

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 10 August 1989

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 9 August. Page 173.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): First, I indicate my support for the adoption of this motion, and I take this opportunity to place on record my condolences to the families of the former members of this place who passed away during the last session.

I wish to talk about an issue that was raised during Question Time the other day, and this relates to the supply of gas to Kangaroo Island. This is an important transport issue. I also want to spend some time discussing the matter of tax increases in water rates, and I also want to talk briefly about facility developments in the sporting and recreation area. Also, if I have time I want to talk about the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement—a matter that I know my colleague from Hanson will be taking up in more detail later.

First, on Tuesday of this week I brought to the notice of the House the matter of the supply of bulk liquid petroleum gas (LPG) to Kangaroo Island carried on the *Island Seaway*. A couple of comments made by the Minister of Marine need to be corrected fairly soon. First of all, he made the comment that the contractor, Peters Transport Company, which owns the cylinders, did not want to buy any more cylinders because of the cost. That is quite inaccurate. Peters Transport Company believes that there should be a more efficient way of transporting LPG to the island and that it should be done in a bulk carrier. It put this proposition to the department some 12 months ago, but it was rejected—for all sorts of reasons, which I will come to in a minute. But the statement by the Minister is quite incorrect, and I think that needs to be corrected.

Secondly, the Minister has said that this also relates to a problem with a special purpose built trailer. It is my understanding that that has never been an issue. The issue is one of the containerisation of LPG. I think that ought to be made clear. The other comment that the Minister made was that this particular type of trailer would be too high. However, it is lower than the petrol tankers that are now used on the trip to Kangaroo Island. Again, this was a misrepresentation by the Minister. I think it is important that these matters be corrected to start with.

Let us consider what the real problem is in relation to liquid petroleum gas supplied to the island. First, there are two types of energy fuel which go across to the island. One is bulk petrol, which goes across in a tanker, with usually 20 000-odd litres in one of the tankers. That is equivalent, in LPG terms, to 10 times the amount at any particular time. The other method of supply of fuel to Kangaroo Island is LPG, and at the moment it goes across in two forms: cylinders of 190 kilograms at a time, and significantly smaller cylinders which are used for household use.

There are two sources of concern among those on the island in relation to the passage of LPG: first, the supply that caters for households, the tourism industry, hotels, restaurants and so on; and, secondly, the supply for the meat works—an excellent development which the Minister

of State Development and Technology recently opened and which I know he strongly supports. However, because of the opening of the meat works the difficulty of transporting LPG in bulk has come to a head.

This problem has been before the Department of Marine and Harbors for some 12 to 18 months, and I was surprised at the Minister's tirade on Tuesday and at the fact that he had not done something about this problem, although I know that the Minister of State Development and Technology has been very helpful in this matter.

Some 12 to 18 months ago both Peters Transport Company and the agent on the island requested that the Department of Marine and Harbors, and consequently the Minister, study this problem. The transporters were told that an international marine code prevented the cartage of LPG to the island in this form. It staggers me that this modern vessel, the *Island Seaway*, cannot safely carry bulk LPG but can carry significant loads of petrol which, I am informed, has a flammable ratio of 100 whereas LPG has a flammable ratio of only 2.5. This should indicate that the safety aspect of LPG is satisfactory.

I understand that the department sent an officer overseas to look at the carriage of bulk LPG and that this officer could find no areas in which that was done. I also understand that before that officer went overseas the department was informed that a company called Calorgas operated from the United Kingdom to the Shetland Islands and the Isle of Man, and had been doing so for some years.

The Hon. H. Allison: Still does.

Mr INGERSON: According to the member for Mount Gambier, it still does. I find it amazing that an officer from the department went overseas but could not find the company which carried this bulk LPG in England. More importantly—and this is the real issue—at our own back door LPG is carried from Melbourne Port to King Island, just off Tasmania, and that has been happening for the past three to four years. Yet, the department of Marine and Harbors could not find—and it is the Minister's responsibility—this situation occurring at its own back door.

That is amazing because yesterday it took me no more than two hours, as shadow Minister of Transport, to find out how LPG could be transported and that in fact it is being done in our own country. Yet, the department argued that an international code stated that we could not carry bulk LPG safely on the sea. That is incredible, and the Minister of Marine should act quickly and get something done about it. The *Island Seaway* is the main transportation between Adelaide and Kangaroo Island, and the people living there deserve the same opportunity to purchase bulk LPG as those living on the mainland. That is what the *Island Seaway* is all about.

I do not believe that the department has done its work well enough and, unfortunately, the people on the island are suffering. We need to look at what is available to overcome this problem, and there is available an isocontainer which is exactly the same as a shipping container that goes through our port authority every day.

Basically it is the same size as a container. A framework is set up and the portable gas tank is hung in a cradle which supports the 10 tonne gas tank. It is a very safe method of cartage. It is a method used in Britain on trips to the Isle of Man and to the Shetland Isles. Further, they are used now between Melbourne and King Island by a company called Elgas, and that has been the case for three years. As I said earlier, I cannot believe that our department could not find it occurring in our own backyard in the troubled waters of Bass Strait that make the trip from Port Adelaide to Kangaroo Island appear as if it were a millpond. It is

incredible that I, as shadow Minister, could find it out in a couple of hours but a company legitimately trying to carry bulk fuel between Adelaide and Kangaroo Island could not get anywhere with our department for more than 12 months.

LPG containers have been carried for many years. Tankers leave Port Bonython continually, and it is interesting that not one issue with respect to major road accidents has been raised about the cartage of LPG. A few tankers have overturned but none have caused any problem whatsoever. Yet, at the same time, petrol can be taken to the island but bulk LPG cannot. That matter must be addressed and corrected very quickly. What a joke it was the other day when the *Falie*, a vessel nearly 100 years old, had to be called in to take a supply of LPG gas to a new meatworks which opened just four weeks ago on Kangaroo Island. It is unbelievable that bulk LPG could not be transported by any other means.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair does not want to be unduly harsh on the honourable member, but he should be addressing his remarks through the Chair and not to the press gallery. It is not unreasonable that members' eyes should light on different parts of the Chamber at different

moments, but to be continually facing the press gallery is most inappropriate. The honourable member.

Mr INGERSON: I apologise, Mr Speaker, but I am finding it difficult with my new glasses to look up without looking into the air. I will try not to do it in future. I hope that the Minister of Marine will go back to his department and actually do something—get off his backside and insist that this ridiculous situation is resolved post haste. As the member for Alexandra rightly pointed out to me this morning, our major concern is to ensure that the bulk gas available to people on the mainland is also available to people on the island.

I now refer to the massive increase in taxes and charges that has occurred in the past three or four weeks with respect to water and sewer rates. I have here a couple of tables that are purely statistical, and I seek leave to have them included in *Hansard*.

The SPEAKER: Do we have the usual assurance from the honourable member?

Mr INGERSON: Yes, Sir.
Leave granted.

WATER AND SEWERAGE RATES ACCOUNTS MARCH-JUNE-AUGUST 1989

March quarter	June quarter	\$ increase	% increase	Date account to be paid by
179.49 (CV 186 000)	210.04 (CV 236 000)	\$30.55 or \$2.35 per week	+17	8 August 89 or 5 weeks early
126.41 (CV 131 000)	145.96 (CV 164 000)	\$19.55 or \$1.50 per week	+15.5	31 July 89 or 2 weeks early
121.59 (CV 126 000)	157.52 (CV 177 000)	\$35.93 or \$2.76 per week	+29.5	7 June 89 or 4 weeks early
136.06 (CV 141 000)	159.30 (CV 179 000)	\$23.24 or \$1.79 per week	+17.1	11 August 89 or 4 weeks early
73.34 (CV 76 000)	84.54 (CV 95 000)	\$11.20 or 86 cents per week	+15.2	14 August 89 or 3 weeks early
225.81 (CV 234 000)	262.54 (CV 295 000)	\$36.73 or \$2.83 per week	+16.3	10 August 89 or 3 weeks early
87.95 (CV 130 000)	135.16 (CV 194 000)	\$47.21 or \$3.63 per week	+53.7	
337.75 (CV 350 000)	418.30 (CV 470 000)	\$80.55 or \$6.20 per week	+23.8	1 August 89 or 1 week early
Business—				
723.75 (CV 750 000)	1 068.00 (CV 1 200 000)	\$344.25 or \$26.5 per week	+47.6	31 July 89 or 1 week early
145.71 (CV 151 000)	186.90 (CV 210 000)	\$41.19 or \$3.17 per week	+28.3	3 August 89 or 1 week early
94.57 (CV 98 000)	106.80 (CV 120 000)	\$12.25 or 94 cents per week	+13	10 August 89 or 4 weeks early
99.39 (CV 103 000)	112.14 (CV 126 000)	\$12.75 or 98 cents per week	+13	10 August 89 or 4 weeks early
204.88 (CV 220 000)	356.00 (CV 400 000)	\$151.12 or \$11.62 per week	+68	
68.65 (CV 110 000)	104.00 (CV 159 000)	\$35.35 or \$2.72 per week	+52	9 August 89 or 4 weeks early
114.83 (CV 119 000)	149.52 (CV 168 000)	\$34.69 or \$2.67 per week	+30	31 July 89 or 2 weeks early
96.50 (CV 100 000)	113.92 (CV 128 000)	\$17.42 or \$1.34 per week	+18	31 July 89 or 2 weeks early
127.45 (CV 130 000)	146.84 (CV 165 000)	\$19.39 or \$1.49 per week	+15	11 August 89 or 4 weeks early

March quarter		June quarter	\$ increase	% increase	Date account to be paid by
102.29 (CV 106 000)	27%	145.06 (CV 163 000)	\$42.77 or \$3.29 per week	+42	9 August 89 or 4 weeks early
169.84 (CV 176 000)	54%	218.94 (CV 246 000)	\$49.10 or \$3.78 per week	+29	18 August 89 or 3 weeks early
91.81 (CV 135 000)	40%	114.68 (CV 171 000)	\$22.87 or \$1.76 per week	+25	10 August 89 or 3 weeks early
	27%				

Mr INGERSON: I want to highlight five major features of these tables. First, they indicate that there has been a significant increase in public sector charges ranging from 13 per cent up to 54 per cent. The table indicates that a business has suffered a rate increase of about 47 per cent. Those rates are exceptionally high, and the increases are astronomical, especially when compared with the Premier's announcement a month or so ago that there would be an average increase of about 45c a week, that water rates would increase by about 6 per cent, and that the sewerage rates would increase by about the same sort of amounts.

Secondly, the tables indicate the dollar increase per quarter which ranges from \$11.20 up to \$151. The newspapers carried a massive headline that there would be an overall tax and charges increase equivalent to \$51 per year, but in one instance we have an increase of three times that amount relating solely to water rates. The 20 examples contained in these tables indicate an average increase ranging from 86c up to \$11.62—not the 45c as announced in the paper.

Thirdly, the increase in property values (and this is the problem with water and sewerage accounts) ranges from 22 per cent up to 82 per cent. Recently, the *Advertiser* published a list of property value increases as calculated by the REI—and I assume that its figures can be accepted—which show that the property value increases are nowhere near that sort of range in the metropolitan area of Adelaide. We must ask whether the values as calculated by the E&WS, specifically in my area and also in the area of Adelaide, have not been excessively exaggerated.

It just so happens that people living in the City of Adelaide sent figures to me, as did constituents in my electorate, and they have seen some increase, but nowhere near that sort of increase, in their property values. They must be assured that they can go to the Valuer-General and not only query these figures but also have them significantly reduced, because really this is tax by stealth. It is the Premier saying, 'We have only a very minor increase in water rates averaging about 45c a week,' but not one of these accounts falls within that range. I believe that the public of South Australia is being conned by the Bannon Government about this issue. It is interesting to note that the Premier's statements have been made a month or so before the budget is due to be handed down but, clearly, he has set out to deceive people. That disgrace must be highlighted.

Fourthly (and this issue is as bad as the range of increases), instead of people being able to pay their accounts on a quarterly basis, or every 13 weeks, these account periods have all been reduced by a period ranging from one week through to five weeks. In essence, more than half these accounts have to be paid after eight weeks instead of at the end of 13 weeks, and one or two accounts have to be paid at the end of 12 weeks.

So, in essence, we have a double jeopardy: people have significant increases in their water rates—far in excess of what one would expect as a result of any inflationary increase and far in excess of true movement in property values; and,

more importantly, all of these people are being asked to pay their account early. That will give the Government a very significant improvement in cash flow from this source. Of course, that will affect a lot of households which suddenly have to find money to pay these accounts. There is a little note with these accounts that, if the householder has difficulty paying, they should telephone and something will be done about it. It is disgraceful that the Premier should allow these accounts to be sent out early, asking people to suddenly find this money. I do not think it is right. The public of South Australia are being conned. Engineering and water accounts will be much higher this year than the 5 to 6 per cent increase predicted by the Premier.

Fifthly, I refer to the Governor's speech in relation to significant developments in first class sporting facilities within this State. In the past four years this Government has recycled more recreation and sporting facility projects than could possibly be mentioned, yet we have this statement that there are numerous new developments. It is important to name just a few that have been completed: \$1 million has been spent on the development and refurbishment of the Olympic Park sportsfield; and at Gepps Cross we have the very significant hockey development, an excellent development with a marvellous international surface. That is it! Yet, in his speech the Governor states that it can be further demonstrated that there has been a significant development of first class facilities in South Australia.

The small bore rifle range has been recycled about four times. The Commonwealth Games, as a principle, has been recycled about every second month. On about six occasions there has been talk of commencing a velodrome. I understand that, because of a ban on the use of timber, it is highly unlikely that the velodrome can be commenced within the next six months. Following on from that, we might have to put in a concrete track and, if that goes ahead, there will be no roof. As a consequence, there will be no indoor stadium for netball, as has been proposed. The idea of a baseball diamond has been floating around for some three or four years, but it has not eventuated. There has been discussion about the development of a soccer facility at Hindmarsh and, again, that has not occurred. There has been some floating of development ideas to the south, but they have not eventuated. Yet, here we have a statement about the development of all these facilities. Only two new facilities have materialised, one being the hockey development at Gepps Cross, which was not financed in any major way by the State Government. Less than 20 per cent of State funds went into the hockey centre at Gepps Cross, the rest has come from Federal funds.

We have this farcical statement that there has been significant development in sporting facilities in this State. Again, we have the Minister playing up these facilities. It is an absolute con: nothing is happening—absolutely nothing—in the development of sporting facilities in this State. Netball is the biggest single participation sport for women and yet nothing is happening in that area, despite many

promises. For two or three years an indoor stadium has been promised at Gepps Cross and, again, nothing has happened. Development of the existing netball property just off Anzac Highway has been promised—nothing has happened.

There was a suggestion in relation to basketball but, there again, nothing has happened. So we have this absolute farce of the Government's saying that we are moving forward in developing international sporting facilities in the State, but absolutely nothing has occurred.

The next area on which I should like to spend a few minutes relates to the statement yesterday made by the Minister of Transport that there were significant increases in fare prices in this State during the time of the Tonkin Government. The facts are that in 1980 the fare price for two sections was 50c, in 1981 it was 70c and in 1982 it was also 70c. Over those three years when the Tonkin Government was in power, we had a 20c (40 per cent) increase, not 100 per cent in real terms as the Minister said. That was a nonsense statement by the Minister of Transport yesterday.

Let us consider what has happened since the Labor Party has been in government. In 1983—its first year in government—it increased the two zone fare from 70c to 90c, in 1984 to \$1, in 1985 still \$1, in 1986 to \$1.20, in 1987 to \$1.50, the same figure in 1988, and this year (1989) to \$1.80. We have had a fare increase from 70c at the end of 1982 to \$1.80—an increase of \$1.20 per two zone fare, or nearly 120 per cent, during the life of the Bannon Government. It is important to get the statistics right and to put them on the record so that we do not have the Minister of Transport fudging the fares, instead of preempting the opening of the O-Bahn, travelling along with the member for Newland and showing to everybody what is going on with the O-Bahn and not waiting for the official opening in two weeks. It seems important that I should correct the statement that was made yesterday in this House by the Minister of Transport.

There is another important issue. The Minister talked about the multi-trip ticket. It is interesting that since 1982, when the base weekly ticket was 65c, it has been increased in 1989 to \$1.15. In essence, we have had a 50c increase in the cost of the multi-trip ticket. That, as can be seen, is an increase of about 80 per cent. Yesterday the Minister said that the percentage increase was bigger when the Liberals were in government between 1980 and 1982, but that is not the fact. It does not stand up to reality. The Minister, as usual, is using statistics to obscure reality.

I should like to put on record a couple of comments about the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. In the *Australian* of Saturday 5 August there is a headline, 'States rebuff Federal plan for housing'. That is different from the statement that was made in this House the other day by the Minister of Housing and Construction. With a fair amount of diatribe and abuse he got stuck into the member for Hanson, but he did not really say anything. However, here are some facts which perhaps the Minister would like to consider. In this article in the *Australian*, the New South Wales Minister for Housing, Mr Schipp, representing all the Ministers, is quoted as having said:

This [the funding arrangement] would require the States to spend 90 per cent of their funds from the agreement on building new homes for their tenants. The other 10 per cent would be spent on programs such as low-start loans and property trusts.

Mr Schipp wanted to make very clear that this would take away from the States the decision-making of stipulating where they were to put these funds. He went on to say that most States had argued that it was absolutely essential that

they retain this flexibility. He said that New South Wales had argued that there should be a 70-30 split.

He pointed out in his further comments that South Australia, Victoria and Western Australia strongly indicated that they could not accept the 90/10 provision as put forward by the Federal Government. Yet, the other day our Minister of Housing and Construction told us that he was reasonably happy with the State agreement. According to this statement, he is not very happy with it at all. The advice I am getting from people directly involved in the housing area is that nobody in this State is very happy with the agreement currently floating around. When I talk to groups likely to be affected by this outcome, I hear that South Australia will be affected more than other States if this agreement is followed through. I simply call on the Minister to come clean and tell the Parliament the position with the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. Before calling on the member for Playford, I remind members of Standing Order 78.

The Hon. T.M. McRAE (Playford): I support the Address in Reply and I acknowledge the continued commitment and enthusiasm of the Governor and Lady Dunstan. I join with the Governor in expressing sympathy to the families of past members who have died since the last Address. This is an interesting time, with State and Federal elections not far distant. Public opinion of recent times has been very volatile, as evidenced by the by-elections in Adelaide and Port Adelaide last year.

In an era in which Australia's economy has been subjected to great stresses and strains, Governments have found it difficult to balance the demands on them. It has been a time of extremes, with conspicuous consumption and wealth in some cases and desperate financial problems in others. A continuous problem over the past four or five years has been the historically and continuously high interest rates. It has been a heavy burden on home buyers and, in a country which prides itself on home ownership, that involves a large number of people.

The Federal ALP Government has used interest rates to help balance Australia's external trade account, which has been running badly throughout the 1980s. It has been a deliberate choice as against the other more damaging options available. It was, however, together with other problems, in particular continuing wage restraint, a fact that has caused the Federal Government great problems. It is no secret that there is considerable disaffection amongst various areas of traditional Labor supporters. According to various polls, they include blue collar workers in their forties and fifties (a group prominent in my electorate); young married women (especially those with young children); and certain classes of retirees (in particular those close to or in early retirement). It was the first group—blue collar workers—that caused the large swings in Adelaide and Port Adelaide. This group believes that it has not been well looked after by its traditional Party and has been, to a certain extent, passed by. It is true that recent adjustments have helped this group. I refer to the taxation reductions and the recent decision in the national wage case, which is still flowing through the system.

The sad point is that this group would be the very last group to be helped by the conservative Parties. On the contrary, based on past and present attitudes, the conservative Parties would devastate this most vulnerable group with high unemployment and, if it were possible, with the removal of the arbitral salary protections that the Labor Party has provided for that group in living memory. The

Federal ALP has governed well and fairly in very difficult circumstances. In the past seven years, although the trade balance has deteriorated badly, unemployment has not been resorted to as an economic weapon, although it would have been used by conservative Parties and will be resorted to in the unlikely event of their gaining power. I have no problems in my electorate amongst blue collar constituents who continue to support the Labor Party, both State and Federal.

Far from being concerned about the Federal Labor Party, I am proud of its efforts and of its equitable work during its period of office over the past seven years. Of course, there are people hurting out there, but the option is too horrible to think of for ordinary salary earners. Over the past seven years a huge number of jobs have been created and unemployment has been cut back in this State as a direct result of Federal and State Government initiatives. There have been very significant tax reforms—and very equitable tax reforms, if I may say so.

In the days of the Fraser Government the Australian tax laws were a disgrace. They provided most generously for the rich and very badly for the poor, and that has been put right by Messrs Hawke and Keating over the past seven years. I have no doubt that, under a conservative Government, the level of unemployment would have risen much higher and that the tax and salary arrangements between the Federal Government and the ACTU would not occur. Under a conservative Federal Government, I doubt very much whether these arrangements would continue. So, the Federal Government deserves our support and I, for one, give it publicly and without any shame or hesitation at all, both here and in my electorate office.

The State Government also has shown itself to be a very good manager during the same period. I have good memories of conservative Governments, both Federal and State. Both the Fraser Government federally and the Tonkin Government in this State were disgraceful and very inequitable managers. Both the Federal and State Labor Governments have been efficient, effective and equitable managers and no one can take that away from them. Every decision that the State Government has made has taken into account the position of the ordinary salary earner. Cabinet has agonised over that very matter, and will continue to do so.

I was very pleased by the statement on Tuesday by the Premier, showing that continued wise management can lead to reduced taxes and charges in areas where they are most needed. In particular, I was pleased to find that he was able to make reductions, particularly in relation to home buyers, without affecting our State's overall financial base or resorting to the quick-fix and so-called easy solutions which simply will not work and which would cause considerable problems for our wage and salary earners were they resorted to. I was pleased with the other initiatives that the Premier was able to make.

The Governor's speech shows that this is a very balanced Government. It is stable but not staid, and it is a Government which is determined but, at the same time, not slow. It has the initiative and business management ability to pave the way for further good decisions in the 1990s. It is very interesting for me to note that business on the whole in Australia, both State and federally, is now in a position where it trusts the Labor Governments and is very distrustful of the conservative alternatives—if one can call them alternatives—in both areas. And with very good reason!

