

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

QUESTION TIME

Tuesday 15 August 1989

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

PETITION: INDUSTRIAL NOISE

A petition signed by 28 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to reassess the permissible levels of industrial noise and increase penalties for breaches of the legislation was presented by the Hon. Lynn Arnold.

Petition received.

PETITION: PROPER BAY WASTE DUMP

A petition signed by 101 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to reconsider the proposed site of the waste dump at Proper Bay was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

PETITION: RURAL INTEREST RATES

A petition signed by 43 residents of South Australia praying that the House take action to persuade the Federal Government to amend economic policy to reduce rural interest rates was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

PETITION: HOUSING INTEREST RATES

A petition signed by 99 residents of South Australia praying that the House take action to persuade the Federal Government to amend economic policy to reduce housing interest rates was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

PETITION: ONE AND ALL

A petition signed by 21 residents of South Australia praying that the House consider means of keeping the training vessel *One and All* in South Australia was presented by Mr Peterson.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

- By the Premier (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—
- Friendly Societies Act 1919—General Laws—Lifeplan Community Services.
- South Australian Superannuation Fund—Actuarial Report, 1983-86.
- South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust—Report, 1987-88.
- Superannuation Act 1988—Regulation—Exemption.

LICENSING, GAMING AND VICE OFFENCES

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): Has the Minister of Emergency Services been advised of concern within the Police Force about a significant decline in the number of prosecutions for licensing, gaming and vice offences and, if so, what action is being taken? Following the scrapping of the licensing, gaming and vice squads, I have been informed that there were no successful prosecutions in these areas for many months because policing became the responsibility of local police rather than squad members, and local police have been unable to cope with this added workload along with all their other responsibilities, nor have they been trained to do so.

I also have been advised that this scrapping of the licensing, gaming and vice squads, has had alarming consequences, including an influx of vice activities from other States on the basis that Adelaide is now 'easy pickings'. One example of this is the reported arrival of 20 girls from Melbourne for a brothel at Athol Park. CIB officers are being ordered off what they regard as more important duties, including drug investigations, to sit outside brothels for hours on end to gain evidence. There has been a reported increase in the number of prostitutes in the city area. The TAB has expressed concern about the proliferation of SP bookies, as a result of which the TAB claims to have lost about \$2 million. We have seen the formation of a new police squad to pay specific attention to hotels and other licensed premises in the northern and eastern areas of Adelaide after reports from the liquor industry of increased criminal activity which normal patrols have not seen able to deal with.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: It is interesting that I should get that question from the Leader of the Opposition, because only last week I looked at statistics on this matter. The statistics were in a slightly different form, which is why I think I can give them off the top of my head, with that qualification. The number of offences reported in the first six months of last year, from memory, was 29 for prostitution and related offences. In the first six months of this year it was 24, but in July this year nine offenders were reported. That triggered something in my mind. One lot were offences and the other were offenders. On an annual basis that is five or six offences per month. It struck me that it was interesting that it should be nine offences in July of this year, which was the difference between the number of offences picked in the two six month periods as against the number of offenders arrested, according to the July figure of this year.

I spoke to the Commissioner about prostitution in general. I am sure that if a number of people had come into the city from other places and were picked up for prostitution offences, he would have notified me of that. At the moment I can only say that there appears to be no major evidence that that is happening, but I will check it for the honourable member. I have no figures for illegal bookmaking at the moment, but will obtain them for the Leader.

RACING INDUSTRY

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport advise the House on steps being taken within the racing industry to examine the possibility of installing a synthetic racing track in South Australia? Extremely heavy conditions caused by winter rains have forced the cancel-

lation of a number of race meetings. Sometimes these cancellations have taken place after last-minute track inspections. Such cancellations pose great disadvantages for administrators, owners, trainers, punters, and supporters, as well as to the racing code, through loss of revenue.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question. Obviously the matter is of concern to both the racing industry and investors. The state of the track over the past few months due to heavy rains has been drawn to the attention of the public. I know that the Racecourse Development Board has already initiated discussions with the South Australian Jockey Club to examine artificial or non-grass surfaces in this State and I am sure that, following the recent experiences in New South Wales and in South Australia which have led to cancelled and postponed meetings, the need to examine this issue will be rapidly accelerated because it disadvantages the whole industry and causes much concern to all those working in and supporting the industry, as well as those persons who attend race meetings.

Concerning the artificial surfaces, I am sure that members have read the name of the surface, Equitrack, which has been installed or is being installed in some other States and which is currently being used for training purposes. From my discussions with members of the SAJC committee, I know they have looked at various States over the past few years and at facilities using Equitrack or an equivalent material for training facilities, especially at our major facility, Morphettville. However, I understand at present there is active discussion between the Racecourse Development Board and the SAJC, and it is appropriate that the SAJC have the carriage of this matter as the body responsible for gallops in this State.

I should be anxious, as I am sure other members would be, to see an outcome to these discussion. I am sure that the Racecourse Development Board will devote its energies to seeing that the issue is addressed in the fullest way with the best possible conclusion for the industry as a whole. I am sure that the SAJC is concerned to provide the racing community, including all those working in it and its outside supporters, with the best possible facilities. As far as I know, that is being achieved with the upgrading of the Cheltenham course and the huge sum of almost \$14 million being spent on the upgrading of facilities at provincial, local and, of course, major metropolitan courses.

This will be a further addition to that. If the SAJC decides to move to an Equitrack or an equivalent surface for the continuation of all-weather racing, obviously, if we had another winter such as this one, the pressure would be on the industry to respond to that. I thank the honourable member for his question. He and other members interested in the industry, as well as the community at large, will be interested to see the outcome of these discussions.

MR ABE SAFFRON

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister of Emergency Services say whether the South Australian Government still regards Mr Abe Saffron as 'one of the principal characters in organised crime in Australia' and, if so, has the Government taken all possible action to stop companies with which he is associated becoming involved in licensed premises in South Australia and will he seek a report from the Commissioner of Police, for tabling in this Parliament, on the current extent of activities in South Australia involving Mr Saffron and his associates?

In a statement to this House on 7 March 1978, the then Attorney-General (Mr Duncan) described Mr Saffron as 'one of the principal characters in organised crime in Australia'. He also said that it was the Dunstan Government's policy 'that all steps legally available to the Government should be taken to try to limit and, where possible, to eradicate the influence of Mr Saffron and his associates in South Australia'. More recently, the Premier indicated that this policy had been maintained when he told the House on 8 May 1985 that 'both licensing authorities and other authorities that may be involved, including the police, have over the years kept an eye on Mr Saffron's activities and have ensured that there has been proper surveillance and checking'. However, a report in last Friday's *News* reveals that while the Police Commissioner is objecting to one application for the transfer of a licence of an Adelaide restaurant to associates of Mr Saffron, including his wife, a number of other licences of Adelaide establishments now involving Saffron associates have not been objected to.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I understand that Mr Saffron is in gaol in New South Wales. The police have asked for the transfer of licence to be delayed so that they can run a check on the various activities of Mr Saffron and his associates in New South Wales. I understood from the Commissioner this morning that the delay was requested so that that check could take place. I imagine that Mr Saffron or his associates have some licensed premises because, at that time, nothing could be found to satisfy the Licensing Court that he was not a fit and proper person to hold a licence.

