leader in research into solar power, and here again the Federal Government could provide leadership by increasing and targeting research funds into solar energy research. Solar energy is no longer a trendy fad. Solar photovoltaic cells, the cost of which has fallen 90 per cent in the past decade, are already being widely used on remote communication systems and portable electronic devices. Photovoltaics are already an economical electricity source for many third world communities, and as costs fall further in the next decade they will become economical for large power grids everywhere. So, a serious and lasting Government commitment to the development and use of energy efficient and renewable technologies is a prerequisite to a stabilised world climate.

Unfortunately there are some people who have used the threat of the greenhouse effect to reinforce fading arguments rather than to rethink their prejudices and seek new solutions. There are some people, for instance, who argue that the greenhouse effect represents a case for nuclear power.

The facts are against it, and propaganda now being poured out by the nuclear industry and its apologists is quite unconvincing. Nuclear power cannot replace coal. To do that we

would need to build a large nuclear power plant every one to three days for the next 37 years at a staggering cost. Unlike renewable energy, nuclear power's problems are growing. It has become increasingly expensive and accident prone in the past decade. And the critical problems of disposing of radioactive wastes remain unresolved.

There is also the problem of public acceptability, particularly on the part of those who live near proposed plants. For nuclear power to make any real contribution to slowing global warming, thousands of reactors would be needed. That scale of expansion would be totally rejected. I am aware that members opposite support the establishment of an enrichment plant in South Australia. However, the Opposition has consistently failed to say where that enrichment plant would be built.

In closing, I would like to stress that national and international action on deforestation must be an urgent priority. I am pleased that the Prime Minister has announced a major program to halt soil degradation and to plant one billion trees. The Premier announced that the Government of South Australia will sponsor the planting of an additional 100 million trees as part of an ambitious soil conservation strategy.

Mr BLACKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour): I move: That the House do now adjourn.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I take this 10 minutes to raise a couple of matters that concern me, my constituents and, I believe, a wider section of the community. Today, a question was asked of the Minister for Environment and Planning in relation to the Belair Recreation Park and the charges that are likely to be made for use of the golf course if an overseas organisation takes over the control of that golf course. In reply to a Dorothy Dix question, the Minister said that the charges for the use of the park by the general public would not be any greater than those that would apply to other public golf courses.

Earlier this year (21 February, page 2013 of *Hansard*), I asked the then Minister for Environment and Planning (the Deputy Premier, the Hon. Don Hopgood), the following questions:

Can the Minister for Environment and Planning say what is the current price charged by the Department of Environment and Planning for the lease of the golf course and hotel complex within the Belair Recreation Park? Is the Government seeking an increase in this price in the current negotiations to transfer the lease to a Malaysian or some other foreign syndicate? What is the name of the syndicate and will the Minister give a guarantee that, if the lease is transferred, no restrictions will be imposed on public access to the park course and that there will be no increase in fees greater than the CPI?

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood replied:

I will obtain the information for the honourable member. I do not have all those details in my head. I can certainly give an assurance to the honourable member that the golf course is part of the park and, as such, there will no attempt in any way to restrict public access to it. I will obtain the rest of the information and bring it down.

The Deputy Premier was kind enough to do that. At a later date (15 March, page 2420 of *Hansard*), the Minister gave this response:

The rental for the Belair golf course lease area within Belair Recreation Park is 8 per cent of green fees.

The Deputy Premier did not answer that query about the hotel. He continued:

The Government is not currently negotiating any changes to the lease with any party. However, the Government is aware of the possibility of an impending assignment request to transfer the lease to a Malaysian investor. The interested party is Mr Dato Cheng of Kuala Lumpur. The lease prescribes restrictions on public access relating to the activities of Belair Recreation Park Golf Club Inc. As there is no proposed change to the provisions of the lease the current arrangements will continue as detailed in that lease. The lease contains no fees price control provisions. As a consequence, rises or falls in green fees charged cannot be anticipated or guaranteed by the Government.

That was the response by the Deputy Premier. Today, the new Minister said that a guarantee was included in the lease, which either has been completed or is in the process of being completed, that the green fees would be controlled by that lease arrangement. I can accept that the present Minister might have a different view from that of the previous Minister and demand that, before the lease is transferred, that provision should be included. It is no guarantee to say that the fees must be tied to those which may be charged at other public golf courses. It is no guarantee to the public at all if a CPI provision is not included because, if other Asian or overseas interests move in and buy other public golf course leases or the total course, as has happened in Hawaii, they can then increase the prices in unison. The Minister's comments today do not clarify that issue. I do not suggest that they are not clarified in the lease arrangement, but we have not been told about the changes to that lease.