I was most interested to hear the address by the member for Victoria. He skirted close to the hidden agenda of the conservative Parties in this country. I recall that Mr Howard went too far in disclosing this hidden agenda as, indeed,

did the Leader of the Opposition at the time of the 1985 election, because the plain fact is that, to deliver what the conservative Parties promised, there must be a savage campaign of reduction of Government services. They cannot produce the taxation cuts that they offer without savage cuts in spending. This is what I tell my constituents without any shyness or hesitancy: 'Sure, the times are tough at the moment and you are having difficulties in continuing but, as ordinary wage and salary earners, you should have no doubt about it—you will be in the gun under a conservative Government.'

Remember what Fraser did—remember what Tonkin promised last time. I, for one, do remember, and I have no hesitancy in telling my constituents all about it. I do not forget the 'Rip the shirt off the back' campaign of the Leader of the Opposition last time around. That is his hidden agenda this time, of course. Members such as the member for Victoria are far more honest than the Leader in hinting at it. The member for Victoria, as a significant and intelligent member of the New Right, has an agenda. He has given his agenda in this House over the past two years. It is his agenda which is the Leader's hidden agenda, and I would like to warn the public and, in particular, my constituents about this.

There are various things that I would like to say on a local level in preparing for the next election. It is necessary that all members pay heed to what developments are required in their own areas and, in conjunction hopefully with my successor, I have been doing just that. I wish to deal with some of the key areas in my district. First, as to the road system, there are urgent demands in Playford concerning roads. I must state yet again that we urgently need Montague Road, between Bridge Road and Main North Road, to be doubled in width. I am well aware of the priority by the Highways Department to extend Montague Road between Bridge Road and Port Wakefield Road as part of the overall Gillman freeway or the Port Adelaide to Salisbury extensions. I am quite aware of that and in principle support those extensions.

However, almost daily I see the tremendous demands that are placed on Montague Road, the enormous hold-ups and the present and real dangers, and I ask the Government to do something about it. There are other road issues in Playford that need attention. Probably most important of all is the situation at the Gepps Cross intersection, which has been in need of major attention for a long time. I now call for the introduction of a major interchange at that intersection, either by depressing Main North Road or Port Wakefield Road or by some other means opening up that intersection to a freer road flow.

I also call for the reconstruction of Main North Road between that intersection and the railway line at Pooraka. That, too, has been needed for some years, and something needs to be done. There is also a number of environmental and recreational issues to which I would like to refer. In particular, I would like to see some extensive tree planting along the Main North Road frontage to which I have just referred. That is one of the main arterial connectors to Adelaide; it is an entrance to the City of Adelaide for business and recreation purposes; and, at the moment, its overall setting is just not sufficient. Again, something needs to be done. Thousands of trees need to be planted in a linear development about 100 feet wide along the edge of Main North Road.

I am pleased to say that the State and Federal Governments have continued to cooperate in the development of the State Sports Park in what used to be called the Samcor paddocks at Gepps Cross. However, I would like to see a

far more urgent start on the velodrome proposed and also the golf course in the area. Certainly, my constituents are looking forward to that.

I hope that, in conjunction with the Federal Government, a start can be made in the not too distant future on the swimming centre in that area. I have put numerous of these requests to the State Government, and I am pleased to say that it is adopting a positive approach to all of them, with the exception that the Highways Department finds it difficult to alter its priorities in the road development area around Gepps Cross. I ask the department to give urgent attention to what I have had to say.

Since this is my last session in the House of Assembly there are a number of people I want to thank. First, I am most grateful for all those people associated with the Playford ALP sub-branch who have gone out of their way to help and guide me, and likewise the staff of this House. I would like to thank the Clerks of the House of Assembly for their many kindnesses, and also *Hansard*, the Library staff, the Joint House staff and the Attendants in this Chamber. I want to thank my electorate secretary of the past 12 years, Mrs Maureen Owen, for her painstaking, loyal and hard-working service. Finally, and most obviously, may I thank my wife and family for their patience and support.

I would like to wish everyone well: unfortunately, logically I cannot wish everybody well in the forthcoming election, so I wish the Government every success in the forthcoming election, and to everyone else I wish good health and every good thing in the years to come.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I am pleased to have this opportunity to contribute to the Address in Reply debate. I also wish to extend my condolences to the families of those former members of Parliament who have passed on since the previous Address in Reply debate in this place. To my recollection, I did not get to meet any of them personally, although certainly the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin lived in the earlier electorate of Goyder, and I know some members of his family well. I have on occasions spoken to them about the achievements of Sir Lyell and also about what he contributed to this Parliament.

I extend my sincere sympathies, as I did at the time, to the family of Sir Lyell, and also to the families of Mr James Alexander Heaslip, Mr Leslie Charles Nicholson, Mr John Richard Ryan, and Sir Arthur Campbell Rymill. I think it shows that we are on this earth for a relatively short period of time, and it is such that each time we come around to sitting again we find that a few more people have passed on. Whether we like it in the years to come, all our names are going to appear on the list too. I guess from that point of view we should all take full advantage of the time we have and do as much as we can for this State, for the community and for mankind as a whole.

I want to draw attention to a few points that His Excellency the Governor made in his speech on behalf of the Government—or at least that is the way I look at it—indicating the business that is going to occur. I notice that paragraph 9 refers to environmental issues, as follows:

Environmental issues continue to be of central concern to my Government and the community.

I was interested to hear that comment, because I believe that the Government has been loud on rhetoric and quiet on action during most of the past 25 years. A Labor Government has been in power for 20 of the past 25 years, and whilst many words have been spoken during that time the amount of action taken has been very limited. As a member who serves a country electorate, it is brought home to me time after time how the Government has not done much,

if anything, towards the environment. It is most interesting that, since the Tasmanian election and since the Green Independents have made a mark, this Government has suddenly realised that perhaps it should really act rather than just speak.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: The latter day greenies!

Mr MEIER: Yes, the latter day greenies—I like that comment from the member for Coles. I am always very suspicious when actions come just before an election. Whilst I do not believe that the Government will be returned, whatever the case it is very clear that this State needs a huge amount of action in the environmental area. In relation to my electorate alone, looking at a natural vegetation map from years earlier it becomes evident that there is very little left of the natural vegetation today. Procedures to rectify this should have been started a long time ago. I guess a similar situation applies to the rest of the State.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: What am I going to do about it? Actually, I can invite members to a public meeting on Monday 21 August to set up a tree propagation group on the peninsula. I am pleased to be able to mention this. The present Government has not done anything and, again, it is up to the Opposition to take a lead here. So, members opposite are welcome to come and I can give them a copy of the advertisement if they would like it—I have some spares here with me.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to return to his speech and to avoid exchanging felicitations with unruly members of the Government backbench.

Mr MEIER: Thank you, Mr Speaker, I will endeavour to refrain from responding to interjections. There are worrying aspects of how the Government has handled environmental issues. For example, one can consider the large expanse of land out at Northfield, in the north-eastern suburbs. The Government announced some time ago that Department of Agriculture operations at Northfield would be relocated. Various options are being put forward and there are still various arguments as to where the matter will finish up—and I will not go into those now. However, what really upsets me is that the Government says that it is going to sell the land at Northfield and use it for housing. One would think that any Government that was environmentally conscious would take such an opportunity to revegetate the area. It comprises a huge area and we could virtually have a forest within the metropolitan area. This would be doing something exceptionally beneficial for the State.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: The Government members do not like hearing this. They are realising that they have made an error and that they cannot backtrack from it. Several years ago it was my privilege to travel to West Berlin, a city that was virtually devastated in the war. The thing that particularly struck me there was the forest area. The forest area that I went through on one of the days I was there was magnificent; in fact, it would have been very easy to get lost in it, and there it was virtually in the centre of the city.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Members opposite laugh at this matter of revegetation and environmental issues—but they will learn their lesson, and unfortunately this State has to suffer from it. This large forest virtually in the centre of the city brought home to me what can be done in this regard. At the end of the war, in the late 1940s, there was nothing there; there were no trees as they had all been bombed or burnt out, while now it is a magnificent forested area—and they even have wild pigs roaming there, with people having to be careful that they are not charged by them.

There is an opportunity at Northfield for the Government to take a lead and to show that it is genuinely concerned about revegetating in the metropolitan area as much as possible. But, of course, we have heard the response of Government members—they laugh at it. Let them laugh: I hope the environmental groups will take note of that. They will realise that it is all very easy for the Government to say that it will make a natural park somewhere out in the never-never, where very few people can get to it, while when it comes to doing something in the city area, no, it does not want to do anything like that. It wants to build homes on the land that I have mentioned, homes that will perhaps house people who would be more likely to vote Labor than non-Labor. The Government wants to seal up that area for itself. It is a disgrace and it shows the hypocrisy of its environmental policy.

There are other areas involved in such considerations. For example, in relation to the Bolivar sewerage works, we have heard the Minister make some noises—again since the Tasmanian election—about what the Government may or may not do. I took up this issue some years ago and pointed out the effects that the pollution was having. I know that the problem was in existence long before I took up the matter. However, I brought to the attention of the Minister the problems that were occurring to the mangroves and also to the fishing area. In both cases the respective Ministers involved indicated that I was upset and concerned about nothing, that things were in hand, under control, and that there was no negative effect on the environment or on the fishing. Only recently the Government has admitted the truth and has recognised what has been known by the local people and anyone with an ounce of commonsense, namely, that the outfall has been having a terrible effect on the environment.

Again, will it simply be words, and will we find that in 10 or 20 years time—and heaven forbid that this Government be returned for another term—that situation has not improved. The environment is of great concern, and it is a pity that the Government has not acted in some areas as it should have. Paragraph 10 of the Governor's speech states:

My Government recognises the value of rural land, and the immense problems caused by land degradation in our State . . .

Yesterday I was pleased to see that the Minister of Agriculture introduced the Soil Conservation and Land Care Bill. This indicates that the Government has taken note of what the Opposition suggested during the previous session—that this Bill needs to be introduced into the House before the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Bill. It is ridiculous to have too many bodies regulating the one area, and that is exactly how this Government has operated for some years. In fact, in 1987 the United Farmers and Stockowners called on the Premier to do something about the waste in rural land administration, and an article stated:

Investigations have revealed growing duplication of work being done by a number of departments . . .

And that article then went through the various departments. The article highlights the gross inefficiency in the bureaucratic system that should have been attended to before now. By dealing with the Soil Conservation and Land Care Bill first, I hope we can sort out who will be in charge of what and, when the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Bill comes before this House—and I think we are all eagerly awaiting the outcome of the select committee, and I hope that Government members have displayed commonsense—we should be able to put it in its proper place and not have a multitude of bureaucrats trying to do each other's work. It is important for the sake of rural land that

commonsense prevails with respect to Government oversight. Paragraph 20 of the Governor's speech states:

Home ownership remains a realistic goal for South Australians . . .

I guess that we would have to agree with that, but since Labor has been in power that goal has become less attainable. It is criminal that interest rates are so high—and are now 17 per cent—that the average person who wants to buy a home would find it very difficult to do, even in conjunction with the Premier's announcement the other day about stamp duty. That is a long overdue announcement which was promised years ago but now occurs just before the election. I suppose the Premier decided he had better deliver. Let us hope that that announcement helps thousands of families, as they certainly need help.

However, many others were trapped before the stamp duty provisions were changed, and they will continue to suffer. It is a heartbreaking realisation that so many people face the prospect of having to sell up and go back to renting their home because of Labor Party policies and tactics in keeping interest rates as high as they are. I have a suspicion that Mr Hawke will probably lower interest rates a short time before the election and say that everything is okay. Let us all hope that interest rates will come down to a more realistic level, to 8 per cent or 9 per cent, or even lower, where they should be and at which other Western nations' interest rates are operating.

The other day the Federal member for Makin, Mr Peter Duncan, at a ceremony at which I was present, made some introductory remarks that I was very interested in. He mentioned that, when the Labor Party came to office, 800 000 people were unemployed, but in its first term of office the Labor Government created 500 000 new jobs. On my calculations, 800 000 minus 500 000 leaves 300 000 unemployed. He went on to say that 1.3 million new jobs have been created so, if that is taken from the original 800 000, that leaves a deficit situation of 500 000. I have to smile at the way the Government has very cunningly and cleverly used these figures. We heard the Minister of Labor use them yesterday. He suggested that 1.4 million jobs have been created. Of course, the realisation is that unemployment has tended to remain static, rise at times and hardly show any fall at all, and I believe that the people of Australia and, particularly, South Australia, see through the blatant misuse of statistics by the Labor Government. Let us hope that that continues to be the case. Paragraph 21 of the Governor's address states:

My Government is addressing a number of concerns associated with the application of the law, and the ability of police to effectively perform their duties.

I certainly hope that that is the case, because I am receiving more and more comments from people who are very upset at the lack of resources for the police and the lack of effective punishments being handed out by the courts. I refer to a letter from one of my constituents at Wallaroo but, for reasons of confidentiality, I will not mention the name. The letter states:

As our MP [I] would like to express my point on the leniency of prison offenders. On Wednesday 5 July my son aged 27 years lives in a flat at . . . was wakened at 11.45 p.m. by two men who entered his bedroom one with a knife and chisel in his hands. They had stolen my son's video, two speakers, \$40 in cash, keys and a new watch. My son has worked hard for these things, doesn't smoke or drink. Why should two men be able to get away breaking in one's home and stealing. The police have been informed. My son got the car registration number but that would be a stolen car, so no hope of catching them. I read in the *Advertiser* 7.7.89 that the court is reducing prison sentence. Why! They should be made to serve their full time. If one tries to defend oneself in their own home we end up being the guilty party. My sons are both being naturalised citizens on . . . at . . .

after living in Australia 20 years. Not a very nice welcome for them. Hope you can bring this up in Parliament. The public are sick of these louts. Yours sincerely.

That letter and the types of comments contained are not unusual. It is a shame that in real terms the Police Force has not been increased in numbers since this Government took office, at a time when we have had a huge expansion in some of the suburbs and many rural areas. It is at a time when crime has increased out of all proportion. In fact, yesterday we had figures quoted that indicated in some areas the crime rate had increased by 100 per cent. It is a great worry and concern, and I believe we need to be reminded of the figures that apply in this State. For every 100 South Australians, violent crime has increased from 92 crimes in 1981-82 to 186 in 1987-88, a massive 102 per cent increase.

In that period there has been an increase of 43 per cent in property crime; breakings of dwellings, 117 per cent; all breaking and entering offences, 71 per cent; robberies, 75 per cent; serious assault, 151 per cent; rapes and attempted rapes, 182 per cent; drug offences (including offences covered by cannabis expiation notices), 152 per cent increase in total numbers, and 138 per cent in drug offences for every 100 000 South Australians; and arson and wilful damage (which includes vandalism), an increase of 55 per cent. However, as I indicated earlier, the effective manning rates for police services have not risen—in fact, it can be argued that those rates have fallen, particularly because of the move to a 38-hour week during that period.

Why has the Government not addressed these problems? I believe that, between now and the next election, the Government will attempt to put on a brave face and show the public that it is concerned, but the reality is that it has not been concerned for most of this period.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr MEIER: The member for Albert Park goes back to 1979; he lives in the past. It is rather ironic, because yesterday, when he gave a speech, he criticised, I think, the Leader of the Opposition, for comparing figures relating to the previous Liberal Government and the Labor Government. He criticised that method, but then, what did he do? He went straight back to 1979 and 1982 and began to use those figures, so he either operates under his own set of rules, or he should not bother to raise those issues. If the honourable member criticises other people for living in the past, then he should not do the same thing himself. When he made those remarks, I was rather amused, because I wondered why he criticised such actions when he does the same thing himself. He is entitled to criticise, but at least he should not fall into the same trap. Paragraph 31 of the Governor's speech states:

My Government continues to respond positively to the problems facing our elderly population.

I wish that the Government would place a little more pressure on the Federal Government in this area. In the electorate of Goyder we are having real problems in obtaining sufficient nursing home beds. The Federal Government is determined to remove nursing home beds, in one instance from the Star of the Sea Nursing Home at Wallaroo. As a demonstration of the Government's attitude, it suggested to the Star of the Sea that, since the institution also had a home at Berri, which is some hundreds of kilometres away, why could not the residents of Wallaroo be transferred to Berri and, in those circumstances, it could become one institution?

That is a totally ridiculous suggestion. One can imagine how that proposal was received in Wallaroo. Traditionally, Wallaroo has been sympathetic to the Labor Party—I acknowledge that—but many people are totally disillusioned

with the Labor Party and the stupidity of the suggestion that residents of the Wallaroo nursing home should live at Berri. Members can imagine how the family would cope having to travel to Berri—which is an hour's drive each way—once a week, let alone any more frequently.

The negotiations are not proceeding as I would have hoped and there is some move to attempt to put these people in long-stay beds at the hospital but you, Mr Acting Speaker, and all members would appreciate that a nursing home can provide much more than can a hospital. Care and consideration must be given to these elderly people. I have to view with grave suspicion the Government's statement that it is responding positively to the problems faced by the elderly population. So many of those statements emanate from the Federal arena. The Premier of this State, who is the National President of the Australian Labor Party, is not exercising his authority at all and, therefore, such a response reflects on him. Paragraph 45 of the Governor's speech states:

At the heart of my Government's initiative in helping expand the scope and potential of South Australian enterprise is a commitment to a broad vision of education.

While on the topic of education, I will mention the massive strike relating to teacher dissatisfaction in this State. One headline announced 'Ten thousand in city march'. The major headline was 'Teacher turmoil'. It is a tragedy that teachers have had to resort to such strike action to have their demands heard by the Government. I sympathise entirely with the teachers when one finds that the curriculum guarantee package, which was handed out by the Director-General of Education and the Minister, was dated 18 July. The document was sent to Mr Tonkin as President of SAIT and would have arrived at schools some time that week. The response had to be in by 8 August: less than a month. In fact, the teachers had only three weeks to respond to what is probably one of the biggest shake-ups in the teaching profession in the history of this State.

I was speaking to some teachers at a school on 21 July and asked the principal of the school, 'What is your attitude towards the package?' He replied, 'Well, I am sorry but I do not have a copy yet. We will be discussing it next week at a conference.' I said, 'In other words, one week will have passed before you had even had a chance to get the document and discuss it?' The answer was 'Yes'. In addition, the staff had no idea what was going on.

Mr Groom: I thought you were against strikes.

Mr MEIER: I have said I have full sympathy for the teachers. I would like the honourable member to quote where I have ever said that I am against strikes. He misunderstands entirely.

Mr Groom: Do you oppose strikes?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. J.W. Slater): I ask the honourable member for Goyder to address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr MEIER: I believe that in our free and democratic country people have every right to strike where an injustice is being done.

Mr Groom: That will be brought back to you.

Mr MEIER: I would be a hypocrite if I said anything else. We are in a democratic country; we have rights and freedoms.

Mr Groom: I'm pleased to hear you say that.

Mr MEIER: That is quite all right. I will go further and say that, certainly, the consequences must be weighed up. Do not be surprised if I attack strikes in the future if I believe the public is being seriously affected. I had a few people ring me about this strike saying that they were very upset that they had to look after their children, or find babysitting facilities for that morning. Some schools were

closed for the whole day because without bus services it was very difficult for the children to get to school. That must be considered.

I believe that the teachers weighed up those factors and considered the pros and cons. They felt that, because the whole structure would be affected, the morale of the teaching force affected and, therefore, the future educational prospects of the students in this State affected, strike action would be taken. They did not take that action lightly or easily, but they made the decision in good faith, and I respect them for that. That is especially so when, as I said earlier, the teachers had only three weeks to respond to massive changes in the structure of their profession.

What really upsets me is that some of the things that were mentioned in the package seemed acceptable. There was to be a point system for service in country schools. Most members would know that I represent a country electorate. One would think that probably all of the schools in the Goyder electorate would be classified as country schools. However, to the best of my knowledge, only one school in Goyder—that is all Yorke Peninsula and from Balaklava down to Virginia—is classified as 'country'. Only one school, which happens to be Point Pearce Aboriginal school, would count. One can imagine how teachers felt when they heard that their teaching on Yorke Peninsula would not be classified in the package as country service; likewise, the extra responsibilities that some teachers have been called upon to undertake. Librarians are one group. They are to take librarian hours away from the students and in community libraries from the community and get librarians to teach more than they do now. Student councillors also will be penalised in that way.

The worst thing is that the package was given and there were no options for variations—it was all or none. I acknowledge that the teaching profession has a long way to go. The Government is not a laughing stock, but it is viewed with great concern in the community. It is a tragedy for our society that things should be heading in this way. Many things have been mentioned in His Excellency's speech about what the Government is or is not going to do, but I have questioned so many of them—

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

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I support the Address in Reply to the speech delivered by the Governor last week and thank him for the efforts that he has put into South Australia. I should like to say how much we as South Australians appreciate what he has done for the position of Governor of this State. I express my condolences to the families of former members who have passed on during the period since the last Address in Reply.

I should also like to address my remarks to those members who are leaving the Chamber and have contributed to the Address in Reply for the last time. All of us, as individual members, put in a great deal of effort in our constituencies. I do not think that it matters whether we represent the Liberal or Labor Parties or come from Independent areas of the political spectrum: all of us try to do our best for our constituencies. I have no doubt that those members who have already intimated that they are going into retirement have earned the respect of their constituencies and can now look forward to a well-earned retirement, knowing that they have done their best and that there will be people out there who are grateful for their efforts.

To those who are perhaps going to a more premature retirement, the same sentiments apply. Some of us come to

this House and like to think that we shall be here for many years. Unfortunately, some stay for only three years and then move on. Even to those people in that last category—and history has proved that this happens after each election—I wish them well. The constituency, however much we may think it is unforgiving, is in fact very forgiving. The constituency appreciates the efforts of members, and to those members also I extend my best wishes.

The Address in Reply debate allows members to pass their thoughts around and address issues which they believe are of prime importance to the State. The Address in Reply debate is an ideal opportunity, particularly as it is the last one before we go to the election, to have a look at the performance of the Government and put on the record some of the things that we would like to see happen when the benches change and the Liberal Party forms the Government for next year.

The Government's measure of success can be determined by several factors. The first, I believe, is the level of employment within the community. The next is the level of affluence within the community and, coupled with that, the level of poverty. We also look to the morale of people and try to gauge whether they are happy with the Government that they have or whether they feel that there is a mood or reason for change.

We also look at the Government's successes and try to document them. In this case I am having the greatest difficulty. Over the years we have heard much about the Casino next door to the Parliament, the Grand Prix and the submarine project. I believe that the Government has wrung the sponge almost dry in those projects. After getting past the Grand Prix, the Casino and the submarine project, I am having difficulty in trying to see some runs on the board that can be held up as being an achievement of the Government of the day.