KARRARA

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): Will the Minister of Lands give an assurance that the views of local residents will be considered when the Geographical Names Board rules on the application by residents in the northern portion of Hallett Cove to have that portion of Hallett Cove renamed Karrara? In 1984, over a year before my election to this place, I was made aware of the desire by local people in Karrara and their residential organisation to have that portion of Hallett Cove renamed Karrara. Since that time I have repeatedly raised the issue in this place and outside. I have also appeared before the board on several occasions to represent those people. Most recently I wrote to every household in Karrara and, of the 150 or so replies so far received, to my knowledge only two have been against the renaming.

An honourable member: What about local government?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: As the Minister responsible for the Geographical Names Board I am delighted to answer the honourable member's question. First, the Geographical Names Board does follow a number of criteria in establishing whether or not a proposal for a suburban name change should be recommended to the Minister of the day. These criteria revolve around some practical things such as looking at the physical boundaries of the area to assist with easy identification, consultation with Australia Post to establish whether other suburbs within the State or the country have the same name, and consultation with the local councils, with the police and all emergency services to ascertain whether there are any potential difficulties or advantages in despatching vehicles.

I give the honourable member a categorical assurance that the Geographical Names Board will consult with the local residents. I understand that it intends to contact per-

sonally every resident within the area that has been identified by the honourable member and that it will seek their views on any potential name change to the suburb of Kar-rara. It will also contact people who own land in the area but who are not resident in the area. They will also receive a letter with a business reply envelope so that they may register their views.

After the board has looked at the criteria, a notice of intent is published in the *Government Gazette* advising of the proposed change and a month later the board meets to consider all factors. If the change is approved, it forwards the submission for the Minister's concurrence. I assure the honourable member that his constituents will be very widely consulted. I congratulate and thank him for the interest that he has taken in this issue on behalf of his constituents and I assure him that it will be facilitated by the Geographical Names Board in terms of its making some decision in this matter.

YOUTH MURDERS

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): Will the Minister of Emergency Services ask the Commissioner of Police whether the offer of immunity from prosecution to any person or persons who may have been an accessory after the fact in the murders of five youths allegedly by members of the so-called Family would help to bring to justice those directly responsible for the killings? An extensive report in the latest *Sunday Mail* contains suggestions that the members of the Family are being protected. It has been widely reported that there are nine members of the Family and that police know their identity but lack sufficient evidence to be confident that murder charges will stand up before the courts.

The alleged killings by the Family began 10 years ago although there have been published suggestions that their procurement of youths extended over an even longer period. One proposition put to the Opposition is that an offer of immunity from prosecution to a person not directly involved in these horrendous activities, but who may have been an accessory after the fact or for some other reason may be able to give vital evidence, may assist the police investigations and lead to successful prosecutions.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The Government's concern is justly shown by the fact that there is a \$250 000 reward for information leading to the arrest of members of the so-called Family, but I will check with the Commissioner in terms of the honourable member's question.

FRIGATE PROJECT

Ms GAYLER (Newland): My question is to the Minister of State Development and Technology. How significant are the benefits from the frigate project for South Australia? What work can AWA Defence Industries, based in the north-eastern suburbs, expect to flow from the contract? AWA is based in the electorate of Todd and employs many people in my honourable friend's district and in mine.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The contract will be very significant for AWA Defence Industries and other firms in South Australia. The ultimate percentage that is obtained by South Australian firms will depend on their tendering for the work in a price and quality competitive way. In that context, the State Government has been pleased to provide significant support to the Centre for Manufacturing, which helps South Australian industry to ensure that it is up to

the mark in quality and technical issues in meeting such contracts.

It is likely that the frigate project will be more significant to AWA Defence Industries than the submarine project, which in its own right has been significant. Independent study suggests that all firms in South Australia, including the constituencies of Newland and Whyalla, will benefit in that there will be 1 400 jobs in this State. The contracts have yet to be finalised, but I understand that AWA Defence Industries is bidding for a substantial proportion of the work, amounting to about \$250 million. It stands to gain a large share of it, and the jobs that will be created will be not only for the five to eight years of the immediate contract life but for the ongoing life of the project up to 30 years. That indicates a significant boost for South Australia and the correctness of the State Government's stance, which has been put into practice by the Department of State Development and Technology, aiming to get maximum value out of the Federal Government's defence procurement program, which is worth \$25 billion. That has already brought us significant benefits as a result of the submarine contract, and now there is the frigate contract. We will keep working in that regard.

Following the success of the submarine project and the Government's philosophy in this matter, the Department of State Development and Technology has established a special defence and aerospace division to optimise further defence contract opportunities. Those strategies have been correct and put the lie to the proposition advanced by the Leader of the Opposition on 30 July that he would restructure the Department of State Development and Technology.

YOUTH MURDERS

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): My question is to the Minister of Emergency Services.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will police be seeking to interview Mrs Mary Gambardella in view of statements by her about the so-called Family reported in the *Sunday Mail*, particularly the following statements: that she had met members of the Family socially through her former husband or, at the very least, knows the names of the men who were provided with teenage boys at relevant times; that her former husband had been 'protected and treated leniently' by certain members of the legal profession; and that members of the Family alleged to have been responsible for the murders of five youths between 1979 and 1983 were 'being protected by strong interests in South Australia'? If a police officer will not fly to Europe to interview Mrs Gambardella, is this because police do not believe she can be of any assistance to their investigations?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The answer to the honourable member's question is 'Yes', although I am not sure whether Mrs Gambardella has already been interviewed by Superintendent White or whether he will do so within the next couple of weeks. He is actually overseas on a trip to smooth the way for the Edinburgh appearance by the Police Band, and this is one of the jobs he will undertake while in Europe.

SIREX WASP

Mr TYLER (Fisher): My question is directed to the Minister of Forests.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the honourable member for Mount Gambier for continuing to interject while the Chair was endeavouring to give the call to the member for Fisher. The honourable member for Fisher.

Mr TYLER: Will the Minister of Forests update the House as to progress to bring under control the destructive effects of Sirex wasp infestation in South Australia's pine plantations?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am pleased to inform the House—this time as Minister of Forests, rather than as Minister of Emergency Services—that there are now clear signs that the rapid reaction of the forest industry is bringing under control one of the most destructive Sirex outbreaks in Australia's history. The magnitude of the outbreak is well illustrated by the fact that an estimated 1.8 million radiata pines in the Green Triangle region were killed by Sirex just in 1987.