Will the lease now expire in the year 2016, as I believe was the previous arrangement? If I am wrong, I hope the Minister will correct me. We are dealing with a national park, which was the second national park named in Australia and which is now called Belair Recreation Park. What are the arrangements for that lease? Will the Minister inform us whether or not there have been any changes to the tenure, the conditions of operation and the control of fees charged to the general public? Along with many other people who have signed a petition, I am not happy about overseas interests owning that golf course.

People in Australia can be hypocritical about their attitude to certain countries. We say that, because South Africa imposes repressive laws against a section of its society, we will not deal with that country. Its cricketers come to Australia in order to coach other cricketers and, even though one has now gone to Queensland, I believe that he is a great guy. However, we will not let the reverse happen. We allow South African tennis players to come here and play tennis, but we will not let ours do that.

However, the group which will have the lease of the Belair Recreation Park is Malaysian, and Malaysia imposes extremely repressive laws against the Malay-Chinese. Those laws are extremely discriminatory, but we do not worry about that, because the Malay-Chinese are not black. The Malay-Chinese have a similar cultural background to the Malaysians, but they have been repressed and the capital punishment ratio is about 20 to one, so our attitudes are hypocritical.

I believe that we should trade with all countries and should engage in cultural exchange programs with all other countries also. The previous speaker mentioned the world environment problem, but various Governments have differing attitudes about this topic. The best way to solve these problems is to trade with those countries and to conduct cultural, sporting and diplomatic exchange programs. My report on my South African trip is in the Parliamentary Library. People can read the report and agree or disagree with me, but that is the way I saw the trip in the context in which I was reporting it.

I now want to speak briefly about one area in which you, Mr Acting Speaker, may have an interest. The issue of local government boundaries has been raised, and I become angry when people take the community to be fools. Recently the Happy Valley council released a circular on that topic in which it advised the public of its views about the proposed amalgamation of Mitcham Hills and Happy Valley. The article states:

Happy Valley rates will drop progressively. Happy Valley rate-payers will benefit from a rate drop in real terms when Flinders begins operation. However, just as the rate change for Blackwood Hills residents will be gradual, so the decrease will be in Happy Valley.

In regard to assistance for primary producers, it states:

Although it is a matter for the yet to be elected Flinders council to address and decide, it is likely that Happy Valley's *bona fide* primary producers will continue to benefit from a lower differential rate in the dollar.

Who do they take to be fools? In both cases it is up to the newly elected council. It has nothing to do with the present Happy Valley council, the present Government or the Boundaries Advisory Commission. After all, it is an advisory commission and has no way of directing a new council how to operate. The same Government may not even be in power by the time it operates. It may not even involve the same Boundaries Advisory Commission personnel at the time. It is annoying when people who should be advising the community cannot stick to the facts.

The article further states that it is an independent tribunal. However, we know that it is not independent. We know that Parliament gave the Government of the day the opportunity to appoint five people to sit on the commission. One appointee was to come from a Government department; one was to have local government expertise; one was to be a lawyer of seven years standing with considerable practice perhaps in the area of local government; one was to come from a panel of three put up by the trade union movement; the other member was to come from a panel of three put forward by the Local Government Association.

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

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** A number of things agitate me quickly as a member of Parliament, none more than elderly people being pushed around by bureaucrats. Nothing angers me more. Last week a dear old lady came into my electorate office to complain about how she was being harassed by a local government authority. She told me that her grand-daughter, who resided with her, had committed an offence under the Local Government Act. In due course, the council quite properly decided that, as the fine had not been paid, a summons would be served on the grand-daughter. The young adult had previously resided at the home of my constituent. She no longer resides at that address and her grandmother does not know of her whereabouts.

Believing that a local government authority would act with some compassion, I wrote to the council concerned explaining the circumstances, namely, that my constituent is elderly, frail, under medication, highly sensitive and agitated. I asked that they no longer persist with the practice of trying to force a summons on this dear old lady.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** Indeed, she is a dear old lady. Well may the member for Heysen mock this dear old lady.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** It is not untypical of this man. I can remember him as a Minister.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** On a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. I rise to make clear that the accusation that is being made by the honourable member, who is accusing me of saying something in relation to the matter to which he is referring, is wrong. I have not raised any issue relating to the subject that is before the House.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I think that that can be dealt with more appropriately in a personal explanation. The honourable member for Albert Park.