Members interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: Members opposite are starting to react. I thought that they might. Let us look at some of the other projects that the Government is claiming. The first is the O-Bahn. That has now been endorsed by and become a Labor Party project. There has been a love affair with the O-Bahn by members who represent the North-East Corridor to ensure that they can align themselves with it. In fact, the project had its embryonic base back in the days of Dean Brown, Michael Wilson and members of the Liberal Party.

We created it and did the research for it and now the Labor Party is riding the bus right out to the terminus to ensure that it can wring out the benefits from it. I was present in the Parliament when the then Labor Opposition castigated the Liberal Government of the day. Members opposite denigrated the project and said that it would not work, but we know what a great success it is. Members opposite denigrated our attitude to Roxby Downs, which is now a great success story. Premier Bannon could not get up there quickly enough, put on his hard hat and open it, just as he will put on his busman's hat when he opens the O-Bahn.

Technology Park was another Liberal initiative. The embryonic idea came from the Liberal side of politics, as did the Torrens Linear Park with which the Labor Party is happy to associate itself. Once projects go beyond the embryonic stage, the Labor Party picks them up. In the arts area, the Festival Theatre started on the Liberal side of politics. On the economics side, the idea for SAFA came from the Liberal Party. In leading the debate on the freedom of information legislation, I pointed out that that idea came from our side of politics. I am having a great deal of trouble finding something which I can say was the creation of the

Labor Party: When it goes out of office it will not be able to look at runs on the board and say, 'We achieved that.'

For the past three years this Government has been very lean on any sort of project, other than keeping its head above water and saving itself from drowning politically. We have had three years of politics by press release. My Leader made the point in his Address in Reply contribution yesterday that the Premier has governed the State by taking advice from his press officers, trying to feel the water by sticking his toe in to see whether it is warm enough.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: They have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on surveys to find out what people are thinking.

Mr OSWALD: Yes, as my colleague says, the Government has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on surveys, testing the water. It puts its toe in the water with the right press release to pick up the mood of the people. That is no way to govern a State. This Government has demonstrated that it does not have the business acumen to run the State. We have high taxes because, with its lack of business acumen, the Government is wasting money.

For the readers of *Hansard* I will put on the record briefly what happened in respect of the Government's foray into the New Zealand timber venture. In December 1985 the Bannon Government decided to invest in a New Zealand timber operation located at Greymouth on the South Island. Through poor research and inattention to detail the Government allowed itself to be defrauded in the deal. It went to court against the New Zealand company involved in the deal but subsequently discontinued the action, in the process forgiving \$2.7 million of taxpayers' money in the form of a debt due by the New Zealand company.

In 1987 a report identified that the New Zealand operation would be insolvent with liabilities in excess of \$8 million. Subsequently the Bannon Government restructured its financial involvement in the New Zealand venture with a resultant shortfall of \$12 million in the funds necessary to make a payment to preference shareholders by September 1989.

In the last financial year the New Zealand venture incurred a trading loss of \$2.1 million. It has an accumulated deficit of \$5.4 million and no prospects in the foreseeable future of being able to pay its way. That is the sort of company with which the State Government decides to become involved. The State Government has no right to become involved with any private company. I know that it is a philosophical argument which I will never win from this side of the House, and I would like to wait until I get to the other side to do something about it, but the Government has no right to be involved in any venture of an entrepreneurial nature.

The Government is in the business of providing services to the people, looking after such services as education, law and order and transport, but not becoming involved in entrepreneurial activities in which not one member of the shadow Cabinet has any expertise. Let that be quite clear to the public of South Australia.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: Not one member of their Cabinet—that is what I said.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: I am sorry: the member for Coles corrects me; that was a slip of the tongue. Obviously, members know what I am talking about. Not one member of the Bannon Cabinet has any expertise in this area of business acumen.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Even if they did, it wouldn't make it right.

Mr OSWALD: Quite right! However, the New Zealand venture is just one of many. I will cite some other examples for the record. As part of the restructuring of the New Zealand timber venture financial arrangements, the Bannon Government has written off debts of \$21 million incurred by the South Australian Timber Corporation, and these debts have been converted to equity. That is \$21 million of taxpayers' money which could have wiped out the waiting lists in hospitals, could have been used to upgrade public transport or used on main roads.

There are many places where that money could have been used, yet the Government had to become involved in a business venture. Another issue which has been around for a while but which is also worthy of mention is the fact that the Government has written off debts of \$7 million incurred by the Central Linen Service, and \$600 000 incurred by the Clothing Corporation. These are all Government business undertakings with poor financial records. Why must the Government become involved in them in the first place? There is no reason at all.

The Government is competing with the private sector and being given the advantage of debt write-offs funded by taxpayers. The private sector could not survive. I know that the socialist Government can survive, because it writes off taxpayers' money, having become involved in business without their having any business acumen. It has the ability to write off the losses and has a pool of taxpayers' money with which to write them off. No Cabinet should be allowed to run a State if it is going to do that sort of thing. The Bannon Government now has a financial interest in more than 200 companies involving shareholdings, equity and other forms of investment of more than \$1.2 billion.

I suppose that from the Labor side of politics one could say that that is the great success story of the Bannon Government: a Government which has involved itself in the entrepreneurial area and squeezed out the private sector. However, the Government forgets that it is the private sector which creates jobs and wealth, yet we saw only yesterday a complaint from one of the Government members that Liberal Governments historically have always opposed wage rises. The Government of the day is happy to become involved in the entrepreneurial area: it does not oppose wage rises; it allows wages to run away, and when wages run away, costs run away. When costs run away, the ability to employ runs away.

The private sector has no option but to start putting people off—the Government sector does not; it keeps them going. But the private sector is the wealth provider in this country, and the private sector must be given a fair go. Every time there is a wage rise it flows through to the private sector, and we in the private sector have to absorb it. The costs of running a business are numerous. They include insurance—and insurance costs are dictated by wages in the long term. If wages go up, the cost of insurance goes up because the cost of repairing damage goes up.

WorkCover goes up, because the cost of wages goes up, because claims are being made on workers compensation. Licence fees go up; light and power and land tax go up, as do water rates, because of the higher cost of providing water. Council rates go up; and then there are motor vehicle expenses which businesses have to incur. Costs related to all these items are increased through labour costs, through wage increases, yet yesterday Labor members were bleating because Liberal Governments of the era have been responsible enough to try to bring in some sort of wage restraint. Therein lies the problem between employers of labour and employees.

The Labor Party, and especially the State Labor Government, is obsessed with the idea that the employer wants to make a profit for himself when, in fact, if the employer makes a profit in most cases he puts that profit back in his business. He reinvests that profit so that he can install more plant and equipment. Without that plant and equipment he cannot expand his business and it is to the workers' advantage if private enterprise can be given a fair go.

It will also be to the employees' advantage if the Government gets out of its entrepreneurial activities and hands those activities back to the private sector. Then, and only then, will the State go ahead and become a prominent State in the Commonwealth of Australia. I would now like to document a few of the statements that have been made over the years and highlight the point that the Premier has run this State by press release. He has carefully designed his press statements and policy speeches to tap the moods of the electorate.

Certainly, if the Premier has 10 minutes he might like to remain in the Chamber and hear this, because I have 15 minutes left to me. Although the Premier is leaving the Chamber, I know that he has an extension speaker in his room and he will be able to hear these quotations. The first is in respect of State taxes which have been crippling small business, private enterprise and people generally. Even workers are being crippled by State taxes because they are pressed down the line.

However, our Premier specialises in politics by press release and favourable statements in his policy speeches which have been carefully researched at great depth. Indeed, I refer to his election policy speech of 1982 when he stated:

We will set up an independent inquiry into the State revenue collections, and any other change to the taxation structure will come after that inquiry reported and take place in our second term.

The Bannon Government never held that tax inquiry. Instead, in its first term of office the Premier increased petrol, tobacco and alcohol taxes. In 1985 he went on to state:

We should be able to hold our taxes.

That was what his market research told him to say. Since becoming Premier, State taxes have been increased by 142 per cent. What happened to the market research? It got him over that election period. In the *News* of 1986 as a result of further research, a report stated:

State charges will continue to rise regularly in South Australia with cost of living adjustments. The Premier, Mr Bannon, confirmed this today as part of his economic strategy to avoid taxation increases next year.

After a statement like that, what faith can the people of South Australia have in their Leader when over this period State taxes per head of population have increased from \$7.31 a week to \$16.48, which is the highest increase of any State. What faith can people have in the Premier? State taxes add to the price of petrol, wine, beer, electricity, gas and buying a house and a car. The Premier says that he will hold taxes down and then does not, and the record proves that he does not—

Ms Gayler: Like your 100 per cent increase in transport costs?

Mr OSWALD: The member for Newland talks about a 100 per cent increase. An increase from 10c to 20c is a 100 per cent increase, but what about the increase in real terms? That was an idiotic remark and I am sorry that the honourable member will not be here for the next Address in Reply in order to comment on it. If an item increases in price from 10c to 20c it is a 100 per cent increase. The honourable member is merely playing with figures and made an idiotic remark. Here is another example of how Bannon

attempted to deceive us in relation to payroll tax. Back in 1980 the *News* contained an article as follows:

The Opposition Leader, Mr Bannon, is ready to lead a national campaign to abolish payroll tax.

As can be seen, Mr Bannon had read the polls and surveys which said that this was the way to go, and he covertly tried to bring on-side the business community. But, there has been no significant reduction in payroll tax—it has not been abolished—and its crippling effect on the ability to employ labour. It remains the single largest component of the South Australian Government's tax revenue, and will account for 29.6 per cent of revenue in 1988-89.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: When the member for Fisher is back teaching next year and has a lot of time on his hands, he might like to read that instead of sitting back there chortling and interjecting. Perhaps, I will allocate him 10 minutes in the grievance debate tonight and he can redress that matter as best he can. Let us look at another broken promise. In 1986, after the Premier had once again read his polls, the *News* contained another article, as follows:

A system of automatic increases in State charges and fees in line with consumer price index movements is likely to be introduced by Mr Bannon. Mr Bannon said the Government would consider such a system in the next 12 months. It might get over the hassle at looking at these individually.

No such system has been introduced. Since this statement was made, most State charges have risen in real terms. Once again it is politics by press release, and over the years the Premier has got away with it. But, the people of South Australia have now seen through it. When one goes door-knocking it is clear that the people in this State have seen through the Premier, who, is governed by the press release and, in a few months time, forgets what he said. On 5 November 1985 an article in the *News* stated:

No catch-up increases will be imposed next year to offset the budget freeze on State taxes and charges, the Premier, Mr Bannon, promised today. 'The freeze is not a con job designed to buy votes,' he said. 'The era of tax increases is over.'

I think that we all wrote that on our blotters when he said it. A survey of 1 003 State charges which have increased since 1985 show that 748 or 74.6 per cent have risen in real terms. These increases include Housing Trust rents which rose by 54 per cent; hospital bed charges which rose by 65 per cent; public transport fares which rose by 54 per cent; and water rates which rose by 27 per cent—and the Premier said that the era of tax increases was over! Of course, it was not over.

Since then, every time there has been a wage increase, the Government has urged that that flow on, and the cost of labour and everything else has gone up. Our overseas debt has gone out of control; the Hawke Government has lost control of the country nationally; and the little old workers, whom Labor once sought to represent but no longer does, have been squeezed out of their homes and work places, and have been driven out of their minds.

If members of the Government have not picked that up they do not deserve to be in Government. They do not deserve to have the honour and privilege of representing people and making decisions that are in the best interests of all the community. The decisions that have been made nationally and at the State level over the past three years have not been in the interests of any worker in this State. That is a fact of life; and it is also a fact that will be clearly demonstrated when we see the results of the next State election. Another reason why one cannot trust the Bannon Government is as follows:

We will not allow State charges, transport fares, electricity, and hospital charges to be used as a form of backdoor taxation.

There were wonderful throwaways such as this in the old heady days of the early Bannon Administration but, under the Bannon Government, Adelaide has had the highest rise in bus and train fares of all States. There is absolute silence opposite, but it is a fact of life. We have the second highest electricity tariffs, and our hospital bed charges have risen by 65 per cent since 1985, more than twice the CPI.

Turning to housing, we all taught our children to look forward to the great Australian dream of owning their own home, but we all know the difficulty of that happening. Some people have little chance of ever achieving that goal because of the absolute indifference of this Government to the desires of young people. The Government is tampering at the edges with little schemes here and there designed to make the first home buyer feel that they will be accommodated when, in reality, we all know the chances under Labor, both nationally and in this State, of getting a home in the future are diminishing day by day.

On 7 November 1985, an ALP advertisement stated, 'Don't blow up your interest rates, vote ALP.' That electoral advertisement went on to state, 'We reject the Liberal Party's plans to remove controls on interest rates.' However, four months later, Paul Keating went straight out and deregulated home loan interest rates—he wiped them off. Here in South Australia, the Premier and his myriad of workers behind the scenes with their surveys had read what they thought were the winds and once again the politics of press release sprung into action. They distributed their statements which did not stand up, knowing full well that within a few weeks through Paul Keating they would change it anyway. The advertisement continued, 'We will boost Housing Trust construction' in an attempt to clear waiting lists. When they came to Government, they criticised the situation as left by the Liberals, with 24 000 on the waiting list. They were highly critical of the waiting list, but what has happened now? Under the Federal and State Labor Administrations, it has blown out to 43 500, and poverty in the community has increased many times. Well might Government members be very quiet and hang their heads in shame about that.

The Housing Trust has now become a welfare housing organisation. It was certainly not set up to be that, but it demonstrates the absolute failure of socialism at Federal and State level to do something to help people in need. Socialism has failed, and those members opposite who have followed that philosophy for years ought to rethink it. It has been an abject failure in this State, or there would not be 45 000 people on the waiting list, others in abject poverty, and a level of bankruptcy never before known in this country. Yet they claim to represent a Government that takes money from the rich and gives to the poor. That has been done to the extent that the country is now crippled. There is no future left for many in this country. Some European countries are back-peddalling as fast as they can go with that philosophy, and it is about time a few people followed suit in South Australia. We end up with this crazy attitude of taking from the rich and giving to the poor, with no-one eventually winning. The end result is this country slipping backwards.

In his 1982 policy speech, John Bannon read the winds and thought he had better attack the South Australian Liberal Party. He stated that an inquiry into poverty would be set up so that welfare services could best meet their needs efficiently. However, no inquiry was ever held. I doubt very much whether the Government ever had the sincerity to want to hold a poverty inquiry. The latest census material available in Adelaide shows that we now have the highest rate of poverty in the Commonwealth, a matter about which

no Government should be proud, let alone the socialist Government that claims to represent the people.

It is the Liberals who are the compassionate people in this community. It is the Liberals who have proved, Federally and at State level, that we have the compassion to govern. I am sure that following the approaching election we will be given the opportunity to show that we have the compassion, the will and the policies which will put South Australia back on the map and, a few months after that, to put the Commonwealth back on the map. Our Cabinet has the compassion and expertise to put Australia back in the forefront of the world where it belongs rather than where it has gone under Hawke and under Bannon, both of whom have been disastrous to this country.

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): I support this motion. I also want to do what many other members have done, and that is to highlight a number of matters raised by the Governor in his speech that are of particular interest to me, and many of which are of particular relevance to my electorate. Chronologically, and in no particular order of logic other than that, I will comment on a number of things.

Paragraph 6 refers to the need to develop an export culture in this State, and I believe that this Government has gone some considerable distance towards doing that. Just last week one of my constituents, who is involved in the export of horticultural products, brought to my attention the publication of quite a brilliant glossy four-page pamphlet which promotes South Australian products throughout the world, but particularly throughout the near Asian region. It was a matter of great satisfaction to her and to her business that the Department of Agriculture had gone that far and had begun to work on that kind of export. I realise that the issue of promotion of export culture goes a little further than promoting the sale of boutique beans and cabbages, but it is symbolic not only of the kind of thing that can be done, and is done, by the Government, but also the good track record of this Government in relation to that matter.

Turning to an issue of considerable interest to me, I mention the legislation relating to vegetation clearance, which was passed some years ago, but on which we probably received a little less help than we might have from the people who ought to have been our allies in the conservation movement. I leave aside the fact that members in the other place will play the issue for all they can, because they have a constituency which is at least slightly green or partly green. They must appeal to that constituency. The Opposition in this place has its own agenda and I understand why it opposes certain matters. I think it is most unfortunate that the vegetation clearance legislation took so long to be passed and that it has been given so little verbal support by our erstwhile allies in the meantime.

However, the fact is that the vegetation clearance legislation works well. Heritage agreements which are negotiated literally every day also work well. From memory, about 250 000 hectares which would otherwise have been cleared has been preserved under those heritage agreements. That has occurred at considerable cost to this Government. The Government has spent year after year and many millions of dollars on ensuring that that vegetation is not obliterated forever. I believe that the public of South Australia should acknowledge the contribution made by this Government and, in particular, by the former Minister for Environment and Planning (Dr Hopgood).

I also welcome the announcement made by the new Minister for Environment and Planning that legislation will be introduced to clean up various parts of the environment in relation to physical and chemical pollution. Members will

be aware that South Australia has passed cognate legislation similar to that passed Federally to clean up the ocean and to prevent further ocean dumping in our region. However, there is a move to go much further than that. Indeed, legislation is being drafted to handle point source pollution of various kinds, most of which comes from industry. I refer here not only to private industry but also to Government enterprises such as ETSA power stations and the like. When that legislation is in place, I believe that it will go a long way towards cleaning up Spencer Gulf and Gulf St Vincent as well as other potential trouble spots such as Bool Lagoon and parts of the south coast of South Australia. I welcome that legislation.

I also welcome the Minister's announcement that similar legislation will be drafted to take care of diffuse pollution as opposed to point source pollution. Diffuse pollution includes the kind of pollution to which I referred last evening such as litter being dropped around the suburbs and washed into the gulf. It also includes litter being discarded at various points and blowing around reserves, national parks, private land and the like. That sort of pollution is quite difficult to clean up. It is also often very difficult to source or to find the culprit, but something must be done particularly in relation to Adelaide's metropolitan beaches.

I believe, as I have said on many occasions in this place, that the way to solve that problem is to install what I previously referred to as basket filters or rubbish filters. Last night the member for Murray-Mallee corrected me and explained that filters were supposed to remove colloids. I was not referring to colloids; rather, I was referring to discarded milk cartons, and I suspect that I should have called them trash racks rather than basket filters. Nevertheless, some device must be installed on the metropolitan drainage outlets (of which there are 32) to contain and to stop that flow of litter on to Adelaide beaches and into Gulf St Vincent.

In relation to conservation, I also welcome the announcement which was made during the past couple of days that the Soil Conservation and Land Care Bill will be introduced by the Minister soon. I look forward to several aspects of that legislation, particularly the involvement of the landowners, lessees and community groups in developing plans for land management and conservation in their own areas.

Clearly, if it is to be successful, any legislation of that kind needs the support of people who manage and husband the land. I stress the point that the role of landowners or leaseholders is to manage land for future generations or, in the broadest perspective, for the planned use of it. In my view, and I suppose in the view of the law, strictly speaking, nobody owns the land. All we do is borrow from our children. That needs to be borne in mind. I believe that the Bill on land care and soil conservation will go some way towards enshrining that principle.

I also wish to make passing comment in relation to the Pastoral Bill, which, of course, came to if not a sticky end at least a sticky stop at the thirteenth hour of its passage through the other place. From my reading of *Hansard*, it appears that one of the Democrats (the other one had gone home) decided that he did not really know that it was the last day of sitting and thought that he could come back the next morning to deal with this issue. Then, in what appeared to be a flat panic, or a lapse of concentration, he allowed the Bill to go to a select committee. I deplore that. It will cost the State dearly, both in financial terms and in terms of the damage wrought on the 52 per cent of the State that is held under pastoral lease.

I also wish to spend time commenting on an issue of particular concern to my electorate, namely, unfiltered water

from the Happy Valley reservoir. There are two sources of water for the southern suburbs, and members from that part of the world would know about them. In the past, it has occasionally been our unhappy lot to receive water from Myponga, which is of worse quality than water from Happy Valley. However, both those water supplies will be filtered in the near future. I particularly welcome the fact that stage 1 of the Happy Valley filtration plant, which will provide water to 400 000 people on the Adelaide Plains, will come into effect in November this year.

I return to the point made by the member for Murray-Mallee in relation to colloids. Of course, it is conceded that the filtering of water will not necessarily guarantee chemical purity; it will not necessarily guarantee that, on occasion, water will not smell; it will not necessarily guarantee that, on occasion, water will not have to be treated chemically; but it will solve problems such as water looking yucky, dirty, or brown. People are distressed when they turn on their taps and get a basin full of brown water or when they drag from their washing machine clothes that are uniformly brownish-red. All of that will be gone. The damage to radiators, steam irons and the like will largely be mitigated by that. We are going some distance down the track by introducing that filtration plant. I simply say: roll on stage 2, because it will extend the filtered water to people in the area immediately south of Happy Valley.

I wish to comment on the issue raised in the Governor's speech about the ozone layer. I note that every politician, commentator, journalist and school child in Australia is now aware of the ozone layer and its role. I, like Ali Fricker from Friends of the Earth, got a bit miffed when the rest of the world discovered it. I can recall sitting on the back lawn of my neighbour's place in 1972 deploring the fact that Australia had just taken on several flights of F4 Phantoms which were capable of flying at 60 000 feet, clearly at the bottom of the stratosphere where the ozone concentration begins. I deplored the fact that the F4 Phantoms and various supersonic transports, including Concorde, would begin making inroads into the ozone layer, bearing in mind that it is only 4 cm thick. I know that the world is a big place, but there is only a finite amount of ozone there and we need to husband it, because it does not regenerate very quickly.

I welcome the actions that have been taken by this State to clean up its act with relation to the ozone layer. It should be noted that Australia has gone beyond the requirements of the Vienna or Montreal conventions. It has shortened the time frame imposed in Montreal by about half. Australia is taking steps to take care of propellants, fire extinguishers, extruded foam, refrigerants, the CFCs used in microcircuitry, and so on, in a much shorter time frame than many other countries, and it should be praised for that.