Control is being achieved through a massive biological control program implemented by the major forest growers—the Woods and Forests Department, CSR Softwoods, SEAS Sapfor and the Victorian Department of Conservation, Forests and Land—at a cost of \$1.3 million. This program has involved the inoculation of 147 000 Sirex-attacked trees with a parasitic nematode which causes sterility in the female Sirex wasp. Evaluation this year is showing nematode infection levels ranging from 40 to 99 per cent in Sirex emerging from most plantations in the Green Triangle.

The sirex population has begun to collapse in the Myora and Caroline forest areas and tree mortality has dropped substantially. A similar collapse has begun to occur in many parts of the Mount Gambier and Mount Burr forests and, by next year, this result is expected to be evident in forests throughout the region. Quick action has also been taken in Adelaide Hills forests following the discovery of Sirex at Kuitpo and Second Valley in 1988 and more recently at Mount Crawford. The parasitic nematode has been introduced at 103 sites throughout the Hills forests and large numbers of a parasitic wasp were released in March.

Further releases of biological control agents are scheduled for the Hills in November. All pine plantation owners in the Adelaide Hills are urged to check for dying pines and to contact their nearest Woods and Forests Department office for technical advice.

YOUTH MURDERS

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I direct my question to the Minister of Emergency Services. Will the brief of Superintendent White be extended also to interview Mr Gambardella who is obviously, from other information made available in the press, a useful witness in the Family affair?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I do not know, because I do not know the willingness of that gentleman to be interviewed.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT PLANT

Mr RANN (Briggs): My question is directed to the Minister of Mines and Energy. Does the South Australian Government support the establishment of a uranium enrichment plant to be located somewhere in South Australia? On a number of occasions in this House and outside, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has supported the establishment of a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia, although he has declined to nominate the Opposition's favoured site

for such a facility. The Leader of the Opposition has so far failed to say whether he or his Party supports his Deputy's position.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The answer is 'No'.

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Albert Park to order. I also call the member for Mount Gambier to order, and this is the second time.

HOUSING SUMMIT

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Following his statement, made immediately after the housing summit of 3 March this year, that the Federal Government had indicated its willingness to look at further submissions to ease housing repayments for low income earners, I ask the Premier what further submissions he has made to Canberra and whether he will make them public immediately and say what replies he has received.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I hope that I do better than the Leader of the Opposition, who cannot even get support from his Federal leadership for his proposals and statements. In fact, since the housing summit there has been considerable follow-up on a whole range of issues. Indeed, apart from the housing summit, to which the honourable member referred, submissions were also made at the Premiers' Conference this year.

The Minister of Housing and Construction has also been actively involved in discussion with his colleagues in other States and with the Federal Minister of Housing about a number of possibilities and approaches in relation to the follow-up. There has been considerable action in this area. It will be interesting to see whether or not the Federal budget—which is to be released today—contains any matters that will address this problem. Whether or not it does, the fact is that we have had some vigorous representations and not in continual dialogue.

At the State level we have already set in place a number of those initiatives, including the mortgage relief scheme and the home owner interest relief scheme. Obviously, we will ensure that this South Australian Government's housing policy remains the envy of the rest of the country: it is at the moment, and it will continue to be so. Incidentally, the latest figures are quite encouraging, and a reasonable uptake of housing loans in this State has continued over recent months, despite the large downturn in and the fact that interest rates are affected. Housing in South Australia, by and large, remains more affordable than it is in other parts of Australia, and this Government's policies will be directed at ensuring that that is the case. Of course, it is now a week since the announcement of the lifting of the ceiling for first home owners in terms of stamp duty exemption. We hope that that benefit will help maintain the flow of housing funds and people's access to housing in this very difficult period.

The honourable member will have noted some encouraging statements made recently by the State Bank economist about the future outlook regarding interest rates. I would not be so bold as to predict that they are coming down, and I would not put a time scale on it, but the current assessment of economists—not just locally, but at the national level—is that interest rates seem to have peaked. If that is so, at least we know the problem we are grappling with in the short term.

PORT LINCOLN SEWERAGE

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): Can the Minister of Water Resources say whether there has been an upgrading of priorities for the construction of a sewage treatment works at Port Lincoln? If the Minister cannot commit the Government to a program for the completion of the work, can she indicate any projections for a staged construction program? In 1973, the report of the E&WS Department into the pollution of Spencer Gulf waters identified the area to the east of Billy Light Point as the most polluted area in the Spencer Gulf. Since then there has been extensive development in the Lincoln Cove area, as well as a move by the Port Lincoln Yacht Club to relocate in the Lincoln Cove area. Most sections of the community are increasingly expressing their concern and are anxious to know when the project will commence.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question and acknowledge his interest in this matter. Indeed, he has had a longstanding interest in this matter and has raised the issue with me and my department on a number of occasions. I am also aware of the growing community concern at the lack of a sewage treatment plant at Port Lincoln. The Government has indicated on a number of occasions that there is no cause for concern from both a health point of view or contamination of bathing beaches.

The situation has been monitored for many years and in fact two months ago I released two comprehensive reports on this matter. The reports showed that the discharge of domestic sewage at Port Lincoln was not affecting the quality of bathing water at nearby beaches and that the biological effects of sewage discharge are confined to a very small area at the outfall. Nevertheless, I am concerned that, after the Finger Point sewage treatment plant is commissioned shortly, Port Lincoln will be the only town in South Australia discharging untreated sewage into the gulf. I have asked my department to prepare a further report on this matter and I hope to make an announcement about it soon. I again thank the honourable member for his concern and interest and I will make available to him the results of that report.

WOMEN IN THE WORK FORCE

Mr DUGAN (Adelaide): Can the Minister of Employment and Further Education advise the House of the outcome of efforts by the Government to broaden the choice of occupations available to young women entering the work force? I am aware that young women have faced many barriers in entering what are regarded as non-traditional areas of the work force, such as the trades. Indeed, they have generally been limited to about 30 occupations, while young men have been able to choose from about 300 occupations.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: This has been an important initiative by the Federal and State Governments through the State Office of Employment and Training and through the Federal Department of Employment, Education and Training. The jointly funded Tradeswomen on the Move program provides opportunities for tradeswomen and apprentices, with the support of many significant employers in this State, who work with a program coordinator under the OET and DEET and go out to metropolitan and country high schools to promote opportunities for young women in non-traditional trade areas.