**Mr HAMILTON:** My ears are very quick to pick up issues like this. If I had more time, I would pursue this issue. I am damned angry that a member of the Opposition would want to ridicule a situation that I raise in this Parliament. This elderly woman is in ill health. Because of her situation she came to me and asked for assistance. Clearly she was a woman who needed assistance, and I gave it.

I wrote to the Thebarton council and asked that it should not persist in bringing these summonses around to this old woman. I told her, 'If you have any further problems, come back and see me.' What happened? On Monday, back she came, 'Mr Hamilton, I have a problem.' 'What is your problem, love?' 'I have another summons. They are trying to push this summons on to me.' I said, 'What did you tell them?' 'I told them that I do not know where my granddaughter is, but they are insisting I take this.' She refused to accept it.

I thought that commonsense ought to prevail. So, despite the fact that I had this letter hand-delivered by my driver to the Thebarton council on Friday, what happened? It was ignored. They persisted with another summons. Like Shylock, they wanted their pound of flesh from this dear old lady, this lady in ill health. They harassed her. I rang, thinking to get some commonsense into this situation, and asked to speak to the Town Clerk. He was not available. I said, 'Can you put me on to someone else?' Subsequently, this person came on but would not identify himself. I explained the situation and his response was, 'Don't you know what the law is?' He did not give a damn about this lady or her problem. The council, like Shylock, wanted its pound of flesh.

I tried to explain in a rational way, but I must concede that I got damned annoyed for this woman. He said, 'That is the law. If you think or are suggesting that my representative who delivered that summons was telling lies, that is not the case.' I said, 'Clearly, by inference you are suggesting that my constituent is telling untruths.' That lady was with me and I questioned her while I was on the phone. I asked, 'Did you say this?' She said, 'No, I did not. I never said that I knew where my grand-daughter was.'

I was promised that a letter would be delivered to my electorate office explaining this situation. What did I get? Nothing. But today, like most members in this House, I contacted my electorate office to determine what matters had been raised during the day. Lo and behold, what happens? My constituent, this poor old lady, in ill health and under medication, had walked to my office, having received another summons. Sir, excuse the expression, but this bloody council ought to be pulled into gear. Not only does it want its pound of flesh, it wants the blood to go with it. I believe that commonsense should prevail in this situation. I understand that three summonses have been issued. How much has that cost the Thebarton council?

**The Hon. R.G. Payne:** It will collect it from her.

**Mr HAMILTON:** As my colleague interjects, the council will collect it from her, if it can. It does not care about this pensioner. Its attitude is, 'Do not worry about her, do not worry about the representations that have been made. We

want that money; we want it, right or wrong. We do not care how we harass this lady, despite the representations.' I say, clearly and unequivocally, that this council stands condemned for its lack of compassion and concern and for harassing a lady who is in ill health.

She is under medication, yet they persist—not once, not twice, but thrice. God knows on how many more occasions will this council harass this poor woman. I make no apologies for standing up in this Parliament and saying quite clearly that if that is the best that local government can do—and I am not casting aspersions on local government *per se*—it is time we got rid of the lot of them. The persons responsible stand condemned, in my view, and I hope that the media takes this up and ask them to explain why they harass such an old lady. I have taken advice tonight—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** No, I am not the local member in terms of the local council, but tonight I have taken advice and will be contacting my constituent tomorrow and telling her to obtain legal counsel. It is a sad day when a representative of local government who obviously does not care about elderly people—

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

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen):** I want to take these few minutes to make representation to members of the Government following matters that have been brought to my attention in recent times, and to express some personal concerns I have on a number of issues. The first is my ongoing concern about some of the activities of the Electricity Trust in this State. My main concern relates to the tree trimming exercise which has been taking place in the Hills. It is not my intention on this occasion to go into great detail on that, because I hope to have another opportunity during the Address in Reply debate to speak more fully to that and to refer specifically to instances within my own electorate which have caused me particular concern.