This State should be given due recognition for what it has done to prevent the escape of CFCs and, more especially, halons. I understand that regulations are being put together to control the actions of refrigeration mechanics and to compel them to drain and contain the CFCs that are used as refrigerants in air-conditioners, commercial fridges and the like. I can foresee a problem if fridges are taken from scrap metal yards and crushed without the CFCs being contained. It is incumbent upon us to ensure that before those regulations come down has been given to the need to contain the refrigerants and CFCs in old refrigerators and air-conditioning units before they are scrapped, crushed and returned to the blast furnaces.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: CIG has a program, which is to be instituted in South Australia, to deal with CFCs.

Mr ROBERTSON: As the former Minister says, CIG in South Australia has taken the lead and markets a device for bleeding off purifying, redistilling and reusing CFCs. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 12.59 to 2 p.m.]

PETITION: INTEREST RATES

A petition signed by 37 residents of South Australia praying that the House take action to persuade the Federal Government to reduce interest rates and urge the State Government to reduce taxes and charges was presented by Mr S.G. Evans.

Petition received.

PETITION: NATIONAL PARKS

A petition signed by 48 residents of South Australia praying that the House take action to ensure that national parks and recreation reserves remain free of foreign control was presented by Mr S.G. Evans.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Australian Formula One Grand Prix Board—

Report, 1988.

Financial Statement, 1988.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TIMBER CORPORATION

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Forests): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Members will recall that, since becoming the Minister of Forests, I have made two ministerial statements on the performance of SATCO and its subsidiary companies. In the most recent statement, in February, I outlined the performance of individual subsidiary operations and the much improved half-year group profit result. I am now able to report to the Assembly on the full-year results for the Satco group generally and, in particular, the IPL group of companies.

I should point out that all the financial information included in this statement has been extracted from draft accounts and is, of course, subject to the Auditor-General's final audit.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave has been given to the Minister, not to the member for Victoria. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Members opposite will not like the next line. The consolidated profit for SATCO in 1988-89 is \$1.498 million. This flows from a trading profit of \$2.039 million in 1988-89, from which financing and administration costs of \$541 000 have been deducted. This outcome is a turnaround of 2.601 million from the trading loss of \$0.562 million in 1987-88. The SATCO group is now trading profitably.

During the 1988-89 financial year, IPL (Australia) recorded a trading profit of \$0.880 million, a result comparable with that of the previous year.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Honourable members having political opinions is not an excuse for bad manners.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: IPL (New Zealand) has recorded a trading profit of \$55 000 for the year, which is a positive turnaround of \$2.112 million from the previous year's \$2.057 million trading loss. After bringing interest received to account, IPL (NZ) will record an operating profit of A\$1.813 million for the year just ended. Dividends appropriated out of the 1988-89 financial year on preference shares amounted to A\$3.09 million, resulting in a deficit after appropriation of \$1.277 million. Simply put, IPL (NZ) has ended the year trading profitably. This considerable improvement in IPL (NZ)'s performance is in large part a reflection on the stewardship of SATCO's Chairman, Mr Graeme Higginson, and his board in their determined pursuit of the corporate plan developed since July 1988.

Preference share issues provide one of the most effective ways of funding business capital requirements in New Zealand, similar to the manner in which Australian companies utilise long term overdraft accommodation, and indeed, this method of financing is used by many other New Zealand enterprises—for example, NZ Rail Corporation. In the past 18 months IPL (NZ) has reduced the amount of preference shares it has on issue from approximately A\$40 million to A\$12 million. The remaining issue is due for redemption 30 September 1989 and I am at this time able to advise the House that SATCO is well advanced in negotiating a replacement facility. This replacement facility will meet the financing requirements of IPL (NZ) for up to the next three years.

Returning to the results of the IPL Group—a trading profit of \$0.935 million has been recorded in the 1988-89 financial year. After dividend appropriations, the IPL Group will record a deficit of \$0.447 million—a significant improvement on the previous year's deficit of \$1.753 million.

I would now like to report briefly on the positive results achieved by the other SATCO companies in 1988-89. Marketing operations in Victoria have produced a profit of \$0.582 million compared to \$0.332 million in 1987-88. This is a significant improvement and is a reflection of the hard work of all SATCO staff. Mount Gambier Pine Industries recorded a profit of \$0.549 million, slightly down on the previous year. Shepherdson and Mewett recorded a small loss of \$27 000, a significant improvement on the 1988-89 loss of \$0.359 million. However, I can advise the House that funding for re-equipping the Williamstown mill has now been approved, and the significant boost in productivity which will result will produce a favourable impact on the 'bottom line' in years ahead.

SATCO New South Wales commenced trading only last month and the launching of scrimber on the Australian market is due in September. As a result, no report on the operational performance of either organisation can be made at this time. That concludes my references to the financial results of SATCO and its subsidiaries in 1988-89. However, I would like to touch briefly on another matter which has been raised as part of the continuing SATCO debate.

In his interim report to Parliament in March, the Auditor-General commented on his appointment as auditor of all SATCO subsidiaries with the exception of IPL (New Zealand) Limited, where he has been provided with direct access to company auditors, Messrs Peat, Marwick, Mitchell. Peat, Marwick and Mitchell has agreed to cooperate with Mr Sheridan in providing any additional information he may require. I am happy to report that all SATCO companies are on schedule to produce audited financial accounts by 21 August which will meet the Auditor-General's timetable to publish his 1989 report.

I remain conscious that there is still considerable room for improvement in SATCO's performance. Profitability has now been achieved: SATCO under the chairmanship of Mr Higginson is pursuing a well planned corporate strategy which has already brought positive results, namely, the group profit of \$1.498 million to which I have referred at the beginning of this statement. I look forward to a continued improvement in SATCO's performance.

SUPREME COURT PRECINCT

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

Supreme Court Precinct—Courtroom 12.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

STATE POLITICS

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I address my question to the Premier. In view of the repeated statements made in this House and elsewhere by the Premier and Government members that what a political Party does in one State it will do in another, will he agree that South Australians are now entitled to assume that under another term of Labor Government in this State there would be massive increases in State taxation and major reductions in public sector employment?

We have seen in this House the Government's reliance on comparisons between New South Wales and South Australia to scare the electorate—a theory being repeated time and again in answers to Dorothy Dix questions and in the Address in Reply debate—which assumes that at the State level the major political Parties have exactly the same policies and strategies. The Victorian budget, introduced immediately before the election in that State last year, contained stamp duty relief, land tax relief, payroll tax concessions and a wide range of other election sweeteners. The Government's strategy is a carbon copy of the Victorian direction. Based on the Government's theory that what a political Party does in one State it will do in exactly the same way in another, South Australians under another term of Labor would face the same sort of massive increases in State taxation and major cutbacks in public sector employment.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has been extremely tolerant for nearly four years with the Leader of the Opposition, but I am not sure how much longer I can tolerate political speeches masquerading as explanations of questions.

Mr OLSEN: Mr Speaker, I can understand why Government members do not want the explanation, given the strategy of tactics that they have had in place over the past week.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask members on my right to give the same consideration to the Leader of the Opposition as the Chair endeavours to get for the Premier when he is speaking.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is a fair question, and I thank the Leader of the Opposition for it. Indeed, I am delighted that at last I have actually got a question from the Leader of the Opposition. I have been sitting here patiently. We were told that the Leader of the Opposition is desperate to have a debate with me. However, he has had two weeks of parliamentary sitting and has not even hit the deck with a question. Finally he has cranked himself up.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Premier to resume his seat. I call the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Victoria to order, and I ask members to try to behave themselves in a way that their electors would appreciate.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As I said, at least I have got a question, and it is a reasonable one. It is reasonable, because it is quite true that we have consistently drawn analogies between the policies. The electioneering and the very slogans that have been used by the Opposition in this State match almost sequence by sequence those of the New South Wales Opposition—now the Government. We have heard the Leader of the Opposition many times extol the virtues of Mr Greiner and his Government. We have noted that the Leader of the Opposition has dispatched not only himself but members of his staff over to New South Wales to work with Mr Greiner, both in Opposition and in Government, to get some clues and to understand better how to ruin a State. So, it is not surprising, when we see an Opposition elected on a policy of reducing taxes and charges and all those other things which have now caused an embarking on the greatest hike of charges that New South Wales has ever seen, that we draw the analogy between Mr Greiner and his counterparts here.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. I call the Leader of the Opposition to order for the second time, and I strongly point out to him that, if he thinks that tolerance on the part of the Chair is weakness, it is not, and if he persists in the line he is following he will be named, with all the consequences that will ensue from that.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In relation to the rhetoric used about the public sector and its role, and all those other things, there is an absolute identity: as I say, it even goes to the very slogans that have been used. So, it is a fair analogy, and I hope that South Australians are well and truly warned about what they will cop if we have the misfortune to see those opposite become the Government of this State. The Leader of the Opposition then called attention to the latest Victorian budget which involves some massive job cuts, apparently, particularly in the railways. It is fortunate that we in this State do not own a railway system. That was a far-sighted and sensible decision made by the Government of Premier Dunstan in the 1970s, for which this State should be eternally grateful.

I have also noted that there have been increases in a number of business charges. Incidentally, in relation to things like payroll tax, the Victorian rates have been well above ours for some considerable time, and those changes that have been made are obviously changes that were forced on the Victorian Government by its very difficult budgetary and financial situation. Now, the Leader of the Opposition says that there is the analogy with South Australia—the same thing will happen here. That does not note a number of quite significant differences between Victoria and South Australia.

For instance, while the Victorian Government is required to put something in excess of 20 per cent of its recurrent expenditure into debt servicing, this State puts in something between 11 and 13 per cent (and it has varied over time). While the Victorian public sector has a very high per capita debt—and this is not only attributable to the present Government in Victoria, it goes back a long time—this State has consistently, year by year, reduced debt as a percentage of gross State product, and has paid off the debt that it inherited, that was wracked up in double-quick time, from our predecessor, the Liberal Opposition here.

So, in terms of our financial structure, as I set out so very clearly, there are considerable differences. However, I might say that there is one area I do envy. I would very much like to have the unemployment rate which operates

in Victoria and which has, I think, for some five or six years now been consistently the lowest in the country. The figures today certainly indicate, in terms of employment growth, that South Australia is on the right track, but our unemployment rate remains unacceptably high. I would be prepared to put up with a few of the financial problems if we could achieve that sort of unemployment rate. But, that is not the situation in South Australia.

This State does not have the WorkCare problems that the Victorian Government is suffering from in unfunded liabilities. We had the advantage, in some ways, of learning from its experience. Our State Bank does not have some of the problems that the Victorian State Bank has, and so on. I believe that if one looks at the structure of our economy and our public finance it is very hard to draw that analogy—very different, I suggest from that between the Opposition policies here and those of the New South Wales Greiner Government.

Let me conclude by repeating the point again. The tax concessions that I announced on Tuesday have not been conjured up out of thin air or put in as election sweeteners. The source of funding of those tax concessions—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The extraordinary thing is that the Leader of the Opposition says that they are insufficient; that we have collected so much more money that more should be returned. That is his argument on the one hand.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: His argument on the other hand is that we cannot afford these things and, because we are coming to an election it is inappropriate to impose the sort of charges the Victorians have to. The Leader of the Opposition cannot have it both ways. Either we can afford these cuts—and the Leader says that we can afford more—or we cannot, and might have to do what Victoria did. The answer is—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Premier resume his seat. I do not like bringing the proceedings of the House to a halt for disciplinary reasons if it is at all avoidable, but if the Leader of the Opposition continues to scream out at the top of his voice in the way he is doing, he will be named. That is my responsibility in this Parliament, and I will carry it out. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I repeat again that we have outlined exactly where and how it can be done. As far as credibility is concerned, it was only 12 months ago that the Leader of the Opposition said of our budget that it was based on far too optimistic growth assessments; the budget was basically false; it must come in far worse than I presented; and that I was really setting it up so that I could have an election in March or April before the crunch came. It is now August and I produced the results of that budget. Everything that the Leader said about it was totally and utterly wrong.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Victoria is also running very close to getting into difficulties with the Chair. The honourable member for Price.

ABALONE POACHING

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Fisheries outline the results of a recent court action against abalone

poachers as reported in a ministerial statement last Thursday. The Minister reported to the House that 24 people had been charged with various offences following a police investigation into allegations against poachers and a subsequent blitz named 'Operation Abalone'.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am certainly pleased to amplify the information I gave last week in my ministerial statement. It is true that 24 people have been arrested or reported as a result of the joint exercise 'Operation Abalone'. They are now appearing before the courts on a total of 41 charges. So far there have been 18 convictions and 23 adjournments on the following matters: 34 counts of taking illegal abalone; 3 counts of hinder, assault or disobeying lawful orders; 4 counts of illegal possession of abalone and that is split into the following regional dissections—25 counts from Yorke Peninsula, 6 counts from Kangaroo Island, 7 counts from the West Coast, and 3 counts from the Adelaide region.

So far those penalties have attracted fines of up to \$8000; a large amount of diving equipment has been confiscated; two vessels have been forfeited and one vehicle has also been forfeited. I quote those figures not only for the information of members here but also, and more particularly, so that the community at large can know that we are determined to follow through what I said last week and what we have said on other occasions: that is, that we are giving a very real and effective warning to abalone poachers that they are the target of a concerted, coordinated and determined policing effort by the Departments of Fisheries and Police.

STATE BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): My question is directed to the Premier. Following the exposure of the State Bank and/or its subsidiaries to the financial failures of the overseas company Equiticorp, to which the bank lent \$100 million; the National Safety Council (Victorian Division), to which the bank lent \$35 million; and the interstate based Hooker Corporation, to which the bank lent \$40 million, has the Premier received a briefing from the bank and its subsidiaries on the extent of their liabilities. What provision has the bank made in its balance sheet for the recent financial year for total bad or doubtful debts, and has the bank, or any of its subsidiaries, taken any action in relation to two major Hooker construction projects in Adelaide it was financing and, if so, what is the nature of that action?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, I have been briefed on the situation. In the case of Equiticorp, obviously it will take some considerable time to sort out. Because of the security against which those loans were made, it is expected that there will be recovery of considerable amounts of money in relation to that sector of problem loans. However, it is far too early to say what that total will be.

In the case of the National Safety Council exposure, at the present the State Bank has an action relating to certain information given it in purchasing a particular loan from Rothwell Australia Limited. We will await the outcome of that. In terms of general provision, the bank has made it quite—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Any briefing on Hooker?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The bank lending in relation to Hooker was against particular building projects being carried out in South Australia and, obviously, the security in those projects is the security for the loan, and those projects will continue. The bank does not anticipate any major problems in those areas. I make the general point that any bank or financial institution will have some bad debts, particularly when it is—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: On the contrary, the figures for bad debts written off as against provisions are very favourable in relation to the State Bank. The provisions that it makes are very high in relation to private banks. The State Bank's performance is much better than that of its private rivals. It is also the seventh largest financial—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member keeps interjecting, Mr Speaker, in her continued attack on the State Bank and its integrity.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The member for Victoria should know better, too. He at least has some skerrick of business information and knowledge as opposed to his colleagues. This disgraceful attack, this guerilla warfare being waged against the State Bank, must stop.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am answering the question that the honourable member put before me. At every point of answer, there is a new little innuendo or interjection to try to put some kind of doubt on the viability or the performance of the State Bank. The State Bank is one of the most successful institutions in Australia at the moment. It is highly profitable in terms of profit growth and its contribution to the State Government in terms of revenue. It is very well capitalised. It attracts the highest possible credit rating. It has contributed enormously to development in South Australia and, indeed, to South Australia's image interstate and overseas. Without the State Bank in the home lending area, the ordinary South Australian would be paying a lot more for housing. More than that, many South Australians would not have a hope of being in housing at all.

If the member for Coles wants to try to pull down an institution making that kind of contribution to our State, I hope that she is kept right away from influencing economic development policy in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Premier to assist the Chair and I caution the member for Victoria that he is travelling down a very perilous path with his conduct.

REDHILL TRAIN CRASH

Mr TYLER (Fisher): Now that debriefings have been carried out with health workers involved in the Redhill rail crash on 11 July, will the Minister of Health inform the House of the outcome of those debriefings and the implications for future emergencies?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: First, we were very fortunate as a community that this accident was not more serious than it turned out to be. It occurred as a result of the Indian Pacific running into a stationary Bluebird rail car. The fact that one vehicle was stationary and the other was travelling at a fairly low speed minimised the number of casualties that occurred. Nonetheless, 56 passengers were injured, nine requiring hospitalisation and some being airlifted to Adelaide after initial treatment.

Doctors and nursing staff from Snowtown and Crystal Brook, along with St John Ambulance personnel, were among the first at the scene of the crash. They stabilised passengers, directed the more seriously injured to one site for further assessment and treatment, and organised buses to carry

those able to walk. All in all, it was handled with a great deal of skill and compassion.

All hospitals in the area went on alert, brought in additional staff and reorganised their casualty and ward arrangements to cope with X-rays and treatment for the injured. More medical and nursing personnel, along with many helpers, arrived as communications reached them. The greatest influx of casualties was at Snowtown Hospital. In all, 200 people, including the injured, relatives, unhurt passengers, and so on, crowded into the hospital's new day care centre. Eight ambulances from surrounding areas, plus two helicopter retrieval teams from the Royal Adelaide Hospital, were directed to the scene.

There was a great deal of efficiency in the response from the State Emergency Service, police officers and the CFS. Several detailed observations are perhaps worth reading onto the record for future consideration. First, identification of all personnel is important when casualties are spread over a wide area. It is helpful when doctors arriving at the scene wear surgical gowns to identify themselves. One officer suggested colour-coding or, perhaps, hard hats marked 'Doctor', 'Nursing Sister', 'St John Chief', etc.

Secondly, we know that communications in country areas are more complicated than in the city, where facsimile machine and telephones are taken for granted. Compatible two-way radio systems interlinking all the services involved are essential. The third point is that one central information source for media is required. In the Redhill incident, hospital telephones were frequently tied up by media calls, at times when anxious relatives were phoning for news of the injured and all available staff were needed to look after casualties as they arrived.

Most media news teams were cooperative, but others were over-zealous. Aiming cameras into the back of ambulances invades the privacy of vulnerable patients and impedes retrieval and treatment. The State Disaster Plan might well follow this up with media guidelines. Interpreters may be needed for non-English speaking casualties. People involved in the disaster may not be acquainted with the State Disaster Plan, or with any emergency procedures. Some may actually obstruct medical and ambulance personnel, whether intentionally or not. I have read those observations into the record and I think it important that they be heeded in any further disaster or near disaster.

I conclude on a lighter note. One of the towns involved in the Redhill incident had a regular 'practice disaster' scheduled for that very day. When a police officer telephoned to say there had been a serious accident and the State Disaster Plan was to be invoked, the reply was 'Cut it out mate. That's not till 8 o'clock.'

FIRE SERVICE AMALGAMATION

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I direct my question to the Minister of Emergency Services. Does the Government support the attempts of the Metropolitan Fire Service and the United Fire Fighters Union to set up a State Fire Service, thereby removing from duty all the Country Fire Services volunteers who have risked their lives for South Australia for many years, including through two devastating Ash Wednesday bushfires, and are these valued volunteers to be discarded because of union pressure? The latest public statement on Government policy is at odds with comments in a confidential report by the Director of the Country Fire Services, Mr Macarthur. The Deputy Premier in a letter to the *Advertiser* published on 11 March stated:

The Government is committed to a composite volunteer/full-time system of fire fighter services in this State.

Mr Macarthur, however, stated in a report to the Government's Fire Services Coordination Committee:

The Chief Officer, Metropolitan Fire Service, had consistently advocated the establishment of a State Fire Service immediately and then to proceed within the framework to make it work. However, the Country Fire Services Board has serious reservations regarding that approach.

Mr Macarthur also said that 'critical factors' which must be determined before any merger is to proceed 'would be defined areas of responsibility and the preservation of the integrity and role of the volunteers in the Country Fire Services'. Mr Macarthur's report raises the clear questions of, first, who does the Minister support—the Metropolitan Fire Service or the Country Fire Services—and, secondly, how far is he prepared to go in promoting the long-standing policies of the Fire Fighters Union, which wants to unionise all fire fighting services in Australia?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for his question because, clearly, this is something that has been around for some considerable time, with different groups having different agendas. I have no present inclination to combine the two services. What I want to do is rationalise, especially at the edges. As people are aware, there are a number of areas—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: When the members of the Opposition stop oohing and aahing and making other little animal noises, I will continue with my explanation. If, on the other hand, they want to continue making silly noises, I am perfectly prepared to sit down and let someone else who wants to ask a question get on with it.

I am perfectly willing to look at whether or not some rationalisation is possible at the edges, as I indicated in a metaphoric way. There are boundary problems and problems in terms of particular responsibilities for areas which can be rationalised to some good for the State. Until now, we would not have done so without the concurrence of both services. At the moment I am happy to continue with that, but I may well at some stage or other indicate that for a certain individual situation the common good overrides the necessary bits and pieces. However, I will continue to make sure that I consult with both services on all these matters, and I guess it would be necessary, if both services could come to an agreement, for them to swap a little bit here for a little bit there. There is no intention to override either of the two services.

AGED ENTERTAINMENT

Mrs APPLEBY (Hayward): Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport advise the House what steps have been taken to introduce live entertainment in nursing homes and day-care centres? I am well aware that in 1987 the Recreation Association for the Elderly conducted research into the need for live entertainment as a form of recreation for elderly residents confined to nursing homes and day-care centres. The research showed that live performers who provide the audience with the opportunity to join in can be a valuable aspect of the social and recreational life of elderly people.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Hayward for her question and, of course, for her interest in this matter because, as Chairperson of the task force that is looking into the needs of the aged, one must acknowledge the work that the member for Hayward has done in this area in the numerous meetings that she has had with aged communities, seniors and aged care workers throughout the

State in dealing with issues that are of great concern to them.

The research undertaken by the Recreation Association for the Elderly identified clearly the need for live entertainment in nursing homes and day-care centres. This organisation is, I point out for the benefit of members who have not had any contact with it, a very progressive and far-sighted organisation. Under the chairmanship of Mary Lane and the Executive Officer, Margaret Scharer, both of whom have worked successfully together in a number of areas to develop opportunities in recreation and care as well as in support services for the aged, the organisation has done much work.

Indeed, it was my pleasure today to join with the Director of Community Services for Unley council, Brenton Miels, to launch the pamphlet 'Live Entertainment for the Elderly in Nursing Homes and Day Centres'. I emphasise the importance of locating and bringing together resources for live entertainment for their members and clients. This is all set out in the booklet, as I am sure the member for Hayward will appreciate, having provided it to her own constituents. A number of organisations and individuals that offer a wide variety of entertainment activities for the elderly are listed.