If one looks at the occupations which are generally available to young women and which have been taken up by

women in the work force, one sees that the comparison is about 30 occupations which are generally most traditional for women as against 300 for men. That is a fairly good comparison and shows the background for the program. During 1989 the project staff visited 42 high schools—20 metropolitan and 22 country—throughout the State. The staff spoke to girls in years 10, 11 and 12 and, consequently, some 300 girls applied to do a week of 'hands on' training in one of seven trades areas. Again, this was organised by the coordinators of Tradeswomen on the Move.

Last week the Federal Minister and I had the opportunity to close off the 1988-89 program. I am looking forward to discussions with the Federal Minister shortly to explore the opportunities for 1989-90. This significant program has been enthusiastically supported by some of our major employers, such as BHP, ETSA and other significant employers in this State.

It is well worth our continuing that program as a State Government, and I hope that the Commonwealth Government can come to the party. My colleague indicated last week that he would be more than happy to explore those opportunities. We can continue to promote the two young women in non-traditional trade areas with the opportunities available to them. In discussions at the function, the chief personnel recruitment officer of a large company in this State indicated that they were delighted with the scheme of getting young women into non-traditional areas. A cabinet-maker indicated that he had a young women apprentice in the trade area in his company. He said that it was the best thing he had come across and that she was the best cabinet maker/joiner that he had had as an apprentice. It is a significant program that has been well promoted and well supported by employers and the State Government.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I will ignore the interjections from the member from Mitcham. He should look at the record of the Liberal Party when it was in power. I will give some figures in respect of non-traditional trade areas. In centralised apprenticeship programs, 8.5 per cent of non-traditional trade areas were taken up by young women in 1987; 7.9 per cent in 1988 and 11.6 per cent (close to 12 per cent) in 1989. It is a significant growth in the right direction—in fact, approximately 60 per cent since 1987. I am pleased that we have been able to support that. I congratulate my predecessor who supported it with the Federal Minister. I am sure that members of this place and the other place would also support employers in this State in respect of a 1989-90 package. I hope that we can negotiate an arrangement with the Federal Minister so that Tradeswomen on the Move goes into the 1990s.

PLASTIC WASTE

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister for Environment and Planning advise what the Government is doing to encourage the recycling of plastic waste and to minimise plastic waste in the litter stream? The ever-increasing incidence of non-biodegradable plastic bags blowing around the metropolitan area in the wind is both an eyesore and, at times, dangerous. It would seem appropriate to control their use before more damage is done to the environment.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his interest in this matter. He has pursued the issue for some time, and I thank him for his question. The whole issue of plastics in the litter stream is complex and complicated. Plastics are one of the more difficult materials to recycle. They are low cost and the many varieties, which

make them attractive for a wide range of applications, limits their value as recyclable material. To overcome the cost disadvantages, we must acknowledge that a large volume of plastics of similar type and colour is inevitable to cover the cost of collection and treatment. The cost of sorting after collection has to be kept to a minimum.

As recyclers have only just started to address the problem, consumers find it difficult to recycle the product and, consequently, plastic litter subsequently increases. A company in Victoria is able to accept a wide range of plastics. It can accept mixed colours and, from this wide variety of products, is making flooring planks and fence posts—useful substitutes for timber. I wish to encourage the private sector to recycle more innovatively and effectively. That is one reason for my calling for the establishment of the Recycling Advisory Committee, the setting up of which I announced recently.

Waste minimisation and recycling are two strategies that the Government is actively promoting to encourage recycling and, as well as minimising plastic waste in the litter stream, it is the responsibility of every member of the community to consciously decide to stop littering. Perhaps we must look as well to ensuring that our litter laws are obeyed because, indeed, if we were to move to a situation such as exists in Singapore there would not be a need for the honourable member to ask me this question. However, I wish to highlight that, although each individual member can do something about littering, we must still address the complex issue of recycling of plastics, and I am pleased to say that this is under way.

SUPERANNUATION TAX

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Will the Premier say what reply he received from the Federal Treasurer to a letter that he sent to Mr Keating in March this year threatening to avoid a new Federal tax on superannuation payments unless all State public servants were exempted, and is it now a fact that the value of lump sums or annuities for retirees is now being eroded because of this tax? A report in the *Advertiser* on 7 April reveals that during the previous month the Premier had written to Mr Keating about this new Federal tax, threatening a High Court challenge or other measures to avoid it if South Australian public servants were not exempted.

However, an article in the financial section of yesterday's *Advertiser* written by David Johnston, an associate director of Day Cutten, suggests that the Premier's threats fell on deaf ears and he does not want public servants to know about this latest failure to be listened to in Canberra. The article states that retirees are now paying this tax although 'it appears that the State Superannuation Office is doing little to warn beneficiaries of the position'. The tax, at a rate of 15 per cent, is on superannuation entitlements established before 30 June 1983. The article gives the example of a public servant with an entitlement to a \$30 000 lump sum established over the past 10 years having this reduced by more than \$3 000 when it is invested. At current interest rates, this also reduces the investment value to the retiree by more than \$550 a year.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Together with other Premiers, I addressed this issue following the changes announced by the Commonwealth Government and the laws passed in June this year. Our contention was that the Commonwealth legislation should not be designed to catch State superannuation schemes, but in fact it has that effect. A simple way of solving the problem would be to provide an exemp-

tion and that was the purpose of my letter, in which I also pointed out that, should such an exemption not be granted, the States, especially South Australia, would have to protect themselves by other means. In fact, the Commonwealth Government has rejected any change by way of exemption and it has indicated that to do this would, in its view, undermine the integrity of the legislation at the national level. Our response simply will be to introduce legislation in order to protect our schemes, and my colleague the Minister assisting the Treasurer will in fact be doing so at an appropriate time. Such action has already taken place in Queensland, for instance, where legislation was somewhat hurriedly cobbled together and put through with the cooperation of the Opposition there in April or May this year. I certainly hope that our legislation, which would be a little more carefully drawn, will receive the cooperation of the Opposition in this State.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There seem to be two or three dialogues going on across the Chamber at the moment and that should not be so. The honourable member for Bright.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): Will the Minister of Housing and Construction advise the House as to the success of the Housing Trust in producing high quality and well designed rental housing in desirable locations throughout Adelaide? It has been Housing Trust practice to acquire surplus land in the inner and middle ring of suburbs around the central business district and to construct one and two-bedroom housing specifically for the use of local people whose housing needs no longer involve three and four-bedroom bungalows.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the honourable member for his question. His phrasing of the question indicates his interest in, and concern for, promoting inner city development within his own electorate, for which I congratulate him. I think it is fair to say that the South Australian Housing Trust leads the nation in its policy of urban consolidation, the guidelines for which have been set by this Government to increase the chances of people enjoying inner city living and, at the same time, to maximise the use of existing infrastructure in the inner city areas.