I am amazed at the hundreds of thousands of dollars the Government is spending, through ETSA, on this operation. Not only is it a matter of ETSA working systematically through the Hills, for example, but in one case I have been advised that ETSA has come back to the same street on three different occasions within four days. The ongoing costs of having the trees trimmed and having to continue that trimming process in the months and years to come is a considerable expense to the taxpayers of this State. Apart from that, it is a hideous sight. Many areas of the Adelaide Hills, which have been noted for their beauty in terms of their natural vegetation, have had some of the finest examples of introduced and native species in this State reduced to hedge form and are, in many cases, very unattractive.

It is not very long ago since we talked in this place about the regulations that have just been introduced under the new ETSA legislation. Concern was expressed by several members on this side of the House about some of those regulations, particularly as they relate to the responsibility on individual private land owners who are responsible for clearing vegetation underneath or near power lines on their properties. The situation is that, if one owns a property, for example, in the Hills, and if a line comes to the house, one is responsible to ensure that the vegetation does not encroach on that line. If one cannot do it oneself, one is supposed to get a contractor to come in and do the clearing.

I know what is happening. In many cases people are saying that they cannot afford or do not want to bring in a contractor and they do the job themselves. I am particularly concerned about this, because elderly people are up on high

ladders trying to cut large limbs. It is only a matter of time before someone is injured or killed.

On top of that are the other liabilities that occur. I was interested to read recently of a 415-volt power surge in the Felixstow area. Some, although not much, publicity was given to this. Under the heading 'Power surge hits suburb', the *Advertiser* report states:

A 415-volt power surge in the Felixstow area yesterday blacked out about 40 houses for up to five hours and damaged a number of electrical goods, an Electricity Trust of South Australia spokesman said last night. It is believed a Felixstow resident lopping a tree damaged a stobie pole, fusing wires, and allowing 415 volts to surge into the normal domestic supply.

An Electricity Trust of South Australia spokesman said yesterday the surge occurred after a resident cut a branch from a tree which damaged powerlines. ETSA was not liable and residents would have to consult their insurance companies about damages.

Perhaps that is fair enough. Perhaps people who lost appliances would need to check the matter with their insurance companies but, as I understand it, in that case (and I am fearful of other similar cases occurring) that person was directly responsible and liable for the damage caused in all of those homes.

This is the forerunner of many other situations where people doing the right thing will bring down a limb over a power line and cause that damage and they will then be forced to accept the responsibility for the damage caused to appliances in other properties.

**The Hon. R.G. Payne:** ETSA will cut off the power—

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The former Minister says that ETSA will cut off the power. I appreciate that that might be the case, but there are many people who might not ask for that and who will then be forced to accept that responsibility.

I want to bring to the notice of the Minister of Transport a matter relating to the town of Mount Barker where, on the main thoroughfare leading south to Strathalbyn, the southern lakes and Victor Harbor, on average 2 780 vehicles travel and have to cross the railway line. At the railway crossing is a stop sign, which was erected when there were regular trains to Victor Harbor and Strathalbyn. At the time

of regular trains, approaches were made to see whether we could have lights installed on that crossing so that people knew when a train was approaching and had to stop only when the lights were working. Lights were not installed and stop signs are still in force, yet we have one train a week on that line, and that is only when there is no fire risk.

The only train that uses that line is the Steamranger on its journey to Victor Harbor. At present, that runs about every other Sunday, so that is one train every fortnight. In the meantime, with no trains using that line from Monday to Saturday, about 2 780 vehicles on average must stop at the stop sign, not for a train (because no trains use it), but because of the stop sign and because the police are regularly patrolling the crossing and will fine people if they do not stop. It is an incredibly stupid situation!

The Federal member for the area (Mr Downer) and I have approached Australian National to try to have the stop sign removed, but it has refused to do so. I have taken up the matter on two or three occasions with the previous Minister of Transport in this State who supposedly made representation to Australian National, but on each occasion Australian National has stated it does not even intend considering removing the stop signs. I have now taken up the matter with the new Minister and Australian National has now agreed to reconsider the stance it has taken previously.

It is hoped that it will now remove those stop signs. This will mean that a flag will be used to stop the traffic when Steamranger uses the line. That situation has prevailed with steamtrains on previous occasions. It is a ridiculous situation causing incredible inconvenience to a lot of drivers and to those people who live in the vicinity of the stop signs. Again, I urge the Minister of Transport to make the strongest representation to have those stop signs removed as soon as possible. The matter is extremely urgent and should be seen as such.

Motion carried.

At 10.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 9 August at 2 p.m.