It is significant that such a booklet has been launched. The State Government provided \$2 500 for the work performed by the Recreation Association for the Elderly, and this will be a significant resource for the community. I am sure that as we come to appreciate it—we are all getting closer to the age when we might want those entertainments provided in day-care centres and nursing homes—

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Hopefully, we will make it. I refer to the information provided through the booklet. If one examines the ideals pursued by the association, one sees that they fit in as another part of the matrix that they have presented, providing recreation opportunities, walking for the elderly, and so on, throughout the community. In addition, awards will be presented as part of Seniors Week, to be held in October this year, and it will be handily joined with the Masters Games, which are to be held from 18 to 28 October. In conjunction with Seniors Week there will be recreation award acknowledgments for both individuals and organisations involved in representing and promoting activities for the elderly in this community.

So, there will be a significant opportunity for organisations to take advantage of this. I hope that all members of this House and of the other place will draw this to the attention of these organisations. There is a chance to provide this recognition for organisations or individuals who have made a contribution to the community. I think this will be a very significant award—being a State award, available for both an individual and an organisation. This will be presented during Seniors' Week, from 18 to 28 October, and it demonstrates the Government's commitment to assisting the Recreation Association for the Elderly. I commend it for the initiative and certainly for the work that it has done. If members require brochures, they are available at their offices. I would encourage members to obtain a copy of the brochure. I am sure that the elderly citizens associations, day care centres or nursing homes within their electorates would appreciate having such a brochure made available to them. I thank the member for Hayward for her continuing work for the elderly in the community.

SCHOOLTEACHERS

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Is the Minister of Education aware that in many schools there is serious concern

over his plan to limit teachers to 10 years in any one school, and will he explain how the stability of teaching staff and the quality of education in those schools will be improved if his plan is implemented? I— and many of my colleagues—have been contacted by many teachers expressing dismay at the Minister's plan. To illustrate the response to the Minister's policy, I would like to quote a letter that I have from a teacher at Murray Bridge High School. It states:

My wife works in this town—must she resign to move with me, or do I resign so she can continue to work here, or do we live in different towns? We chose to forgo promotions to establish a stable family life, and we own our own home here. What are they gaining by uprooting us? Nearly half the teachers at Murray Bridge High School have been here 10 years or more. Do 47 of us sell our houses and move this Christmas?

Through our close contact with schools, we know there will be massive disruption, even if the changes are phased in over three years. Let me further explain: for example, Murray Bridge High School would lose 47 of its 99 teachers; Woodville High, 44 per cent of its current staff; Marryatville High, about one-third; Campbelltown, about a third; Magill Primary School, about half; Nailsworth Primary School, seven out of 20 teachers—who are all married women living locally; Kilkenny Primary School, half; and Tanunda Primary School, 60 per cent.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for giving me the opportunity to comment briefly on this component of the curriculum guarantee package which is currently the subject of negotiations between the Education Department and the South Australian Institute of Teachers. The concept of there being limited tenure for permanent teachers in the department arose many years ago in discussions between the institute and the department, but this was formalised in the recommendations of the Uhrig report on personnel practices within the department. Since that time it has been included in many of the negotiations over a range of industrial issues with the Education Department.

It is true to say that there is a division of views within the Education Department system about that principle and its application. Clearly, in relation to a number of schools in the metropolitan area, in particular, and in some of the larger country centres, if all teachers decided to stay the career opportunities for those teachers who serve in the more remote areas of the State, or the so-called more difficult or less desirable school situations, would then be very limited indeed, and there would be a very clear division between the opportunities available for some teachers and those available for other teachers in our system.

The proposal advanced by the department would see teachers, on average, having an opportunity to serve in approximately three schools during their teaching career. It would also allow teachers, particularly those returning from country posts, to have some reasonable choice of the schools to which they would like to return in the metropolitan area—maybe because they are schools with which they have had a long association in a district where their family lives, or perhaps because it is an area where they grew up, where they want their children to grow up or study, or where there are other schools nearby, or where they own their own home.

So, for many reasons it is important that this matter be discussed and, if possible, resolved. There has been a lot of emotive discussion about this. There was never intended to be a blanket situation right across the teaching service where every person was dislocated from their school. That was never a part of that package, and obviously in many situations teachers would remain in their positions: that was all part of the discussions. However, the stage that the discus-

sions had reached prior to the stoppage of teachers last Friday was that this whole issue of limited tenure for permanent teachers would be dealt with outside the curriculum guarantee package, and that information has been conveyed to teachers throughout South Australia.

So, this matter will obviously continue to be the subject of discussions and, hopefully, we can resolve this issue in the interests not only of individual teachers and their career prospects but also of the young people in our schools whom we want to ensure have the very best opportunities that we can make available to them.

LABOUR FORCE SURVEY

Ms GAYLER (Newland): Can the Minister of Employment and Further Education advise the House of the results of the Australian Bureau of Statistics labour force survey released today?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I think the figures warrant some attention, particularly the national and South Australian figures over the past 12 months. According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures published today, the number in full-time employment in South Australia for July totalled more than 507 000. We now have a total of 650 400 people in employment, which is a record for South Australia. Employment growth in July was very strong, with 3 100 jobs being created. If one reflects—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The honourable member talks about unemployment. Members opposite should know about that, because during the period of the Liberal Government they were going backwards so fast. The Leader of the Opposition was a Minister in that Government, and from 1979 to 1982 more than 4 800 jobs were lost, and that occurred on a much lower base.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order and I ask the Minister not to goad the Leader of the Opposition into being named. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Mr Speaker, the thought never crossed my mind. It is important that we look at the growth in employment in this State, in particular over the past 12 months.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Mitcham should read the *Sunday Mail* article if he is going to quote statistics; they are very selective indeed. He has the narrowest vision when using statistics. I thought that last weekend's *Sunday Mail* article was very telling, drawing attention to the base figures—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Heysen spruiks—he is the expert on statistics. He has difficulty with his fingers, let alone dealing with statistics.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Mitcham draws on statistics—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: He can't even keep his job on the front bench.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: That's right; we can't work out who is and who is not on the front bench. The *Sunday Mail* article highlighted the problem about the commencement base used by the member for Mitcham. It reflects very badly on the Tonkin Liberal Government. We went backwards so fast under its guidance—

Mr S.J. Baker: 30 000 jobs!

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the honourable member for Mitcham.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The July seasonally adjusted figures (they are not raw figures) going back 12 months demonstrate a growth in employment in this State. For July 1988 there was 8.6 per cent unemployment, but in July 1989 that figure decreased to 7.6 per cent. Those figures reflect that, under the guidance of the Bannon Government, South Australia has experienced growth over the past year. I recall the Premier's mentioning the growth in manufacturing which outstripped the national growth in that area, and that clearly indicates that the course set by the Bannon Government is producing results, and jobs are being delivered.

From the overall figures, one can see an increased participation rate, indicating a further growth of confidence in the work force and the labour market. The participation figures were 62.6 per cent and 62.2 per cent, which is a 0.4 per cent increase. Because of the confidence being expressed in the work force, one can see that people still have confidence in South Australia and in the market, because more people are entering the market.

From the national figure (and the Federal Government is obviously tightening the purse strings) one can see a slight increase in unemployment. Given the national figures, South Australia has done well. I believe that the results for South Australia are reasonable and they reflect a growth of full-time and part-time jobs over that period. For the previous 12 months they represent a decrease in unemployment and a further shoring up of the South Australian commitment, particularly in manufacturing. I believe that the manufacturing area was neglected, particularly by the Fraser Government, and by earlier Governments. The manufacturing sector is fundamental to the success of South Australia's economy, and continues to receive the appropriate attention by this Government.

I am delighted to be able to say that those figures reinforce what we have seen over the past 12 months. It comes back to a situation where I believe we can be very proud of the manufacturing sector in this State in terms of full-time jobs, especially when compared with the national figure.

MARINO ROCKS MARINA

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I direct my question to the Minister for Environment and Planning. I have not asked the question yet, so do not get too excited.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The pleasantries exchanged between the two members are appreciated because of the contrast they present with other behaviour in the Chamber but, nevertheless, we should get on with the question.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister please clarify the discrepancies between what she has told the media she has in terms of a proposal from Crestwin developers for the Marino Rocks marina site and what Crestwin tells the Opposition she has in her possession? This morning's *Advertiser* quotes a spokeswoman for the Minister as saying Crestwin had not completed a full proposal for the Marino Rocks site, and that a final proposal has not been received.

However, I have in my possession a letter from Crestwin dated the 8th of this month, which detail the current position, and which states that last month the company's financial analysis for the proposal was submitted to the Government after a preliminary submission went to Cabinet in March.

The project director of Crestwin, Mr Anthony Vaughan, describes his proposal as 'sound', and writes he is waiting on a decision from Cabinet on its acceptance. He details his proposal as having a world-class marina; a residential component; a harbor with several public facilities of major importance, such as air, sea rescue and a public boating shelter; and public access to harbor and breakwater to ensure maximum public use. It is clear that the company believes it has submitted a final proposal.

Mr Robertson interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The question that I should like to talk to the Opposition about is whether it supports this project or not.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I will get to that. The reason I pose that question is that the Leader of the Opposition has taken an interesting stand. Having called this supposed public meeting in the electorate of Bright and issued selective invitations, I understand he was going there to do some cheap electioneering because he thought that the results of the poll had shown that the residents were supporting it and he was going to be the champion of the marina development. When he got there, he discovered that some of the residents were asking questions and maybe were not supporting it. When pushed and asked whether the marina could be moved somewhere else, I understand he said, 'Yes, we could move it down near Port Stanvac.' What an amazing situation.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Despite the fact that I have warned the Leader of the Opposition that repeated interjections will lead to his being named, I will give him one further warning. I suggest that if he is indignant about some matter, he can resort to a personal explanation at the conclusion of Question Time.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: There was another member of this Parliament present who gained the impression that the Leader of the Opposition was on the run, as he so often is when he tries to sit on the fence and have a bit each way. Unfortunately, he was caught out in this instance. I am not going to insult the intelligence of this House by delineating the reasons why this ridiculous last-minute desperate attempt to curry a few votes in the Bright electorate is such a ludicrous proposal—to remove the marina from what has been identified as one of the most suitable sites along the metropolitan coast of Adelaide. I remind the House that it was identified by a marina suitability study and the conservation movement has come out in support of the site. I believe that the Leader of the Opposition, who has obviously adopted a number of positions on this issue, as he has on several other developmental issues, has again been exposed for what he is.

The Cabinet has not examined the proposal from Crestwin. When Cabinet has examined it, I am sure that the Premier and I will make an announcement to the community of South Australia. Once again, I shall not be bulldozed by any member of the Opposition into making some kind of decision in advance of the proper process of the Cabinet making its decision.

GMH WOODVILLE

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): Is the Minister of Labour aware of the situation at the GMH tool room at Woodville—

Members interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: Can I ask my question now?

The SPEAKER: Order! I take it that that was a point of order from the honourable member for Semaphore.

Mr PETERSON: Yes. I should like to ask my question.

The SPEAKER: The Chair has given the call to the honourable member for Semaphore. I hope that the House will extend him the courtesy of listening.

Mr PETERSON: Thank you, Sir. Is the Minister of Labour aware of the situation at the GMH tool room at Woodville, where there is a distinct possibility that up to 100 highly skilled tradesmen will be made redundant, and are any steps being taken to protect these jobs? I have been approached by concerned GMH employees representing the Woodville Combined Shop Stewards Committee, who were informed at their last meeting with the GMH representatives that 'there was a strong possibility of reduction in the tool room labour force.'

When the South Australian manufacturing park was set up at Woodville, it was reported that the GMH tool room would play a crucial role in activities of that park. That does not now appear to be the situation, and it has been put to me that highly skilled men—men, we have just been told, who have the skills necessary to make our State more competitive—are likely to be thrown on the scrap heap and made redundant.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I regret that I have no personal knowledge of what may be happening at Woodville at present. Some inquiries I have made have proved fruitless. However, I will continue to make inquiries and when I have definitive answers I will advise the honourable member accordingly.

COUNCIL AMALGAMATION

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): My question is directed to the Premier. Because an independent survey in June this year showed that 74.3 per cent of residents in the Brighton council area want no change to their council boundaries, and following the precedent the Premier set yesterday in relation to the Mitcham council, will the Government make a submission to the Local Government Advisory Commission asking it not to proceed with proposals to amalgamate the Marion, Brighton and Glenelg councils into the City of Sturt?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will refer that question to my colleague, the Minister of Local Government. In doing that, I think that we would be most unlikely to do so. I do not know whether the honourable member has been following events in relation to the proposal for the City of Flinders. I know that at least two other members of the Opposition have sought to politicise this matter—and they have not done a bad job of it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would like to make the Government's position clear. We see ourselves as facilitating changes to local government areas, not as promoting or dictating them. That is the procedure under the Local Government Act. After all, local government is the third tier of government and, although members opposite opposed the referendum to see local government included in the Federal Constitution, thus indicating their contempt for local government, nonetheless we believe that local government has certain rights and responsibilities.

The Local Government Act, which is an Act of this Parliament, gives validity to the activities of local govern-

ment. The procedure for making amendments to boundaries was laid down with, as I understand it, the support of both Parties and, most importantly, the Local Government Association, as an appropriate procedure. In the light of the Mitcham experience, it is obvious that, despite 34 very successful recommendations and actions under that procedure, there can be problems. In relation to that matter, the Government has made clear its views. However, the matter has been referred back to the Local Government Advisory Commission which will be examining it.

Mr Gunn interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is pretty unreasonable for the member for Eyre to say, when you consider that about 30 successful changes have been made to boundaries—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—which have been very successful. I repeat: it is not the State Government's role to dictate to local government what its boundaries should be.

WATER RATES

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): Will the Minister of Water Resources say whether the average rise of the rate in the dollar for sewerage and water has been higher or lower than the consumer price index for South Australia?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Adelaide has the call.

Mr DUIGAN: The Minister is already aware of concerns of mainly elderly pensioners on fixed incomes, living in the electorate of Adelaide, and has indicated her preparedness to have the valuations on which—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Premier to extend the courtesy to the member for Adelaide that he should be able to deliver his question to the House.

Mr DUIGAN: The Minister has already indicated her preparedness to have the valuations on which the rates are calculated reviewed, and has assured pensioners that their water will not be disconnected if they are unable to pay their bills. She has offered a range of payment schedules to help further those individuals whom I have brought to her attention. However, the Opposition has been arguing that the actual average rises in the rates being faced by householders are over and above the CPI commitment which has been made by the Government.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I acknowledge the concern that the honourable member has shown towards pensioners in his electorate. I am a little disappointed that the member for Bragg did not have the courage to ask me the question.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Yes, I know, and he has also spoken in the media. The reason why I am quite delighted to answer the question is that it will give me an opportunity to explain to the member for Bragg, who either does not understand or chooses deliberately to misrepresent the facts about these increases. I will start at the beginning of this whole question of water and sewerage rates. Let me remind the House that members on both sides are continuously approaching me for increases in the services and, indeed, in the service provided to our customers, therefore the water and sewerage rates were set to increase the revenue which would be raised from the base water rates. This rise would be 6.8 per cent and the increase for sewerage would be some 6.9 per cent.

I remind the House that some people seem not to understand this: that property values form the basis for determining the actual rates levied on individual township customers. Those on the minimum annual rate have had their water rates increased by 6.25 per cent for water and 6.5 per cent for sewerage, so customers other than those on the minimum rate will therefore be dependent on the capital value of each individual's property relative to the average statewide change. Now, we move to the valuation situation. In South Australia in the past 12 months the average increase in property values for the whole of the State was 16.8 per cent. The effect of this—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am sorry if the honourable member does not know how to work out an average. My colleague the Minister of Health, I must say, was obviously not able effectively to explain to the member for Bragg how to work out averages. Obviously, my colleague has been out of teaching a little bit too long and has to put it into much more simple language for the member for Bragg to understand what an average is. The effect is that any customer whose property value has increased by about 16.8 per cent will be subject to a rate increase of about 6.9 per cent for both water and sewerage rates.

I will give the House a couple of examples, so that the member for Bragg will clearly understand what this means. Those customers with property value increases of greater than 16.8 per cent will incur water and sewerage rate increases of more than the average of 6.9 per cent. Let me use the example of Burnside. While I do not think that it is the member for Bragg's electorate, I think that it is the electorate of his next door neighbour.

Mr Ingerson: No, it is mine.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Well, that is appropriate. The average Burnside property value increase has been 26.2 per cent while the Statewide average is 16.8 per cent; the difference is 9.4 per cent. Burnside customers can therefore expect an increase in water and sewerage rates of the 6.9 per cent plus the difference, which is 9.4 per cent. That is for those properties which are in the high capital value area which have undergone significant increases in their property values. Let me remind the House that the homes in which people live are their principal asset, therefore they have a greater increase in that asset.

Let us look at the other side of the equation. Conversely, customers whose property values have increased by less than the State-wide average of 16.9 per cent will be subject to a smaller increase. For example, I refer to the situation in Woodville. The State-wide average increase was 16.8 per cent and if the Woodville average was 12.1 per cent, the difference would be minus 4.7 per cent. Therefore, Woodville customers could expect an increase in their water rates of only 2.2 per cent. It is interesting that members opposite have not bothered to raise that matter. Customers whose capital value has risen by less than 9.9 per cent, that is 16.8 per cent minus 6.9 per cent, will see a reduction in water and sewerage rates in 1988-89.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am sorry to say that they probably do not live within the District of Bragg. Members on this side believe in a policy of social justice and therefore I will not make any apologies for it. Let me conclude with a final example. Taking the average increase in property valuation of 16.8 per cent, a property that in 1988-89 was valued at \$77 500 would have attracted water and sewerage rates of \$299.50; in the current year that property would be valued at \$90 500, attracting a combined water and sewerage

bill of \$322. In fact, that equates to an increase of about 6.9 per cent—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: It's amazing that you have had three briefings by my department and you still do not understand. That is incredible.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to direct her remarks through the Chair.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am sorry, Mr Speaker. I am about to conclude. The overall increase for an average property is \$22.70, which equates to approximately 44c, exactly the figure initially given to the community by the Premier.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

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

That, pursuant to section 15 of the Public Accounts Committee Act 1972, the members of this House appointed to the committee have leave to sit on that committee during the sitting of the House next Tuesday.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 206.)

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): I have previously drawn attention to my support for, and I now welcome, the filtration plant at the Happy Valley reservoir and the fact that it will serve about 400 000 people on the Adelaide Plains and beyond. Also referred to in the Governor's speech were the interest rate protection plan and the mortgage relief scheme, both of which have been extremely successful in addressing some of the problems faced by people in the District of Bright and beyond.

It has been my experience that people have been interested in and inquired of the Housing Trust about these schemes. Many people have taken advantage of them. I have observed that they were well targeted and extremely successful.

I turn now to paragraph 23 of the Governor's speech in relation to the confiscation of the proceeds of crime. I have read considerably on this topic and welcome the move to enshrine such legislation. It will no longer be profitable or possible for people who make their fortunes at the expense of other people by trading in drugs or anything else to continue to pocket those ill-gotten gains even after they have been to prison.

Perhaps this amendment to the Crimes (Confiscation of Profits) Act is the sort of thing that we should have done earlier. It is certainly welcome now and it is the kind of legislation that will make clear to members of the community, particularly those bent on making their money from drugs and other illegal activities, that we are serious in our attempts to stamp that out. If they persist in acting in that way, it will cost them dearly; it will cost them their homes if they are found guilty.

The Governor also gave some attention to the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act, and I welcome his undertaking that that Act will be amended to enable some young offenders to perform community service as a sentencing option in its own right and that members of the

bench will be quite entitled, and even urged, to consider that alternative. Many of the schools, kindergartens and public institutions in the district of Bright (and I suspect elsewhere) have gained considerably from the work of young offenders, who at weekends and at other times have tended the gardens, cleaned the guinea pig hutches, planted vegies and undertaken various other activities.

The Karrara kindergarten was opened by the Premier at the end of 1985, I think, and as the Premier would recall, it was something of a mess at that time. The school was finished but the grounds were unkempt. It was not a particularly nice place for little children to be but, as a result of work by young offenders over the following couple of months, it quickly became a most habitable, warm and welcoming sort of place definitely owing much to the work of those young offenders. On the same issue, it seems to me that we might as a Government consider extending that aspect of community work to actually having offenders working with the people against whom they offended to help redress some of the psychological damage done to these victims. I am aware that that is being considered in New South Wales.

In respect of offences commonly known as 'granny bashing' and the like it has been suggested that community work with the person who was bashed would be one way of remedying the situation not only from the point of view of the offender, by teaching the offender that grannies are humans as well but also from the point of view of the granny in that she may come to learn that the offender is not entirely as bad as she might have believed him or her to be. That has been looked at in New South Wales. I am unsure whether consideration has been given to enshrining it in legislation in South Australia, but it is something that I believe we ought to consider.

I also wish to give some attention to paragraph 25 of the Governor's speech dealing with the Wrongs Act. The Act is to be amended to provide that, where the acts or omissions or the parents of a child under 15 have materially contributed to the criminal conduct of the child, the parents might be compelled to pay a proportion of any loss or damage caused by their child. This involves the offences of burning down schools or wilfully damaging public or private property. If there is a suspicion that the parents have contributed in some way to that behaviour through inadequate parenting, it is only right and proper that those parents ought to pick up some of the tab. Members of my ilk may feel a little uneasy about the civil rights implications, but this is the sort of measure that should be enforced in order to force parents to have a little more responsibility for their children and their activities.

The view that when a child turns 14 he or she can suddenly be turned into a loose cannon on the decks to wreak whatever damage they choose to wreak on the rest of society seems to be unfair and out of time, and it is about time that society came to grips with that. One way to force parents to parent a little better and to force children to behave more like children instead of habitual criminals may be to amend the Wrongs Act in the way that the Governor has suggested.

I refer also to paragraph 30 in the Governor's speech which deals with the Intensive Adolescent Support Scheme. It is clear that this measure is overdue. Under the scheme, helpers will act as informal counsellors to provide intensive support in areas where children are experiencing difficulty. This, of course, arises out of cases of neglect, which the Department for Community Welfare people encounter, and the homelessness and hopelessness of many children. It seems to me that much of this has arisen because policy

makers in our society have tended to be white, middle-age, middle class, and male. Many of the problems that we appear to have with young people in society, young offenders in particular, arise, it seems to me, from the fact that we (and I suppose this relates to Parliamentarians as much as to anyone else) through no fault of our own have a set of visions and values, a set of intellectual baggage, which tends to mean, almost by definition, that we are out of touch with kids who are young, black or poor—or in some cases female, because perhaps they are not understood as well as other young people.