I was very lucky to accompany the member for Bright when I assisted him in his campaign to retain the very valuable seat that he has ably represented for the past four years. On that occasion I officially opened four cottage flats at Hove. Prior to the trust building those four units, that area was an STA carpark, which had very little use, thus the area was going to waste.

Following advice from the member for Bright that the trust should look at this area of land, it did undertake the purchase and erected very good quality pensioner homes on that site. One of the tenants who graciously allowed us to use her home for the opening ceremony lived only about 500 metres away prior to moving to that new site. The move has reduced her rent from about \$100 a week to \$30 a week, and that gives her more money to spend on consumer items. In addition, she was able to retain the same circle of friends, the same doctor and all those things that are so important to our senior citizens.

I remind the House that the role of the trust is to provide stability. We do not make a big song and dance about it, but that is one of the criteria adopted by the South Australian Housing Trust, supported by this Government. I will also ensure that sufficient money is received from the Fed-

eral Government so that we may continue to pursue that policy and that is despite the gloom and doom from the member for Hanson and the member for Bragg. I assure the member for Bright that we will continue to provide good quality inner city dwellings so that he can serve the people of his electorate in the future as ably as he has done in the past.

MARINO ROCKS MARINA

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I address my question to the Minister for Environment and Planning. In view of her admission to the House last Thursday that the Government has in fact received a proposal from Crestwin to establish a marina at Marino Rocks—a complete contradiction of a report in the *Advertiser* that morning which quoted a spokesperson for the Minister as saying that the Government did not have a proposal to consider—will she now tell the House when she will submit the proposal to Cabinet for its consideration?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I could be forgiven for thinking that I answered that question last week, but obviously the Opposition is running out of questions so it is recycling them. I am pleased with the principle of recycling, but it highlights the lack of depth in the Opposition's questioning. However, once again, I am happy to restate the situation. I will not be telling the member for Davenport or any other Opposition member when I shall be taking proposals to my Cabinet colleagues. The Opposition is aware of the principles under which the Cabinet operates and of the Cabinet confidentiality which operated under the previous Liberal Government and which operates under this Government. I shall be taking the proposal when it is ready and, in conjunction with the Premier, or on my own, depending on what we decide, I will make the announcement to the community. The honourable member will just have to wait for that time to arrive.

FOOD ADDITIVES

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Mitchell): My question is to the Minister of Health, although I would rather ask the Minister of Housing and Construction a question about yesterday's cricket results.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member not to Test the Chair.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Health ask the Health Commission to examine whether monosodium glutamate is a desirable and necessary additive in processed foods marketed in cans, bottles and other packages by many Australian food processors? There have been reports that in the Eastern States asthma sufferers have been seriously affected by foods containing this substance. Inquiries that I have made suggest that this substance is described as a flavour enhancer. One would think that, if good wholesome foods were being cooked and sold in the packages that I have mentioned, there would hardly be any need for a flavour enhancer.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am prepared to give this one a spin. The general approach is that, if it can be demonstrated that foodstuffs contain an abnormally high concentration of cadmium, bismuth, antimony, mercury, or something like that—a substance which is likely to be noxious to those who consume it—then it will be banned and removed from the shelves. On the other hand, if it has an additive or constituent which may create allergic reactions

in some people but not in others, it is usual for it to be clearly labelled and, as it were, for the buyer to beware. However, if it can be demonstrated that monosodium glutamate has such a wide-ranging impact that a large number of people are affected by it, it may be that it will move into the earlier category. I thank the honourable member for his question and will get a report from the Health Commission for him and the House.

HOME OWNERSHIP

Mr MEIER (Goyder): My question is to the Minister of Housing and Construction, but I also would like to direct a question to him about the cricket. Will he confirm that there are now 6 875 applicants on the waiting list for loans under the Home Ownership Made Easier scheme, reflecting the growing pressures home buyers are facing under the current record interest rates, and, in view of this and the statement that he made on 13 February this year that he expected to announce a new scheme 'within a few months', when will that announcement be made?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I should like to place on record my congratulations to Alan's lads for making it four nil.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is Bordering on irrelevance.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the honourable member for his question, which is a very serious one. I cannot confirm the exact number of people awaiting concessional home loans. I think the honourable member gave a figure of 6 875, which obviously I will check out. The honourable member's saying that that number of people are waiting for home loans because of the rising interest rates shows a dismal lack of knowledge of what it is all about. The problem with those people who are seeking concessional home loans is not the interest rate, because the rate for those people is fixed at the initial period.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I do not mind the member for Goyder showing his ignorance, but do not let the member for Mitcham show his as well!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The problem with the concessional home loan scheme is the deposit gap. Because of Government policy, prices in South Australia are the lowest on the mainland: it is still possible to get a three or four bedroom home within 20 kilometres of Adelaide for between \$60 000 and \$65 000—still the best price. The concessional loan scheme is geared to those people on low incomes, and they have the problem of the deposit gap—not interest rates. Interest rates, which are affecting people paying market rates or servicing a second loan, are not affecting those seeking concessional home loans.

If the member for Goyder does not know that, my good wishes for his future career in the Liberal Party are all for nothing. There are problems facing those people seeking concessional home loans, and the Government is well aware of that fact. The member for Goyder is correct in this instance: that I announced that I would be undertaking a review of the relevance of the concessional home loan scheme to today's prices, the amount of loan money we could make available, and also the price of house and land packages available in the metropolitan area. I do not have the exact figures, but if the honourable member were to look in his own electorate he would see that there is less of a problem

there than in, say, the metropolitan or outer metropolitan region, for the simple reason that the price of land and houses in Goyder is a lot cheaper than in metropolitan Adelaide.

Also, we are looking at the way in which we can obtain funding for the concessional loan scheme, bearing in mind that in the past we were able to use nominated funds at 4.5 per cent, repayable over 52 years, to top up that money which was made available to the State Bank for concessional loans. That avenue is being closed off, and our problem is that the only way in which we can obtain money to provide concessional loans is from SAFA. Therefore, if the Government, through the State Bank, in the initial stages is lending money at a low interest rate to concessional loan applicants, problems are being created for the future.

I am sure that the member for Goyder and all members opposite will agree that we have to look closely at that way of dealing with those people seeking accommodation assistance. The honourable member, therefore, was quite correct: the Government has undertaken a review and is looking at the concessional loan program. We are examining the options that may be available to us so that we can enhance the prospects of low and middle income earners getting into the home purchase arena, and we are pursuing that matter vigorously. I should like to think that the member for Goyder's question shows that he is concerned that there are people on low incomes who still wish to get into home ownership but who, because of the deposit gap, are finding that it is hard to do so. I will continue to look at the whole aspect of the concessional loan program. I remind the House, particularly the member for Goyder, that the problem with the concessional loan program is not rising interest rates but the deposit gap.

STAMP DUTY

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): How many approaches has the Stamp Duty Office received from first home buyers who are still to settle on their home but who have been told they are ineligible for the additional stamp duty relief announced last week, and is the Premier prepared to reconsider their applications?

The Opposition has received representations from a couple buying a house at Norwood. Their application for a stamp duty exemption was posted on 2 August. However, settlement on their property is not due until 21 August. Following the Premier's announcement last Tuesday, 8 August, that the stamp duty exemption level would be increased from midnight that day, they contacted the Stamp Duty Office to establish whether they were eligible for the additional relief which would reduce their tax liability by \$1 050. However, the people were told that because their application was received before the Premier's announcement was made, they were ineligible, even though the settlement on which the duty is payable will not occur until a fortnight after the Premier's announcement.

In their discussions with the Stamp Duty Office, these people were told of other home buyers in a similar position, and they have simply asked whether the implementation of this measure will not be reviewed to include all first home buyers settling after midnight on 8 August.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: With any of these changes there is inevitably a cut-off time. As I explained when I made my statement, we made the announcement when we did to get that into effect as quickly as possible—that is, even pending legislation. If the House rejects legislation that is to be introduced at the end of this week—which is most

unlikely—that would render null and void the announcement that has had already been made.

Administrative arrangements are assisting the Government at the moment. Inevitably, there is a cut-off point. We could have made the legislation prospective and contingent on the legislation passing. The problem is that people would then hold off on purchasing a house, which I think would be counterproductive. In all these situations, I have been advised by the Taxation Office that it applies at the time that the application for exemption is made, and that is when the assessment is made. Presumably, any applications made after midnight the day on which the announcement was made would qualify for exemption: those whose applications had come in before then would not qualify. I have not received any detailed advice, but there was previously an exemption of up to \$50 000.

One could go back in time, but, at this stage, that is apparently the administrative system under which the Stamp Duty Office is operating. One can argue that somebody who has settled the day before is equally in as difficult a situation. It is the old problem of the cut-offs. There must be some people falling on one side of the line, and some falling on the other side of the line.

We are administering the policy in order to anticipate the legislation coming into effect. While that requires a rebate effectively—in other words, the tax officially is payable and must be rebated—I think that is acceptable, I find it difficult to justify going back prior to the time of announcement. That could be subject to considerable criticism.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the time allotted for—

(a) completion of the Address in Reply; and

(b) completion of the following Bills:

Supply (No. 2),

Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act Amendment,

Prisoners (Interstate Transfer) Act Amendment Bill,

and Summary Offences Act Amendment—

be until 6 p.m. on Thursday.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 10 August. Page 225.)

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I support the proposition, as other members have. I offer my condolences to the families of former members who have died. I congratulate Sir Donald and Lady Dunstan on the excellent way in which they have conducted themselves—he as Governor of South Australia and she as his spouse. I am compelled, by virtue of the outstanding way in which he has conducted himself and attracted favourable comment, and with regard to the dignity that he has brought to the office, to put my congratulations on the record. I hope that the next appointment of a Governor will be made by a Liberal Government and that his successor is a man who is approaching the calibre of Sir Donald and who has a wife who is as capable as Lady Dunstan in supporting her husband. Of course, it would not fuss me if a woman were appointed as Governor, but I see no great need to dwell on that point.

For those people who may not otherwise realise, the remarks made by His Excellency when he opens Parliament are not his own sentiments or views: he merely puts down

the broad framework of the Government's legislative program for the coming parliamentary session. More often than not the incumbent would probably not agree with those views if, at any time, that person were asked to give their own opinion. However, the Governor has a constitutional responsibility to state what the Government will do. The Governor is the head of State and, as such, does nothing more or less than the very important job of ensuring that the head of Government and, indeed, the executive Government of the day govern according to the constraints laid down in the Constitution. The Governor is the ultimate umpire, ensuring that Parliament plays by the rules.

We must not regard that as an insignificant or unnecessary role. For as long as we retain a head of State separate from the head of Government and separate from our judiciary, we will never be bothered by a 'Watergate'. However, the moment we are tempted—and I will never be tempted—to dispose of the office of head of State—the Governor—we will run the risk, in fairly short order, of facing the consequences of the kind of incident that was uncovered at the Watergate hotel during the Nixon presidency. President Nixon was dismissed from office as a result of his involvement in this nefarious activity.

From time to time people in this place canvass the notion that we can do without either the Governor or the Upper House. Anyone who does so is kidding themselves. I have had 25 years experience dealing with different kinds of Government in this country and elsewhere—some without constitutional backing and Governments which are in office exercising power because they own the guns and pay the people who tote them—and, as a result, I am more than ever convinced that our form of democratic government is easily the best. It ensures the good government of the whole of society by its elected representatives, within a framework which also ensures that those who are elected do the job for which they are elected, and which also ensures that those who are appointed by the elected representatives enforce the laws.

I have heard some stupid and inane remarks in this place from time to time made by Ministers opposite: in particular, I refer to the Minister of Housing and Construction, but I will also refer to the record of other members in Government. However, once again I am drawn to the Minister of Housing and Construction because of his unfactual and unfounded rhetoric that is not matched by the record. The pomposity of his performance from time to time is not matched by his performance elsewhere. The Minister can pump himself up if he so wishes and, if he lets his ego listen to what he is saying, he will end up believing it. That is the problem with the Minister of Housing and Construction. Let us look at the Minister's record during the time that the current Government has held office (during most of which he has been the Minister of Housing and Construction).

During the 1982 election, on behalf of the ALP, the now Premier said:

We will boost Housing Trust construction in an attempt to clear the waiting list for trust homes which now totals 24 000.

The Premier said that in a tone which was intended to be an indictment of the performance of the Tonkin Government. Of course, that statement was roundly cheered by members of the Labor Party. If one looks at the record, one will find that the Housing Trust waiting list is now about 43 500, which is almost 20 000 more than the figure when this Government came to office. This has occurred during the time that this Minister has held the Housing and Construction portfolio. Part of this problem arises from the fact that the Minister was foolish enough to believe that it is

sensible to squander the limited capital resources at his disposal for the purpose of making construction work in a way that results in it producing fewer dwellings than it could otherwise.