Paragraph 34 of the Governor's speech refers to an expansion of child-care facilities. I am in the fortunate position of living in the electorate of Bright and of having seen several child-care facilities spring up around me. It is clear that much of the centre based day care need has not yet been met. It is equally clear that since the Federal Government began funding these schemes both it and the Children's Services Office in this State have worked hard and effectively to invest public dollars in areas where they are most needed. The fact that many of the centres fill almost instantly testifies to that. Indeed, the Hallett Cove centre, which was opened about two years ago, was virtually full the day after it opened.

The successive community committees which have run that centre have implemented the guidelines most meticulously, such that those who need the help most for training, job search or simply for respite are those who have access to the care. It seems to me that this program of day care is working most effectively. However, 75 per cent of the parents and kids who need this assistance still do not have access to such facilities. It is quite clear that family day care is an option that is working quite well to redress the imbalance and to meet the need.

In addition, I welcome the investment of both the Federal Government and the Children's Services Office in providing in the coming year an additional 1 700 out of school care places to cater for the needs of children before and after school—children of the kind who live in the electorate of Bright, and I suppose in many other outer suburban areas, where two parents work, simply because they have to work, and where out of hours care is a necessity for children. It seems to me impractical and particularly unfair on working mothers if that facility is not provided.

I welcome the fact that the suburb of Hallett Cove has one program, with two venues. The Sealcliff area has set up its own and is currently funding its own program, and I understand that funding has been allocated to establish a program at Seaview Downs. Again, they will be very well used and very much appreciated by those two income families who need them. In this day and age it is impossible for working parents to rely on relatives, friends and neighbours to care for their children.

Further in relation to the Governor's speech, I want to pay brief attention to hospital funding, and in particular I welcome the \$18 million set aside for the construction of the Noarlunga Hospital. That hospital has been advocated by local members of Parliament, councillors and correspondents to the local newspaper for many years. Over the past decade or so, one Brian Wreford has had his name written largely in the saga of the Noarlunga Hospital. I was assured that on the day when the first sod was turned Brian was delighted with the prospect of having a hospital in that area, as I am sure is the case in relation to most of the ratepayers and residents of Noarlunga and Willunga. For the residents of O'Sullivan Beach that will also be the closest hospital. Indeed, it is a welcome addition to the raft of health care services in the south.

I also note from the Governor's speech that \$21 million has been set aside for a theatre complex at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and I welcome that. I particularly welcome the further development of the Marion Community Centre, where, again, health services are on offer. The Governor went on to talk about the \$46 million to be spread over the next four years. I happen to know that the problems beginning to emerge at Flinders Medical Centre in respect of the waiting lists and non-urgent surgery, and the like, will be addressed by that allocation. It is my experience, from people walking through the front door of my office, that the concern that was beginning to surround Flinders Medical Centre has now abated. Indeed, most people appear to be content that those lists are shrinking, that people are receiving the services that they need and desire, and that the pain, suffering, agony and anxiety that was beginning to attend the waiting lists is now beginning to dissipate.

I also welcome in the Governor's speech his reference to the Year of Skill and Industry and the fact that in this State we have begun to establish an education system that is most responsive to the needs of the industries in which many of the products of that system will eventually work. If we in this State are to drag ourselves into a competitive position in the open international market, if we are to concentrate in the way that we want on generating exports, we must give our children the most relevant possible education. It seems to me that that education cannot be relevant in an industrial context unless there is the kind of interchange that has been encouraged by this Government under the skill and industry program.

In passing, I also want to welcome some of the findings of the Gilding report and to suggest that some of the amalgamations, some of the multi-campus arrangements, the parallel timetabling and shared curriculum arrangements that take place in the southern suburbs are working extremely well, despite the doom saying of many of its critics. The students of Mawson High School and Brighton High School do in fact share courses and curricula in a way that has worked quite well. Also, the multi-campus arrangement at the new Seacombe High School, which incorporates the former Dover and Seacombe High Schools, is working well. There are some outstanding difficulties concerning transport, but the schools are finding that, by timetabling and arranging their classes a little differently, and by making structural rearrangements, they can get over these problems. Indeed, the community satisfaction with the new Seacombe High School, as evidenced by recent letters to the local newspaper, is great indeed.

On the subject of educational restructuring and rearrangement, I welcome the Gilding report and its conclusions. I suggest that, if this State again is to produce products from its education system which can fit into the world of work and which can dovetail neatly into the sort of activities and industries that will be around in the twenty-first century, the sort of model proposed by Gilding, whereby senior schools are encouraged to form foci and students are encouraged to choose at year 11 and year 12 their future career and schooling, that needs to go ahead. It is clear that it will work and it is clear that it needs to be encouraged even further—and I welcome that.

The final matter that I want to refer to also springs from a constituent's inquiry. In this respect, I welcome the allocation of money to complete the exhibition hall, just down from the Parliament House building on North Terrace. It is clear to me that, if the Convention Centre is to work in the way for which it was designed, that exhibition hall must be there, and indeed many people who have used the Convention Centre have remarked on the need for the exhibi-

tion hall. It is pleasing to see that it is nearing completion, and I am sure that it will make the package complete.

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

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I am pleased to speak in this Address in Reply debate. I acknowledge the way in which the Governor and his wife, Lady Dunstan, carry out the duties of their office. They show compassion for those in the community who suffer in many different ways, whether those people be on Eyre Peninsula or other parts of the State; they understand the need for business to prosper and for State development to occur within the environmental constraints of our modern society (and every year we learn of more difficulties with the environment); and they are approachable and have respect for other people's points of view.

I will not go through the list of the former members who have died, but acknowledge their contribution to this place. Each of those former members contributed to the best of their ability, and for that I am sure the community respects their effort. It is something of which their families can be proud.

I now turn to local government boundaries. There is no doubt that the Government finds council boundary changes very difficult. It is known that the ALP would like to see a central Government, preferably without a Senate, for the country to be a republic, for State Governments not to exist, and for local governments to be the regional governments.

Those who work closely with the Labor Party in universities and other institutions are prepared for a long haul to achieve this goal. However, on this side of politics we are more concerned about the individual than trying to guide society towards a political philosophy by appointing people with a particular philosophy to different stratas of society. I have heard comment in and outside this place about the failed referendum by which the present Federal Government tried to have local government recognised in the Australian Constitution.

Mr Lewis: A form of local government.

Mr S.G. EVANS: It was a form of local government. It did not specify the present form of local government. The member for Murray-Mallee is right. One can interpret 'local' as one wishes. I opposed the referendum. I believe that there are three tiers of Government in Australia—Federal, State and local. Local government is recognised in the State's Constitution, and that was done by the Tonkin Liberal Government. State Governments are recognised in the Federal Constitution—our founding fathers made sure of that.

I have told my children that if ever there is a move to do away with State Parliaments they should sell everything they have in South Australia and shift to Western Australia or to the Eastern States, unless there is a massive change in the population base in our country, because if we shift from regional and State Governments to a central Government South Australia will have no voting power—it will be a useless appendage to the Eastern States.

The Leader of the Western Australian Labor Party in the early 1970s, Mr Tonkin, at the Constitution Convention, sought permission to speak straight after the Prime Minister, and a Conservative speaker stepped aside to let him do so. He said that if we had a central Government he would secede Western Australia because it took a week to get answers from Canberra to telephone calls. I do not want to see the Federal Government being responsible for recognising local government in the Constitution. Local government

is recognised by the Liberals and it is in the State's Constitution.

Today the member for Morphett asked the Premier a question about whether Brighton council would be treated in the same manner as Mitcham, and the Premier said that he would refer that question to the Minister of Local Government. The Minister of Local Government in another place refused to answer that question also. Today the Premier confirmed that the matter of Mitcham council has only been referred back to the Local Government Advisory Commission. He did not say that he wanted the boundary to be returned to what it was before it was proclaimed. He did not say anything about leaving Happy Valley as it was. It is obvious that his actions yesterday were nothing more than a play for time to try to appease the peasants—as the ALP sees them. Members of the Local Government Advisory Commission are appointed by the Government. It is not an elected body. How can anyone say then that it is not the Government's responsibility to find out what the people of a particular area want? Mayor Starr of Happy Valley in the local *Messenger* newspaper of 8 August said that he did not believe that a poll was necessarily the correct way to determine a boundary dispute. If local government is not a matter for the local people, whose responsibility is it?

A recent *News* editorial suggested that it would not help to create large or 'super' councils. The editorial believes in 'super' councils. Who wants 'super' councils? The answer to that is the ALP, because it wants to remove even further decision making from the people. What the hell has it got to do with anybody else if a small group of fewer than 200 people, like those in Carrieton, has its own local government? Those people pay their rates and they are satisfied with the services they receive. That is local government. What does it have to do with anybody else? Who says that they have to be as big as Salisbury? The answer to that is Big Brother or somebody else pushing some political philosophy. That is the truth of the matter.

Today the Premier said that the matter was being politicised. A committee was formed in the Hills and I initially attended those meetings which comprised 20 people. People from all sides of politics, except the National Party, joined that committee. I eventually stepped aside. They still come to me with thoughts and ideas, but it is my job as a local member to listen to them. I invite members to research the matter and establish how many times I have made public statements on this issue. I believe that the member for Mitcham has also made a similar number of statements on this topic—that is our responsibility. If we did not take that action as local members, that is our decision. However, do not let the Premier condemn any member of Parliament who helps a group of people in his or her electorate to achieve their goal. If some other group came to me for help, I would have assisted them also.

People living in the Coromandel Valley area and included in the Happy Valley council asked me whether it was appropriate for them to take up a petition, and I advised them that it was the right of any group of citizens to do so. As a consequence, they asked me to show them what to do. At my request, my secretary then showed them the procedure to be followed. Those residents are dissatisfied with the Happy Valley council, but in a newspaper report on 9 August Mayor Starr states that some of the Mitcham Hills people are not happy with the Mitcham council. It has always been the case that some people are not happy with their local council. Probably more than 50 per cent are not happy with this Government at the moment. Obviously, in any local government area, some people will be dissatisfied

with the local council but, in our system, in the end the majority point of view must prevail, with help going to the minority wherever it can.

It does Mayor Starr little credit to compare this situation with Mitcham Hills when he knows that residents from Flagstaff Hill, Coromandel Valley and other parts of his own council area are not happy with the administration and the standard of services which also create high rates. We should all consider the fact that there is a different style of local government as between Mitcham and Happy Valley. Over the past 21 years I have probably represented more areas with large and medium sized councils than has any other honourable member. Mitcham is a more frugal council; it does not provide as many fringe benefit communities. It does not pick up every State or Federal grant only to have the grant withdrawn and thus then have to carry the costs itself, but the opposite applies to Happy Valley. That is a decision of the Happy Valley council. That is the type of council which Happy Valley residents elect but, if they chose, they could elect councils with a different style. The style of the council creates the costs.

It has been suggested that new councils incur greater initial costs. However, that is only true in the case of the building. All roads and services in new subdivisions (of which there are many in Happy Valley) are provided by the subdivider rather than by local government. New councils such as Happy Valley receive larger grants. For example, the Mitcham council has 63 000 people in its area and this year it received a grant of \$954 750. Happy Valley, which comprises 32 366 people, received \$1 979 760—twice the amount received per head. If Happy Valley wants to provide drainage works, it applies for a \$60 000 grant. In the main, because it is a marginal seat, it receives better recognition from Governments. Because such practices occur, the procedure for drawing up electoral boundaries should be addressed.

The Hon. Terry Roberts received a hiding at the Blackwood meeting. He read somebody else's statement, and I am sure that he would not have made that statement himself. He read the statement, and he went well. In relation to the meeting at Mitcham, the Mayor said that the Minister had written a letter the day before and he wanted to refer to it. He thanked the Minister for the letter and said it should be referred back to the commission and the council could then look at the result. The Minister could have then retreated quietly; however, after a few introductory words, the Minister said, 'You don't want a situation like that in Queensland where the Fitzgerald report is about to be released. You have an independent tribunal.' That was the beginning of hooting, but then the Minister said, 'It doesn't matter if you lose the Mitcham Hills; you still have a council as big as Burnside, which is a viable council. You should be happy with that', and that brought the roof down. If ever there was an opportunity for a person to get off the hook, it was then. She then walked off the stage. I was absolutely amazed, as was a person sitting alongside me who was a very strong supporter of the Minister and of her political Party. However, he bowed his head and said, 'Stan, I don't believe it.' If any honourable member wants to know who that person is, I will be happy to divulge that information outside this Chamber.

It is amazing that some people believe that the community cannot think for itself. The reason why the people became upset at that meeting was that they were not given a vote. I had no real qualms about supporting the establishment of a boundaries advisory commission. All commissions are established by Governments which do not appoint anybody who is hostile to their philosophies, but it

is an advisory commission of the Government and it is not elected by the people. It does not represent the people and does not have the power to act on anything which has been forced upon the people.

The Government makes the decision. If the Government cannot do it, it is up to Parliament to look at it. About 18 months before the Minister proclaimed the advisory commission's decision, I told people at a public meeting in the Belair hall to forget about any new council in the Mitcham Hills. I said that will not occur. I told them to forget about the Happy Valley part of Coromandel Valley being added to the Mitcham Hills. However, I asked them to take note that Happy Valley would attempt to take over the Mitcham Hills and that the Government would back the proposal. That was 18 months before the report came down. People told me not to be so stupid. I was stupid in one area. I told them not to worry, that they would get time to make submissions when the report came down. I said that no Government would implement a change like that directly; it would give the community an opportunity to have its say. That is where I was stupid, and so was the community. Even the 4 000 who put their signatures to the submission for an inquiry into the setting up of a Hills council thought that the report would come back for consideration and that, if need be, a poll would be conducted before it was implemented.

It is worth noting that, for whatever purpose, the Happy Valley council had a briefing on the Tuesday before the Thursday when the Minister officially explained the position. The Minister got the report on Thursday, took it to Cabinet the following Monday, had the Governor sign it on Tuesday and had it gazetted on the Thursday and the mayors were told on the Thursday. That was scandalous. A council, 136 years old with a considerable heritage, was ignored. The community was in uproar.

It has now got to the point where the whole community of Adelaide knows about it and wants a change in the law. I would change the law even more than my Party is proposing. I believe that, before any proposition goes before the commission, those proposed to be affected should have a poll to decide whether they want any change. If local government means local government, we should ask local people to decide before Big Brother steps in to do it. This talk of economic viability or economy of scale is hogwash. A small operation does not need to buy equipment. It can hire equipment for the work that it needs to do. There is no doubt that we are being led down a false trail.

The Government, the commission and others have said that the rates for one area will go up and for another will go down if Flinders becomes a reality. No one in local government, on the commission, in Parliament or in a Government department knows whether the rate will go up or down in the new Flinders council. It is up to the new people who will be elected. They can predict, but they are not doing that. They are saying it will be a reality.

The report does not say that within a couple of years Clarendon and Kangarilla could be attached to another local government area. Consideration should be given to that point. Will that go back to the same group of people—the commission? Clarendon and Kangarilla could be added to Stirling and Cherry Gardens left in between. Willunga could become involved if it were considered that Happy Valley or Willunga were getting too urbanised, or could it be put back to Mount Barker? The people of Happy Valley succeeded in getting their own council only six years ago. They had the bitterness and fight with the Meadows people and council until Meadows was wiped out and the balance of Meadows was added to Mount Barker, and Kangarilla was

appended to Happy Valley with Clarendon, but still reasonably close. Yet the commission has the infernal cheek to say that the area should not be part of the council and it should be thrown out to Mount Barker or some other council further out.

No-one has said a word about what was to happen to those people, because that was bad news. If I try to ensure that those people know about it, the Premier will say it is playing politics. He thinks that I should say, 'Don't worry. This commission is an independent body.' The only thing in its favour is that the same personnel will not be on that tribunal, and the new Government, when it comes in, will at least give the people some say in what happens.

Happy Valley goes deeper than that. It fought for its own council. Its councillors wanted to give it a different name. There was a poll in the community to decide the name Happy Valley. They fought to get their own council, to know their own destiny, to control their own area, to know their rates and style of council, and they had to demand a poll to get the name Happy Valley—and it is now to be taken away from them. When Happy Valley council made its submission to the Local Government Advisory Commission it did so without asking the people whether there should be any change or not. The Happy Valley council proposed that the name be changed to Flinders. The people were told not to worry, that they would have a say when the report came down and a vote on the name. Those who sought to inquire were misled. In fact, they formed a committee to make representations to the council on that aspect. Former councillors have now confirmed that that was the case. If we are to have local councils, let us make sure that we have local councils. The community—not Big Brother, not we here—should be able to decide its own fate.

Henley and Grange is in the melting pot. I have referred that back because politically it is dangerous at the moment. Kensington and Norwood, Walkerville, Glenelg and Brighton are sensitive areas politically just before an election. The Government's attitude seems to be to try to sneak through the election quietly and then get rid of them. I assure the House that, if Happy Valley or Uley had been strong Labor or Liberal and Davenport had been the marginal seat, this report would not have seen the light of day.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: That's a load of rubbish.

Mr S.G. EVANS: The member for Stuart suggests that when 10 000 people attended two rallies his Government would not have been concerned if Davenport had been a marginal seat and the others had been safe seats. The people of the Hills or of the Plains have more intelligence than that. They want to see local government deal with local people. I hope that the people who are fighting for democracy will sing their hymn for as long as may be.

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

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I join with other members in acknowledging the manner in which his Excellency the Governor (Sir Donald Dunstan) delivered the opening speech for this session of Parliament and record my appreciation of the wonderful service his Excellency has given South Australia. He happens to be the Patron of the Holdfast Bay Yacht Club, which is in my electorate, and we had a delightful afternoon when he first came down there to open the season, following his appointment. Mind you, he was not very impressed when I told him he had to go to sea: he preferred to stay on the land; a bit like me.

His speech notes with regret the passing of James Alexander Heaslip, the member for Rocky River from 1949 to 1968, and Leslie Charles Nicholson, the member for Light

from April 1960 to March 1962. I had briefly met those gentlemen but had been aware of their presence and service to this Parliament and to their State. John Richard Ryan (better known as Paddy), of course, was Speaker during my term in Parliament, and he was well-known for the forthright manner in which he conducted the House. I respected him very much for that. He was a person who called a spade a spade, and was an excellent Speaker. Also, he was a member of the Parliamentary Bowls Club, and it was sad to hear that he had passed on.

Sir Lyell McEwin, of course, has been a household name to any of us born and bred in the mid-north of this State. I knew Sir Lyell well, and worked with his son Ken McEwin in the Bank of Adelaide, therefore I was able to follow Sir Lyell's progress within the Legislative Council and during his term as President of that Chamber. Sir Arthur Rymill was Chairman of the Board of the Bank of Adelaide for which I worked for 20 years and was well-known to me. Sir Arthur and I crossed swords on many occasions during my five years as President of the Bank Employees Union of South Australia, and you had to be pretty good to get his respect.

He felt that if I fought so hard for the staff he had the right to fight hard for the shareholders, and I felt that, when they introduced a superannuation scheme for the board, that gave us the opportunity to improve our superannuation scheme as well. Sir Arthur was one of those persons well respected within the business community. He served the State extremely well in public life as Mayor of the Adelaide City Council and as a member of many boards. He was an esteemed member of the legal profession. We want to thank the families of those deceased members of Parliament for lending us their fathers and relatives who served and gave their time to South Australia as we all have and will do very proudly. Paragraph 20 of his Excellency's speech states:

Home ownership remains a realistic goal for South Australians, due to a number of factors including the orderly release of land and the continuing comparatively low cost of housing compared with other States. My Government will continue to assist families experiencing difficulties as a result of high interest rates or other economic pressures through the Interest Rate Protection Plan and the Mortgage Relief Scheme. My Government is also currently negotiating details of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement with the Federal Government.

I appreciate reading comments like that, and hope that the Government is genuine in implementing that policy, because I have the impression that home ownership has not been encouraged fully in South Australia. We need a scheme to enable young people to purchase a home with confidence; to borrow money to finance that purchase with confidence, knowing that they will be able to meet those repayments. However, in the past 10 years that has not been possible. It is a great tragedy to see so many young people and young families denied the opportunity of home ownership and of borrowing money at a reasonable rate of interest.

I believe that the Commonwealth Government has let down the people of this country and let down the ambitions of so many people by not coming up with a plan to provide the finance necessary at a considerably reduced interest rate from ordinary market rates. I do not believe that there should be such a thing as market rate loans for housing. The Australian banking system is and was so structured that the banks had to place with the Reserve Bank of Australia a considerable amount of deposits, sometimes at rates of interest of less than 1 per cent—certainly very low interest rates.

That money was used by the Reserve Bank to support the Commonwealth Government of the day. It was used as a buffer and standby credit fund for the banking system if it ever got into trouble. But the Reserve Bank never touched

the other financial institutions—never touched the finance companies or any other organisation. That is where the problem has been created in this country. The finance companies have been able to live off the unfortunate affairs of some by charging extraordinarily high rates of interest and, of course, take up a tremendous amount of deposits through our financial structure.

If we could come up with funds from the Commonwealth Government out of a statutory reserve deposit fund at about three or five per cent, then we would be doing something to help the young people of Australia. It could be done: a statutory reserve deposit fund could provide funding for low income earners. I was surprised today to see on page 18 of the *Advertiser* the headline, 'Housing scheme to aid Aussie battlers'. It stated:

Canberra: Low-income earners should be given the chance to buy their own home with no-deposit, fixed-interest loans, according to a radical plan released yesterday.

The Housing Industry Association has called on the Government to give its blessing to its proposal which it said would remove the risk of repayment shock in the critical first few years of a mortgage.

The proposal is backed by the Government's Housing Loan Insurance Corporation and NSW financier FANMAC Ltd, but has been greeted with scepticism by some of the major banks.

The ANZ and National Australia banks warned prospective borrowers that now was probably the worst time to take out fixed-interest loans because market rates appeared to have peaked and were set to fall.

They said the expected strong Budget surplus would further ease pressure on interest rates.

Before we go further, this talk of interest rates falling and peaking is something no one can predict, and that is an unfair comment. The economy is being talked up, hyped up, and this is reflecting on the Australian Stock Exchange. The entrepreneurs and those in the fringe finance area are saying that the Australian Stock Exchange has under-performed the rest of the world, and that is correct, but that does not mean that the Australian Stock Exchange should see a huge rise in the value of shares listed. What the pundits are predicting is that the stock market could go up quite considerably.