In early May the boast was that very swish housing had been erected for trust tenants, who would be given access to the housing at subsidised rental—or so it said in the article in the *Sunday Mail*. Each dwelling cost well over \$100 000 (something like \$130 000 to \$140 000). As far as I am aware, during this Government's term of office we have also had the situation in Port Adelaide where over \$10 million (in today's dollar terms) has been spent on providing public housing. That has only produced, up to May this year, a further 200 dwellings. My sums suggest that each dwelling has cost over \$200 000. Is that the action of a Government that boasts its capacity for compassion—when it spends anything from \$135 000 to \$200 000 plus on each dwelling whilst the number of people said to be on the waiting list for such accommodation has blown out from 24 000 to about 43 500 during its term of office. I think the Government must be nuts.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: That is another illustration of the profligate idiocy of the policies of this Government in general, and the Minister of Housing and Construction in particular. In any case, it is my judgment that, if the Minister had applied himself properly to the task in hand and responded to the kinds of proposition which I have put to him from time to time and to the Government—even to my own Party when it was in Government during my first term in this place—we could have provided dwellings for those people in circumstances where there was no risk of children being exposed to those animals who would sexually assault them. In fact, no risk of them suffering from the undesirable consequences of being placed in ghetto situations in the kinds of suburbs that we have created, where there is almost wall-to-wall welfare housing. Those dwellings could have been built in the electorate that I represent, where the cost of doing so would be in the order of only \$30 000 to \$40 000 per dwelling.

The land can be purchased for less than \$10 000 a block. In many of those towns, \$3 000 to \$6 000 a block stops it. They are big blocks, closer to schools, shops, hospitals, doctors and so on than any block anywhere in the metropolitan area is ever likely to be. Therefore, their amenity value is very high. Community tradition of support and a fair go for everybody, particularly children, is strong. There is an already existing community with churches and recreational activities laid on. It is not necessary to go in and spend hundreds of thousands of dollars in the preparation of raw land in trying to establish a community which, in the first instance, has neither heart nor soul. That is the consequence of the alternative policies being pursued by the Government.

I am not seeking a further extension of the number of Housing Trust homes in Murray Bridge: on the contrary, there are well over 1 000 trust homes there now and no further extension of that number of dwellings is justified until and unless the unemployment rate in Murray Bridge is reduced. Furthermore, an increase in the available infrastructure support services of the high school and so on is necessary. The high school campus is crowded, having been designed only for 800 pupils and now with in excess of 1 200 pupils. It was the largest high school in the State with student numbers approaching around 1 450.

We look again at the ALP Government's housing record. I refer to another statement in the 1982 campaign:

The ALP will give a major boost to housing not only to provide more homes but also to stimulate the depressed building industry.

Mr Tyler interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: The Minister boasts from the benches opposite, but the current figures do not support the argument which, by interjection, the member for Fisher would want me to accept. When we look at South Australia's share of national dwelling approvals, we find that in December 1982 we had 8.8 per cent. That is acceptable, I understand, to the member for Fisher. In 1985 it had fallen to 7.4 per cent. One might say that that difference of 1.4 per cent is not much, but as a proportion of 8.8 per cent it is fairly substantial. However, it is nothing compared with what we now see. In January of this year it had fallen not a further 1.4 per cent but 1.5 per cent down to 5.9 per cent. During the term of this Government, which said that it would do so much, our share of national dwelling unit approvals has fallen from 8.8 per cent upon election to 5.9 per cent as at January this year.

Mr Tyler: Record levels.

Mr LEWIS: Record deterioration of performance! The Labor Party prides itself on being a Party which supports people who suffer poverty. Again in 1982 the Government said, 'We will establish an inquiry into poverty so that our welfare services can best meet needs efficiently.' That was not just the Party speaking but in fact Premier Bannon, as well. What is the performance? There has been no such inquiry. So much for that promise!

According to the last census, Adelaide has the highest rate of poverty in Australia. From the 1986 census, 11.6 per cent of Adelaide income earners have an annual income of less than \$12 000. Not only is that appalling by comparison with the rest of the nation—capital city by capital city—but it is better than the rate for many of my constituents. That is a salutary statement about the way in which this Government has cared not one jot for people who live in rural communities. However, let us take a look at the 31 000 Adelaide families in the situation to which I have referred (those on less than \$12 000 a year income), we find that in our capital it is 11.6 per cent. Hobart is next at 9.6 per cent; Brisbane at 9.6 per cent; Perth at 9.4 per cent; Sydney at 8.6 per cent; and, Melbourne, at 7.8 per cent. However, in 1981—just before the Labor Party came to office—8.4 per cent of Adelaide's population was in the lowest income bracket.

Effectively, during the time in which the Labor Party has been in office it rose from where the Liberals had it in 1981 at 8.4 per cent to its present 11.6 per cent. That is almost half as much again. It is clear that the Labor Party, whilst it must feel compassion, does not have the capacity as a Party, despite its philosophy (and platform being built upon that philosophical framework) to deliver the goods in economic terms. It is a formula for disaster. It may sound good. It is the kind of deal required by people who want to see things in terms of arithmetical projections and who believe that there are simple solutions to problems and that, if you just get the Government on the go and tell it to fix it up, it can be fixed. It cannot be fixed. Governments do not create wealth—people do that. Any prosperity that this State and nation has ever enjoyed—indeed any society of human beings in the history of the human race have enjoyed—has always been created by the efforts of individuals working either according to their best wit or together as a team. Governments do not create prosperity—they simply redistribute it. For Governments to claim that they can create prosperity is a nonsense.

Governments must recognise that they should make laws which determine the way in which individual citizens will treat with each other, that they should respect each other's rights and allow each other to get on with their lives accord-

ing to their own inclinations and then get out of the way. Governments should encourage excellence on the basis that each individual is challenged by the society created by the Government to do the very best they can as individuals from the time they enter the school system or play sport. The model should be to pursue the very best they can and to provide incentives for that attitude to develop, to seek it out and reward it. By that means Governments will ensure that prosperity is created by the efforts of individuals which can then be enjoyed by all.

However, in 1982, according to Labor's promises (the key economic indicators when we look at their philosophy and platform), 'instead of sitting back we need to go out and get our share of growth and development'. The ALP also said in 1985:

Three years ago South Australia chose a new direction, a new start, a new leader. Now, three years on, South Australia is up and running. With the people behind us our recovery is a reality.

Why the hell are we still talking about the problems that confront us—problems which are now worse than at the time of the last election—if 'our recovery is a reality'. The record shows that South Australia has the highest unemployment rate of the mainland States and the lowest rate of job creation of the mainland States since 1982 when the Labor Party came to office. We have the lowest rate of population growth, which means that people have less confidence in this place. When I say this, I have heard members opposite claim that, when it is said, I and other members on this side are knocking. However, it is not knocking: it is simply putting the facts on the record. Under this Government, our State has the lowest rate of net migration gain since 1982. Migration has contributed only 1.7 per cent to South Australia's population growth, compared with more than double that at 3.6 per cent nationally.

The lowest rate of growth in retail trade is also another part of our parlous record. In December 1982, we had 8.5 per cent of Australian retail trade, whereas now it is only 8.15 per cent. That means that people have less to spend because the Government's policies have produced a situation where their inclination to spend and their capacity to do so have been reduced. We have the lowest rate of growth in new motor vehicle registrations: that is, the number of new motor vehicles registered in January 1989 was 49.7 per cent less than the figure in December 1982 when the Labor Party came to office.