There is no doubt in my mind that this is being talked up by entrepreneurs and being encouraged by the Commonwealth Government as a way of boosting its stocks in the run up to the next Federal election. That is where the warning comes, because if you keep talking up those sorts of things and building up people's expectations, and it does not happen, you will see a greater number of bankruptcies. It is about time someone did an exercise on the Australian Stock Exchange to find out just how many companies were floated during the magic years of the stock market boom before 1987, how many of those companies are now almost insolvent and how many have been delisted and are prime takeover targets.

Many of them, particularly in the mining resources area, will lose all the capital that they have raised from the public without digging up an ounce of dirt. That is absolutely scandalous, yet it happens decade after decade. Many companies float off and then go 'thump' after a few years. It means that there are some smart entrepreneurs who can make much money out of nothing; they do nothing and achieve nothing: they just fleece the public. The money lost could well go into low interest housing loans and such schemes if it was encouraged by the Commonwealth Government.

The Commonwealth Government should also be encouraging people to put their savings into low interest deposit schemes and tax benefit schemes so that the younger and future generations will have the opportunity of purchasing their own homes. Certainly, this scheme goes part of the

way towards the coalition's policy of encouraging home ownership for low income earners. The loans would be insured by the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation. We would try to obtain the lowest possible interest rates for people to buy their houses and, hopefully, interest rates will come down. The coalition will be able to do that by insisting on tight management to bring down interest rates.

I was interested to note that the Government recently held a seminar in the Barossa Valley. Obviously, the Premier took the lead from successful motivators in this country. He jugged up the troops and warned that the Liberals would get down to the dirty socks and dirty tricks department, yet all we have seen since the opening of Parliament has been dirty tricks from the Government side. I do not care what anyone says, but there comes a time when I get a little tired of having to put up with the smear, slander, innuendo and say what you like from the Government Minister.

The Minister of Housing and Construction is notorious. The Minister is not clever—he is more annoying than anything else. As long as I can remember, since he has been the Minister he has abused, slandered and smeared the member for Light. Whenever the member for Light asks a question or made a statement about housing this occurred. I followed the member for Light and I received the same sort of treatment. After a while one gets a little tired of it. One can take so much. I am a typical average Australian and I know what I would do with the Minister—I would give him a bit of Trades Hall treatment if he kept doing it.

The Hon. G.F. Kenneally interjecting:

Mr BECKER: One could do what they do at Trades Hall—whip them around the back and give them a good old thick ear. The Minister has totally misrepresented and misunderstood the situation about the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. He has a problem with the Housing Trust, which has served the people of South Australia extremely well by providing about 66 000 or 67 000 units of accommodation to people in need. Many people in need in this State cannot get trust accommodation—45 000 families.

We have to do all that we can as a Parliament to help the trust meet that need. I refer to statistics from the trust's document 'Housing for the Community: A Paper to Promote Community Discussion, January 1988'. At page 4, the trust states:

In 1977-78 the number of households applying for public housing totalled 9 376. Of these 52 per cent had jobs. By 1986-87 the number applying had grown to 17 371; with only 34.7 per cent having jobs. This change has impacted directly on the number of tenants paying a reduced rent due to their inability to afford full rents. Consequently, over the past 10 years the proportion of tenants on rent reductions has grown from 37 per cent to 64 per cent.

I believe that it is up to 66 per cent today. The paper continues:

In dollar terms this has meant the resultant loss of rent has grown from \$3.2 million in 1977-78 to \$47.4 million in 1986-87, and an estimated \$68.8 million in 1987-88.

The Minister said the other day that it has been \$91 million for the past financial year, and it is expected that rent subsidies for the trust will exceed \$100 million in 1989-90. That is a lot of money that the trust must provide to meet and assist certain classes of trust tenants. The paper continues:

The trust and the State Government have long argued that this loss of rent is just another form of income support for public tenants; and that since income support programs are a Commonwealth responsibility the cost should therefore be accepted by them.

I agree totally. I agree with the trust that we should be doing all that we can to have the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement changed so that the Commonwealth Government will meet its obligations in providing assistance to the tenants in need. If the trust could get that \$100 million a year, members can imagine how many houses we could build. We could rip into that waiting list and that would be doing something extremely worthwhile for the people of South Australia.

More importantly, for every \$1 million spent we create 50 jobs. We would be creating jobs. Members will be aware of how the housing and construction industry suffers, and it appears as if it will suffer from the tremendous downturn resulting from trends in the past few years. I refer to the fewer housing starts not only by the trust but also by the private market. There needs to be some assured system to give the trust the flow of income that it needs.

In 1985 the trust froze rents for the election year period and in 1986 the Government set out a rent formula to gain a 20 per cent net increase plus increases in line with the cost of living for the next two years. The trust ended up with something like a 45 per cent or 50 per cent increase in rents for most trust tenants. Other tenants were faced with huge increases because the trust changed the income assessing base.

War veterans found that their disability allowances were included as income to determine rent and their rents increased by \$9 or \$10 a week. People receiving supplementary family assistance were told that that income was included in rent determination and their rents increased by \$4 or \$5 a week. We have seen the trust get into its tenants and obtain as much rent as it could from them.

I believe that it was unfair that people were led to have a false sense of security in that 1985 election period. They were assured that all was well, that they had nothing to fear in respect of trust rents and then 'whack'. They copped an almost 50 per cent increase over and above other increases. The Minister totally ignored the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement of 1984, yet he was part of the negotiations. His Government negotiated and agreed to it, and the second schedule provides:

Depreciation:

- (i) depreciation rate is to reflect a life of between 40-75 years of the capital improvements on the land;
- (ii) the value of capital improvement will be based on the estimated current capital improved value;
- (iii) the minimum annual depreciation rate will be not less than the rate resulting from a term of 75 years.

These depreciation allowances must be taken into consideration when working out the rent formula for the trust. The trust's General Manager in a discussion paper to his organisation stated:

If the current cost method was applied the trust's accounting system, depreciation charged to the Income and Expenditure Account as at 30 June 1987 would be increased from \$9.044 million to \$30.233 million. The impact of this would be:

1. The net deficit for the year would increase from \$6.669 million to \$27.858 million.
2. To recover this 'cost' it would be necessary to increase rents by \$9.10 per week per dwelling.

That is the view of the General Manager expressed to his own organisation. That \$9.10 comes out at about \$11.50 today. When the Opposition warns the people of South Australia to be careful when accepting statements by the Government that there will be only one rent increase or that that will be no more than a modest rent increase, there is no way that one can believe it, unless the Minister can renegotiate that agreement and receive the subsidies from the Commonwealth Government to which I have referred amounting to about \$100 million a year. Unfortunately,

trust tenants will see their rents increased by the present Bannon Government.

It must increase the rents; it is forced to do it, under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. On the other hand, if an Olsen Liberal Government was elected one can imagine the tremendous amount of pressure that would be placed on the State Government by a hostile Federal Government or the Labor States in forcing South Australia to increase its rents. That is what is happening now. The other States of Australia are jealous of the role of the South Australian Housing Trust. Even my own colleagues in the Liberal Party in New South Wales and Victoria were critical of what we were doing. I said that we were meeting the needs of the people and that we would not be moved, that we would not change our attitude towards providing the housing that is needed by our people. So, we do have difficulties with the Commonwealth of Australia in not truly representing the views and the opinions of all the people.

There are other matters that I want to raise in this debate. It is marvellous how at election time an issue is always brought up within my electorate—an area that I have very jealously guarded and worked for. I refer to the tragedy that has happened in relation to Marineland. The Minister of Tourism tells us that we need to encourage tourism in South Australia, that we need to build and establish new tourist facilities. I could not agree more, but in relation to a wonderful tourist facility, which has served the State for some 25 years, the Government bungled the greatest ever opportunity to have Marineland redeveloped. There is no doubt in my mind that there is a conspiracy between the State Development Division and the West Beach Trust in the attempt to extract the West Beach Trust from a situation that was not properly handled in the first place.

The West Beach Trust set out to encourage the developer. That developer came to South Australia in good faith and was prepared to develop a first-class marine facility, with the animals, and was going to improve it and provide further facilities for the benefit of tourists in that general area at West Beach. However, the West Beach Trust did not support the developer. The State Development Division pulled the plug. Instead of getting behind the company and allowing it to charge up to the guarantee that was sought and encouraged by the State Development Division, it decided to liquidate that company, bankrupt it, and grab the 40 year lease and turn it into a 50 year lease for another developer. It cost the State something like \$6 million, and it will cost the State a lot more than that before it is finished. That was a tragedy arising from the incompetent bungling of this matter by the State Development Division, and those who handled this project must take the full brunt of that responsibility.

There was also the tragedy of the Marineland operation when it was being run by the West Beach Trust. For the financial year ended 30 June 1983 the trading loss at Marineland was some \$70 000, and after administration charges by the trust the loss grew to \$123 000; in other words, \$53 000 was charged for administration. The net result of the West Beach Trust for that year was \$56 932 profit—after making some large profits well into a quarter of a million dollars in years before. The attendance at Marineland was 101 706 patrons. In 1984, the trading loss at Marineland was \$29 000. After administration charges of \$63 000 by the West Beach Trust that loss was \$92 000. The West Beach Trust had a profit of \$114 645, and the attendance at Marineland that year was 111 153 persons.

In 1985, the trading loss of Marineland was \$41 000. After administration charges by the trust, the loss was \$118 000. The trust charged \$77 000 to manage that operation. The

West Beach Trust result for that year was a profit of \$14 196, and the attendance at Marineland was 106 443 patrons. In 1986 the trading loss at Marineland had blown out to a staggering \$109 000. After administration charges by the West Beach Trust the loss had grown to \$184 000. That administration fee was \$75 000. The West Beach Trust made a profit of \$41 000, and the attendance at Marineland slipped to 91 273 people. In 1987, after only a few months trading, the loss was \$113 000. The result for the West Beach Trust that financial year was a \$3 000 profit, and the attendance was 41 457 people.

In the years that the West Beach Trust operated Marineland there was an overall loss of some \$632 000. The West Beach Trust should have taken the step much earlier to bring in a private person to look after that organisation. It is interesting to note that since 1974 the West Beach Trust had received \$2.3 million in Government grants. It spent \$200 500 acquiring Marineland in 1974, and it spent about \$500 000 on capital improvements to Marineland, including in excess of \$94 000 for the new water filtration system—the sea water inlet system—which, incidentally, still does not work properly. It also spent \$113 000 for an outdoor dolphin pool—which is not used. Some 1 612 000 people visited Marineland in that time. Also, a multi-screen circle cinema was built on the Marineland site at a cost of \$179 000. It was opened in May 1980 and only ever showed one film in the round. So, we find that it is a very sad story in relation to Marineland.

From the evidence and documents that I have received concerning Marineland during the period when the largest losses were incurred, we can see how the West Beach Trust obviously starved that organisation of money and how it was run down. I refer to evidence given to the Industries Development Committee, at which time photographs were shown displaying the problems that were being encountered at Marineland. In one case a witness said:

These photographs show a female sea lion who was mauled late last year and was not being attended to when we discovered her. We found a massive staph infection. All of the animals were suffering nutritional deficiencies and have been fed incorrect fish species for many years. The sea lions were suffering from chronic hair loss. Their skin was an unnatural colour . . . We found enormous counts of bacterial chloroforms and a virus which was a killer of marine animals in ocean parks, particularly in Hong Kong.

There are no facilities for keeping young animals that are born at Marineland. This photograph shows a pup that died after 18 hours. Nobody knew that the mother was pregnant . . . All of the penguins were suffering from bumble foot disease because of the wrong strata in the enclosure. One penguin was blind and another was suffering from a brain tumour. The penguin had a fractured skull, as well, and the brain tumour is still there. None of the birds were being attended to by a veterinarian. All the birds have now been sent to the vet.

Another witness further stated:

One dolphin in particular was very ill. It would not eat and was very thin. The vet came in over two nights. Eventually he had to put an arm into the dolphin's stomach and remove a large portion of a plastic ball which the dolphin had swallowed several months before. It was known that the dolphin had swallowed the plastic but nothing had been done about it.

Another witness said:

When the company took over, almost all of the sea lions were about 30 per cent below the body weight of what they should have been for their age and length.

So, we find that unfortunately the saga at Marineland continues. One of the witnesses further stated:

To date we have spent over \$10 500 in veterinary expenses to bring these animals back to a state of health. It is comfortable to us to believe that they have a reasonable chance of survival.

But after taking over West Beach Marineland, fancy the new owners having to spend that amount of money to bring those animals up to reasonable health, and we find today

that, instead of the West Beach Trust and the State Development Division getting behind and supporting these people, particularly the Abel family, which is widely recognised for its services and understanding of humane treatment for these animals, they are accusing these people of not carrying out the job. The staff at Marineland have worked under atrocious conditions in the past 18 months since the area has been closed. I want to pay a tribute to their diligence and to the way that they have restored those animals to their health.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Hamilton): Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Stuart.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Stuart): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and in doing so express my appreciation for the many kind remarks that were made about me and my colleagues who will be retiring from Parliament at the next election. I also thank those people who have privately expressed their best wishes, and I thank those people who would have expressed their best wishes if they had thought of it and who did not have time during the debate to do so. But, we know that their thoughts go with us.

As one of the last speakers in this debate I thought that I would have the opportunity to rebut some of the arguments that were put forward by the Opposition and that I would be able to debate some of the policy directions that it injected into this debate. But, what has happened? The Opposition has achieved the impossible—or what many people would deem to be the impossible. It is actually worse this year than it was last year. In fact, I think that this year's performance is the worst I have seen from an Opposition since I came into this Parliament in 1970.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: I take back all those nice things I said about you.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I was a bit concerned about that, but it is on the record and it was the truth, just as what I am saying now is the truth. The subject for debate is the Governor's speech—the Government's legislative program for this session. Prior to Question Time on Tuesday the Premier made a major statement about the finances of the State, and that also should have been the subject of this debate. The Government's management philosophy was also spelt out in the Governor's speech. All these are major issues for this State and Parliament and one would have thought that the Opposition could have at least addressed some of them. But, here we are, at the end of the debate, and we have heard nothing from the Opposition about them.

The most generous commentary that anyone could make about the contribution of the Opposition is that, collectively, it was pathetic, uninspired, disinterested and negative, from an Opposition with no ideas, no talent and no hope. These are the people who like to see themselves as the alternative Government of South Australia.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: You can do better.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: It gets better. I agree that being in Opposition is not the easiest of tasks, particularly for people who have talent, ideas, energy and ambition. It can be frustrating when one does not have the opportunity to put into effect one's policies. Opposition can also be frustrating for people who have no talent, no ideas and no energy but who have big ambitions to sustain them—and there are quite a few of them on the other side.

However, Opposition can be a very comfortable place for those who are unimaginative, who are lacking in ideas, whose ambitions have been dulled by being in Opposition

too long and who, in their hearts, know that they will be there for a long time yet. And that is the Opposition that we have here in South Australia. Even the considerable skills of some of the leading political journalists in South Australia are unable to make Opposition members appear to be anything but what they are—dull, uninspiring, negative and tired. I acknowledge that I am not likely to be fulsome in my praise of the Opposition, even in the unlikely event that it might deserve some praise. But, even allowing for that, the evidence is overwhelming that what I am saying is the truth.

Mr Groom: Who is the Opposition's next Leader?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I intend to make some comments about that later. This is the twentieth Address in Reply debate that I have listened to or participated in. In the early 1970s we came, as a Government, to expect a coherent, concerted critique of the Government's program. Have we heard that in 1989? Of course, we have not. Have we been told what the Opposition would do for South Australia if it were in Government as against what it would do to South Australia if it were in Government? Of course, we have not heard that either. What we have heard is a repeat of last year's negative carping and altogether predictable set pieces that for members opposite pass for debate.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: You are not reading this, are you?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: No, but I have one or two notes to ensure that I get it right. I'm a little bit out of practice, as the honourable member would appreciate, but I will soon get back into the swing of things. I assure the honourable member that I am delighted with my new status in this place, and I will fit into it very smoothly, even if my Whip is still having trouble with my being a recalcitrant ex-Minister. Cobweb Corner is a comfortable place to be.

In South Australia the Liberal Party talks our State down. It is the prophet of doom. It does our State harm. The Opposition must know that prospective investors in South Australia are interested in the Opposition's view—the alternative Government—of the State, but still it persists on this road. One of the things that interested me in the past day or two was a statement by the Leader that, if he were in government and Premier of this State, he would take the Opposition Leader overseas with him to promote it. I wonder what we can make of that. First, it could be a bid by the now Leader of the Opposition for a cheap overseas trip, where he can bask in the reflected glory of the Premier.

In fact, who would want to take the present Leader of the Opposition overseas? Over the years he has made an art form of bagging South Australia. He does it within South Australia and interstate. If he were taken overseas, he would do it there. There is no value in taking this particular Leader of the Opposition anywhere; nor would I take any of his colleagues. These are the people who, for the past 3½ days, have been lecturing the Government about financial responsibility. Who are they and what are their records? Many members on the front bench opposite have been here since 1970, and the Opposition still contains seven members of the Tonkin ministry.

How did the electorate judge the Opposition when it had an opportunity to display its wares to South Australians? In 1979, to its surprise as well as ours, a landslide victory swept the Liberal Party into Government. It had a massive endorsement of its policies, one that should have given it the opportunity to govern in South Australia for at least six years. But, it blew it. The South Australian electors are no fools. They recognised that they had made a mistake and, at the first opportunity given to them, they rectified it: they got rid of the Liberal Party in government. I wonder how

it feels to be here for 20 years, to be given one opportunity to govern and then to be immediately rejected.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: In fairness to the member for Hanson and the member for Eyre, they were never given the opportunity they should have been given to participate in government at that time. That is one regret I have about those two gentlemen: after the years they have given to this Parliament, they will never be given an opportunity to be on the Treasury benches because they cannot survive long enough. Of course, they were treated shoddily and, when one looks at some of the people who were in that ministry when these two members should have been part of it, one can judge just how shoddily they were treated.

The electorate knows that these people who were rejected in 1982 and again in 1985 are the same people who are leading the Liberal Party in 1989; they are 1970s people with 1970s solutions to the issues of the 1990s. They are yesterday's people, as someone has already said, with yesterday's ideas. No-one who has been in this place during the past couple of days and has seen Opposition members in action could contemplate their ever sitting on the Treasury benches.

This brings me to the contribution of the Leader of the Opposition. What an extraordinary performance! It is clearly the worst he has given in this place, and I can tell members that that is no mean feat. We had to walk through the years of 1980 and 1981. Obviously, some members opposite feel some nostalgia about those heady days of the Liberal Party. The Leader freely quoted the then Leader of the Opposition (now the Premier) as if to convince himself, and more particularly to convince his colleagues, that he is on track for an electoral victory. I can tell everybody here, if they need to be told, that he is no John Bannon and, more particularly, John Bannon is no David Tonkin, so there is no solace or encouragement for the Opposition in referring back to the early 1980s. A decade has passed.

What we want in South Australia is a political Party that can set the agenda for the 1990s and into the next century. Where are the people on the Opposition benches who can do that? Members of the Opposition are quite obviously seen by their electorate as being tired and—

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Hopeless!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: —and hopeless, as my colleague said.

An honourable member: Worn out!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Worn out, I am encouraged to say, but certainly irrelevant. I believe that the real reason behind the Leader of the Opposition's performance on either Tuesday or Wednesday was the latest Morgan Gallup poll.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: That's how memorable it was; we don't know when it was.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Yes. Today, the Speaker kept threatening to name the Leader of the Opposition. It would have been useful if he did, because most people around here do not know who the Leader is. It would certainly help members of Parliament, if not the electorate, to get a fix on him. This contribution, which clearly was his worst, was designed to instil some confidence into his back bench; it was grandstanding. He was cheer chasing and he used the old political phrases, clichés and slogans, but his efforts to lift the spirits of his colleagues were as feeble as they were unsuccessful. Opposition members know as well as we do that their Leader is a loser and it is becoming increasingly apparent that he is no better received in the electorate than his Federal colleague, Andrew Peacock.

I believe that we are witnessing a new dictum for interpreting political polls and the Liberal Party seems to say

that the number of seats a political Party will win is in direct proportion to the erosion of support for a Leader and his Party. That is the only way that I can explain the false confidence of the Opposition. Forget about the poll that was cobbled up by the Liberal Party to try to deflect the electorate's attention from the Morgan poll. I should point out that the Leader and the Liberal Party have consistently referred to the Morgan poll as the authoritative poll, as the barometer of political feeling in the State, so perhaps I should point out what that poll had to say.

The *Bulletin* poll clearly shows that Andrew Peacock is on the nose, with his popularity plummeting through the floor, and as a result of that he claims that he will win 16 seats, so the more poorly he performs, the more seats he claims he will win. In South Australia we have the same phenomenon. The *Bulletin* refers to the Morgan Gallup poll and states:

Had an election been held in July, Bannon would have won. Over June and July support for Labor rose 2 per cent to 45 per cent, while Liberal-National Party support fell 1 per cent to 41 per cent. His [Premier Bannon] own personal approval climbed 3 per cent to 72 per cent . . .

This must really be galling to members opposite who have spent seven or eight years denigrating and trying to impact upon the Premier's high standing in South Australia, both as a Leader and as Premier, and the integrity for which he is rightly honoured. His personal approval rating has climbed to 72 per cent. The *Bulletin* article continues:

. . . with his disapproval rate down 3 per cent, to a mere 19 per cent . . .

He is still the most popular political Leader in this State.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: In Australia.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: In Australia, and I believe that he has consistently been the most popular political Leader that this country has seen. As the *Bulletin* states:

It confirms his long held standing as one of the most popular leaders in the country.

The article could have said 'forever', but it continues:

On the other hand, Olsen's approval fell 6 per cent to only 41 per cent while his disapproval climbed 7 per cent to 41 per cent. This is his lowest approval rating since 1986.

Now we get to the very interesting bits. The article continues:

Fewer people see him doing a better job than Bannon. In the head-to-head clash for the preferred Premier, Bannon is favoured by a huge 62 per cent of South Australians, while Olsen is only favoured by 20 per cent.

I ask members opposite to contemplate this:

Of Liberal-National Party voters, only 42 per cent said Olsen would make a better Premier, while 39 per cent favoured Bannon.

What can we make of this poll that was cobbled up by the Liberal Party, apart from the fact that it was trying to deflect attention from the real poll? After seeing some of the figures that have been bandied around, it seems that the poll must have been taken at some of the Liberal Party's sub-branch meetings around South Australia and, even then, he did not do all that well. Members opposite realise this. I can see them shaking and nodding their heads in approval. They know that what I am saying is correct. Yesterday, we saw the member for Victoria, the member for Coles and even the member for Bragg sitting back there comfortably, contemplating what they will do before or after the election, because they are getting the numbers together now.

That might seem to be a little disloyal to their Leader, but I can tell them that in 1982, prior to the State election and when he was still a member of the Tonkin Cabinet, the Leader of the Opposition was doing exactly the same thing; he was getting the numbers together prior to the election so that he could make a challenge for the leadership. Therefore,

members opposite should feel quite comfortable about doing the same thing.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: That is something to speculate about.

Mr Groom: What about Victoria?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I have certainly read about the high profile that at least one political journalist is prepared to give the member for Victoria. That journalist has a higher opinion of that gentleman's capabilities than have some of the member for Victoria's colleagues. We have not seen anything in this House to suggest that he is a likely Leader. Mind you, if he was, I would not mind one bit. I would say that that would be a plus for us.

Mr Groom: What about Coles?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The member for Coles has always been a chance, particularly in the eyes of those people who hanker after Thatcherism and who would like to have implemented the rather interesting concepts about finance and Treasury matters that she tried to display on Monday. I would suggest that, if the Leader of the Opposition has any skill at all, it is to destroy the credibility of those people within his own Party whom he perceives to be a threat to him. He did it to Dean Brown and to Michael Wilson who are no longer here. He must have thought that the member for Bragg was a threat, so he gave him the shadow portfolio of transport.

Since that time, the member for Bragg has disappeared from sight. He gave the member for Coles the shadow portfolio on Treasury matters. It is obvious that she is out of her depth and that she should never have been given that portfolio. She could only have been given that position so that her limitations could be displayed for all to see. She is certainly much better at lying down in front of bulldozers than she is at lying down in front of Treasury figures. I believe that the Leader of the Opposition has disposed of any possible threat from her.

One can also mention the member for Mitcham, and that always gets a laugh. I believe that the member for Hanson made his abortive push for leadership too early—in 1974 against David Tonkin.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Eastick in 1975.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The member for Light.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: He did not run, but he made his claim.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: He made his claim to leadership. He was entitled to do that and, at the time, I think he had every reason to expect that there would be some support for him.

An honourable member: What happened to the LM?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Like all fringe Parties, as with Independents, sooner or later they disappear into the political wilderness. The speech by the Leader of the Opposition warrants some analysis. It interested us, but we were more interested in the faces of those sitting alongside and behind him when he was speaking. It was clear from their faces what they thought of their chances at the next election. They could see that their Leader was a loser, and we agree. They know that it is too close to an election to get rid of him. They know that they cannot expose him to the electorate because he will be like Peacock. The more he is exposed to the electorate, the lower his rating will be. They are in a cleft stick. They will have to expose him sooner or later and they know that immediately they do down will go their chances.

It was interesting to hear members opposite lecture us about what happens when doorknocking. We have been doing our own. It is true that many people are unhappy

with Labor Governments, State and Federal. Many people are being hurt. Interest rates are a problem in many areas and generally people perceive that there has been a drop in their basic living standards in recent years, although that has been balanced somewhat by the tax rebates given by the Federal Government in July. The State Government's tax rebates announced by the Premier will also assist. But people are hurt, they have doubts about the Labor Party and they express those doubts to us when we knock on their doors.

Generally I am always able to leave people in good spirits about the Labor Party, because I point to the alternative. There is no doubt that when they contemplate the alternative they say, 'We are not altogether happy with the way you are going, but the alternative is too frightening to contemplate.' When members opposite go out doorknocking and somebody criticises the Government, as they will, let them suggest that they can do better and listen to the response. They will then know what people are saying. A number of people will declare themselves as being undecided. However, talk to them for a moment or two and one will clearly see on what side of the political spectrum they will come down when forced to make their decision at the polling booth.

I turn now to the Premier's statement about the finances of this State. The cheap shot by the Opposition of it being too little too late was quite predictable. We know that is all that it can say about a very good statement. However, I was surprised by the negative and grudging acknowledgment of the management of the State's finances that editorial writers gave to the Premier. They tried to find more to criticise than to acknowledge. For some time they have been asking for the return of State revenue to the pockets of constituents. Yet, when it happens, they are not prepared to acknowledge the benefit. The Premier could have gone cheer and vote chasing and spent the money in many areas that might bring short-term benefit to the Labor Party. But he did not; he looked at where it would do the most good.

As Rex Jory said, the State debt is not a glamorous area and it does not seem to affect too many people in the community. The Premier could have avoided reducing that debt in the run-up to an election, but he does not bolt away from the hard option. That area has to be reduced. Reducing the State debt from 23 to 16 per cent of the gross State product is an achievement for which generations to come will be thankful. No Government has the right to build up a debt and leave it to our children or our children's children to pay. That seems to be what editorial writers and the Liberal Party are asking us to do.

In addition, the Premier has been able to pay off the accumulated deficit built up by the Liberal Party when in Government. Those people who lecture us about financial responsibility actually left our revenue base in a mess and a large deficit for the Labor Government to address. Then and now they have had no policies to manage the State's finances effectively. The electorate is not stupid; it understands. People look at those who present themselves as the alternative Government and see '70s people with '70s ideas. They do not see any new invigorating ideas or members. There is no-one in the Liberal Party to whom they can relate. That is a gross disservice to the people of South Australia. We know, and members opposite know, that what I am saying is absolutely correct.

The Address in Reply debate is an opportunity for an energetic, competent and skilled Opposition to challenge the Government on a whole range of matters relating to its legislative program, its capital works program and its management of the State's finances, but there has been none of

that. We have heard the excuse that this is an opportunity for a wide-ranging debate so that they can talk about everything but the core issue that this Parliament would expect them to address. No matter how many times Opposition members were challenged to tell the House and the people of South Australia what their policies were or to explain how they would address the problems that they suggest the Government had, not one of them was prepared to take the hard option and say what the Liberal Party would or could do to improve the State of South Australia. The debate has clearly shown that only one Party in South Australia is equipped to govern the State or to develop the base to take this State and economy into the 1990s and the next century, and that Party is in Government and will stay there.

I will be delighted to assist Colleen Hutchison, who will more than adequately take my position as the member for Stuart in this place, to ensure that the Bannon Government is returned to the Treasury benches. I do not know that I will really have to work too hard to do that because, sooner or later, the Liberal Party and its members have to come out of their bunkers, expose themselves to the electorate at large and tell the people of South Australia what they have in store for them. When that happens, with the already poor rating of both the Leader and his Party, they will slump even further, and there is very little that can be done about it. These little phoney polls that they use every now and then to throw out to an obliging press are no alternative to the real thing, and the real thing sits here.

Mr Groom: 1985 revisited.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Yes, and that really claws at the guts of members opposite. They do not like it but they will have to live with it. I support the motion.

Mr LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Water Resources): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): There is a custom in the administration of parliamentary papers that, when a Government has a policy that it wants to produce as a discussion paper, it presents what we call a green paper. Members have all heard of green papers and white papers. This evening I want to refer to the green paper put out by the former Minister of Health (Hon. John Cornwall) in October 1987. The green paper was issued in relation to the aged with particular regard to accommodation and discrimination against the aged. Following its release, the Government would consider a white paper, and the white paper is the Government's response to the green paper.

I will take members back to October 1987 when the seniors of this community were given the opportunity to contribute, and contribute they did. The white paper is still forthcoming. I pose the question: why is it that for two years we have had to wait for the Bannon Government to make up its mind on policy issues that were canvassed in that green paper? There is now the added frustration of the Premier's Aged Task Force which he has brought into being, headed up by the member for Hayward. It is nothing more than a cheap political gimmick.

Members interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: Members can protest as much as they like, and I know the member for Hayward cannot wait to get into her place to take part in this debate, but I say again

that aged task force is nothing more than a cheap political gimmick, and I will explain why. All the evidence that was needed in that green paper produced by the Hon. John Cornwall is there, and the only reason we do not have that white paper is the task force itself. This Government is very good at producing task forces. The Minister on the front bench is particularly good at producing task forces, and I will refer to that shortly. The membership of the task force alone gives it away. It is made up of every member of the Government backbench who is in a marginal seat.

Members interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: The Hon. Carolyn Pickles is in it to give representation from the other place. Members opposite can protest all they like, but it is made up of marginal seat members, and it is going around to all marginal seats listening and taking evidence. However, we have seen nothing. Members opposite can protest as much as they like, but we have seen nothing concrete come out of that task force. Even the Chairman of the Seniors Action Committee, a well respected gentleman in that group, Mr Murray Haines, was reported in the *Advertiser* on 18 January 1989 as having said that the Premier's task force was a gimmick. That sums it up in one word. No-one can tell me that the way this task force has operated—

Members interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: Methinks they doth protest too much over there. The task force is going around to all the key areas where the heat is on the Government with respect to the aged and is taking evidence. But where is the evidence? What have they done? What has resulted, other than the heat being taken off the Government in marginal seats? I submit that nothing has come out of it. We have not seen anything. What input has the Government used from it? What input has the committee made to the Prime Minister prior to the Federal budget which is about to come down? I suggest that there has been no input.

As was identified in the *Advertiser*, it is nothing more than a cheap political gimmick, going around to all the marginal areas making sure that members get plenty of mileage. We have also noticed that whenever the members of the task force appear at a public meeting, a Minister is present. The Minister always welcomes, for example, the chairperson of the task force, and we then go through this *ad nauseam* diatribe of what a wonderful job the chairperson is doing in the task force and how she is so interested. Once again, it is really a great big PR job and nothing more than a PR job to take the heat off the Government in the marginal seats.

Until such time as I can see some evidence to prove that this task force is doing its job, it will stand, as the newspaper said, as a cheap gimmick. The Liberal Party took an entirely different point of view. Some time ago, many months before the Labor Party refused to bring down the white paper and let us know its opinions on the green paper, the Liberal Party produced its policy on the aged. We did not do it with a lot of fanfare and trumpets and publicity stunts. We went around quietly to aged groups and interviewed them, and came up with a concise statement, a very popular and well researched document called 'The Ageing: The Liberal Party's Position Paper' in which we have made specific commitments.

Before I rose I started to count the number of recommendations and counted 48 and was then only about two-thirds of the way through the book. We have made a genuine attempt to produce a specific list of issues based on positive statements, research and a positive commitment. It is a commitment we intend to make and one which we believe we can make. We have costed it and know that

it will be very popular amongst the seniors in the community. There is value in going round and talking to aged groups.

Ms Gayler interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: Are you saying there are no recommendations? You have not even read them: they are absolute commitments. I found 48 commitments before I rose, and there are many more in there. The honourable member only displays her ignorance if she cannot go through that book and find where we have made firm commitments about what we will do for the aged. I can understand the task force chairman getting all upset, because she knows that the task force was just a cheap political stunt to get them around the marginal seats and take the heat off the Government. You all follow a pattern over there.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Hamilton): Order! I ask the honourable member to address the Chair and to ignore the interjections on my right.

Mr OSWALD: It is very hard to ignore the interjections. Members opposite are obviously agitated, and they traditionally become agitated when I get close to the point. I am so close to the point today that the reaction is absolutely as one would expect. The Liberal Party has put this position paper on the aged, and I noted that, when we floated the notion of a Minister for the Aged in order for the aged to identify themselves with a Minister and have access to their own Minister, it did not take very long after this document to hit the deck before the Hon. Don Hopgood suddenly had added to his title 'Minister for the Aged'. I have also noted in many of these policy areas as time has gone on that the Government is 'me too-ing' all the way along the line.

Members opposite may laugh, but how many press conferences do you think have been conducted within the past few weeks when Ministers have not had their press secretaries sitting in the crowd with tape recorders running and have then called a press conference later in the day to announce the same. The Minister at the bench is very good at saying 'We were thinking about that.' I think it happened in relation to those trees in the north that were to be planted. The Minister that afternoon was saying 'We were going to do that; we have a committee looking at it.' It was 'me too' all the way through the document which I cannot show the House, although I would like to. It is in the library. I commend it to members who have not read it. I am sure that the member for Hayward has read it, because from it she will receive enough information to be able to go round the electorate and sound intelligent on this whole subject of the aged.

Ms GAYLER (Newland): I would like to announce to Parliament today the good news that the Minister of Transport and I announced earlier today at Tea Tree Gully regarding the celebration ceremonies to mark the completion of the O-Bahn Busway on 20 August. On 20 August, Adelaide commuters will be treated to a day of free travel on STA buses, trains and trams to celebrate the completion of the North East Busway to Tea Tree Plaza. It is hoped that thousands of families with their young children will come out and enjoy the O-Bahn and Sunday shopping—Westfield Tea Tree Plaza will be open on that day of gala festivities—and join in, if they wish, in the bike ride along the track, the fun run, or simply walk along the linear park and take part in the face painting, buskers and so on, arranged for that day.

On that day, the O-Bahn service, which presently runs for six kilometres from the city to Paradise, will be extended a further six kilometres to Tea Tree Gully, making it the longest guided busway in the world. This will not only be

an extremely pleasant and scenic trip for north-east commuters, it will halve their former travelling time, if one goes back to pre-O-Bahn days. The O-Bahn ride from the city to Tea Tree Plaza will take 23 minutes, compared with the 33 minutes which it currently takes and the 46 minutes which it took prior to the opening of stage 1. This means that north-east commuters in my electorate and in the electorate of Florey who take the O-Bahn from the Plaza to Grenfell Street will have a travel time saving of 10 minutes. This is a world class achievement in a public transport system of which all South Australians, including the Opposition, whom no one disputes generated the idea in the first instance, can be proud.

I am extremely proud that the Bannon Government proceeded with the O-Bahn construction, and implemented it superbly. I congratulate Allan Wayte of the North-East Busway team and the others associated with its construction, testing and very competent completion. The Tea Tree Plaza Interchange is nearing completion and will be ready for operation on 20 August. A covered walkway will link the interchange to the Westfield Shopping Centre and, in 12 months or so, the interchange will also be linked with the soon to be commenced new Tea Tree Gully TAFE College.

The opening day (20 August) will not only provide free public transport and round trips from Paradise to the Plaza but it will also be a day of great entertainment. The shopping centre will be open from 10 am to 4 pm for Sunday shopping and there will be continuous entertainment with bands, buskers, magicians, face painters and so on. There will also be a drill display team, fashion parades and a charity auction. Along the Linear Park, which follows the River Torrens and O-Bahn route, Life Be In It will stage a fun run, bike run and fun walk. STA Information bags for O-Bahn commuters will be available for sale.

The O-Bahn completion is not simply the culmination of a world class public transport system providing a 23 minute link from the City to Tea Tree Plaza. The completion of the O-Bahn will transform Tea Tree Plaza—a shopping centre which is essentially closed at night and surrounded by a massive, black, bitumen car park. Basically, it is a wasted resource every evening, apart from Thursday nights when the shops are open.

The city centre of Tea Tree Gully will be transformed into a vibrant area with the potential to be open day and evening. It will be adjoined by the new education facility to which I have referred, that is, the new TAFE college, to be built at a cost of \$40 million, with construction to start in September.

At the end of the year Hoyts will begin construction of a \$12 million eight cinema complex which will be the beginning of the development of entertainment for Tea Tree Gully residents who have long awaited this development and who were pleased to see the announcement this week. Therefore, not only will we see education, transport and cinema developments in Tea Tree Gully's centre but also I believe that the O-Bahn service will be the stimulus for substantial new office development and, therefore, the creation of new job opportunities in the heart of our city in the north-east.

It is on that basis that I welcome the O-Bahn completion, not simply as a public transport system but also as a stimulant to the development of a true and lively multipurpose city centre. In conjunction with today's announcement of the celebrations on 20 August, I was pleased to announce that my proposal for credit card size STA timetables was to become a reality. The new O-Bahn busway commuter card giving peak hour travellers a handy new timetable was released today by the Minister and me.

In February I called for the development of a mini timetable because the A4 bulky complicated timetable was hard to read. We were in a position where we had to convince the STA on this matter, but I am pleased to say that it has been convinced. The original timetables were extremely hard to decipher. They were wasted in massive quantities; three million were produced each year at 3c a shot. The snazzy new commuter card for the busway will come into operation on 20 August. It is printed in O-Bahn colours and is sponsored by Westfield. It will have a 12 month trial.

The commuter card will provide timetable advice for peak morning and afternoon periods for the busway section of the route and also for two of my district bus routes. For the interest of members representing southern districts, I understand that a version will be produced for the train service from Adelaide to Noarlunga Centre. If the mini timetable proves popular, I am sure that we will see the STA extending it to other routes, with a version being introduced for offpeak travellers. I think it would be especially helpful for elderly travellers who find the standard A4 timetable complicated and difficult to understand. I am very pleased that the STA has adopted my suggestion. We will test public transport users' reactions to the commuter card and pursue it further if it is well received.

In conclusion, I hope that the people of the north-eastern suburbs will join our celebrations on 20 August. I hope that people from other parts of Adelaide who have not ridden on the O-Bahn guided busway will take the opportunity to come and have a fun time and see the beginnings of the true development of the city centre for the Tea Tree Gully area.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): During the past week I have been constantly calling on the Premier to meet a delegation from Murray Citrus Growers concerning the current crisis situation in respect of citrus juice prices. Unfortunately, I have met with no success. The Premier wants the delegation to be received by the Minister of Agriculture, but, with all due respect to the Minister of Agriculture it is not perceived by the citrus growers or the public at large that he has much influence in Canberra, and it is believed, rightly or wrongly, by the public at large that the Premier, as National President of the ALP, should have some influence with his Federal colleagues. However, unfortunately, at this stage the Premier has seen fit not to receive the delegation from Murray Citrus Growers, representing the South Australian citrus growers.

Today the citrus growers have been handed another price reduction of \$30 per tonne. This brings grower returns to well below the cost of production. Citrus growers are requesting a number of matters to be addressed at the Federal level. They are seeking the Premier's support in these matters. Unless growers can see some light at the end of the tunnel they will have no choice but to take more extreme action. Given that 50 per cent of the navel crop and 70 per cent of the valencia crop are processed for juice, lower juice prices threaten the very viability of a significant South Australian horticultural industry.

Citrus is the largest fresh crop in South Australia and was worth \$47.4 million to South Australia in 1987-88. South Australia processes 40 per cent of the total Australian citrus crop and accounts for 65 per cent to 75 per cent of citrus exported from Australia. The delegation from Murray Citrus Growers represents an industry-wide approach to the issue—not a narrow sectional interest. That is borne out in an article in the *Murray Pioneer* of Tuesday 1 August. Under the headline on the front page of the paper 'Citrus industry SOS to Government' the article states:

A 25 per cent drop in the price of imported orange juice concentrate has prompted the Murray Citrus Growers Cooperative Association to form a delegation to meet the Federal Government.

The delegation will discuss a number of Government policies which will have an impact on the valencia season.

MCGCA Secretary, Mr Peter McFarlane, said the delegation hoped to meet with the South Australian Premier, Mr Bannon, within the next two weeks to ask him to intervene on behalf of the State's citrus industry in his capacity as ALP President.

He said the policies which concerned the MCGCA were:

The tariff policy; status of Brazil as a developing country; provision of realistic anti-dumping legislation as a safety net higher than the current price of \$60 per tonne; abolition of sales tax on pure fruit juice; continuation of sales tax concessions on products containing at least 25 per cent Australian juice; and implementation of the recommendations for the restructure of the citrus industry contained within the McKinna Report as a matter of urgency, which would operate through the Australian Horticultural Corporation.

Further, the Murray Citrus Growers organisation has issued a statement in relation to this matter. The news release, dated 8 August, states:

Murray Citrus Growers recognises that current minimum juice prices are below the Australian cost of production, and represent an unsatisfactory situation for growers.

Minimum juice prices are set by the Citrus Boards in South Australia, New South Wales and Victoria, working in consultation with each other. It is expected that minimum prices will be set by late August for valencias.

The minimum juice price can be objectively calculated on an industry agreed basis. The formula used takes into account:

1. The prevailing world price of Frozen Concentrated Orange Juice (FCOJ). FCOJ is currently trading on the New York Futures Exchange at \$US 1 500 per tonne of concentrate.
2. Tariff protection levels which the Australian Government has phased down to 19 per cent.
3. The value of the Australian dollar.
4. Transport, storage and handling costs.
5. Processing costs including debittering of navel oranges.
6. Changes in crop maturity throughout the season (Sugar:Acid Ratio).

In summary, the minimum price calculated for the Australian crop is equivalent to the actual costs of importing FCOJ from Brazil. Through the Australian Citrus Growers Federation (ACGF) we are continuing to challenge the policies of the Australian Government that are responsible for the present situation. Murray Citrus Growers is also seeking a meeting with the Premier, Mr Bannon, and urges his intervention in the following Federal issues:

- (1) Reverse the phasing down of existing levels of tariff protection.
- (2) Reassess Brazil's status as a developing nation, in line with approaches by the Governments of the USA and NZ.
- (3) Extend anti-dumping provisions against Brazil, currently set at \$A1 640 per tonne concentrate, which equates to only \$56 per fresh fruit tonne.
- (4) Gain sales tax exemption for 100 per cent Australian juice product.
- (5) Retain sales tax concessions on 25 per cent Australian juice product.
- (6) Implement the recommendations of the McKinna report as a matter of urgency.

As I said, on some 15 occasions in the past week I have telephoned the Premier's office to try to convince him that he, as Premier of South Australia and as Federal President of the Australian Labor Party of Australia, should receive this delegation representing the citrus growers of South Australia.

It is an extremely urgent situation. This industry is important to South Australia and unless action is taken immediately its viability and contribution to the economy will be devastated. This will occur purely because of the Federal Government's tariff arrangements. Brazil is by far the largest citrus producing nation in the world and whenever it has an over-supply of citrus product it dumps it on every market it can find in order to gain any form of foreign exchange. Brazil is not concerned about how much it reduces the price of its concentrate. Without adequate protection for the Australian citrus industry our cost of production

will exceed the price of the dumped Brazilian concentrate, and our industry will be thrown into turmoil and its future jeopardised. I again call on the Premier, in the interests of South Australia, to meet with this delegation of citrus growers and endeavour to make an impact on the Federal Government.

Motion carried.

At 5.25 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 15 August at 2 p.m.