We have lost our reputation as a low cost State. The CPI increase for Adelaide between the September 1982 quarter, when the Labor Government under Bannon came to office, and the December 1988 quarter was higher in Adelaide than in Brisbane or Perth. Further, as a consequence of financial pressures, South Australians are losing their ability to save. They have less to spend, and what they have to spend it on is costing a lot more. Government charges have risen faster than inflation and the residual sum in their purse at the end of their pay period to contribute to savings has been reduced substantially from what it was in 1982.

That is borne out by the fact that savings bank deposits have increased by only 37 per cent compared with 117 per cent for the rest of Australia from 1982 to the present day. Moreover, in exports there has been a growth of only 77 per cent in value of all Australian produced exports since 1982, whereas in South Australia the position is worse than that: South Australia trails the national average growth by 33 per cent.

Take another factor. In 1987 in South Australia there were 1 444 bankruptcies, a record exceeding even the Depression years. In 1988, the number was much the same—1 403. South Australia, with 8.5 per cent of the total national population, has, on the other hand, more than 17 per cent

of the nation's bankruptcies. During the 1982 election campaign we were told by Mr Bannon, then Leader of the Opposition:

... our major goal will be to get South Australians back to work in a productive way.

The escalation of unemployment figures from the time the Bannon Government assumed office clearly gives the lie to that promise. Mr Bannon also said:

As a first step, we will establish the South Australian Enterprise Fund to assist the expansion of industry.

However, the South Australian Enterprise Fund never became a major source of funding for industry, as promised by the present Premier. Moreover he said:

We plan to tap the potential of our diverse rural industries—as well as our established manufacturing base—to send products to international markets that will return wealth to South Australians.

I agree with that: we should be doing that. Mr Bannon continued:

A key to that program will be the immediate establishment of South Australia International, which will bring together private sector enterprise and Government backing to promote trade wherever there are opportunities for South Australian business.

Well, South Australia International as an organisation has never been established. The enterprise fund and South Australia International, as well as other schemes promised before the past two elections, have not been delivered. In fact, I have probably done more than the Premier with the limited resources at my disposal in expanding export opportunities for stuff uniquely produced in South Australia or even produced well in South Australia, especially in terms of rural production.

And so it goes on—the comparison between the promises and the performance in the economy. My goodness, if only some small measure of the promises had been put together, we would most certainly have been in a much stronger position now and I doubt whether the Labor Party would be staring defeat in the face at the next State election. The Premier also said that all possible steps would be taken, including action at the national level (and he is now President of the National ALP), in order to ensure that oil from the Jackson field was piped through South Australia and not to Brisbane. He said that that made economic sense. Of course, it does. He continued:

It is more economical and it is vital for our State. But we have got to have a Government that will fight to ensure that this happens and not like our present Premier who simply caves in to Bjelke-Petersen.

That was Mr Bannon talking about the then Premier (Hon. David Tonkin). However, the performance speaks for itself. Bannon did not mount any fight to have the Jackson oil piped through South Australia; it is now being piped east. Bannon is all noise. When there is anything to be done, he is out jogging and nothing gets done. He is nowhere to be found when there is a real problem to be dealt with.

During the time left to me today I wish to detail the consequences of the indifference that this Government has shown to the problems that it could otherwise have addressed had it seriously tried to deliver on its promises and had it used a framework different from Labor's philosophical ideology, which is not only outmoded and outdated but purely irrelevant and wrong-headed. The Labor Party has not injured the people who can deliver it office at the next election if it could avoid injuring such people: it is engaged in pork barrelling and flat chatting such people, as you well know, Madam Acting Speaker, representing one such seat. The present Government has done that at the expense of the people that I represent. Had it not been for the outrage expressed by the people of Tailem Bend, Laura and Blyth,

their local hospitals would have been effectively and conclusively closed.

In addition, the Government was not content to do just that: it reduced the number of police available to country people to perform essential tasks. Those police were already sparsely distributed. In this regard, it is not just a matter of law enforcement. When we think of the police, we must remember that they provide many services in a civil sense in addition to ensuring that people who break the law are apprehended and prosecuted.

The Government has also reduced the funds available for our schools, having closed the secondary components of the Geranium Area School and the Pinnaroo Area School. This Government has had neither the guts nor the gumption to introduce technologies that would have enabled the children to stay at school in the communities in which they grew up. The Government ignores the fact that teachers and the Education Department exist to provide us with the means of educating our children in the next generation and it tends to see things through the simple model that the Education Department owns the school and employs the teacher, regardless of the sociological consequences of policies determined for the convenience of the Education Department and in compliance with the industrial demands of the left wing, hot headed leaders of the South Australian Institute of Teachers. In this regard, I hope that the member for Fisher notes my statement and sends it along to Mr Tonkin and the rest of his rabbits so that they will know what I think of the way in which they are breaking up the opportunities for the education of our children in country areas; they have simply taken away what those schools could have offered. The so-called curriculum guarantee, the staffing levels and the formula hatched out by the Government, the Education Department and SAIT did not ever countenance the consequences for area schools.

It left them out of the calculation completely. Now that there is not enough money to go around, the Education Department says, 'Tough beans', you have lost your secondary school.' Primary schools will be the next to go and, what is more, it will not only be Geranium and Pinnaroo that are adversely affected.

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

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I support the motion. In so doing, I acknowledge the service of His Excellency the Governor and Lady Dunstan. At this very moment they are in the Riverland undertaking vice-regal duties. Ever since Sir Donald took office, he has undertaken those duties in a very positive manner across the whole State.

I also record my sympathy for the families of those deceased members whose names have been mentioned by other members. I knew all five members and served with three of them. I believe that, of the five, the late Mr Nicholson, who was the member for Light between 1960 and 1962, is the least known in the parliamentary scene. When one looks back on the circumstances, one sees that his departure from this place was rather tragic. He left this place after one term in office and it was not until January 1986 that he again returned through the front doors of Parliament House in order to attend a function directly associated with Parliament.

On the occasion of the 1986 parliamentary bowling carnival, which was held here in South Australia, Mr Nicholson, with his sister with whom he was living at Brighton, accepted an invitation and came back to Parliament House. He made a comment then which all of us should note, particularly those who are about to retire. He said that, even

though there were certain aspects of the whole parliamentary system with which one would not want to associate, there was a tremendous advantage in being able to rub shoulders with those with whom one had a camaraderie and with whom one had undertaken committee work or various other activities in the Parliament.

I hope that those members who are about to depart this place, whether voluntarily, or involuntarily as a result of the election, recognise that the doors are open as they are to every member of the South Australian public. They are open to those people also through various channels such as the CPA in particular so that that fraternisation may continue. Such contact is to the ultimate benefit of the State, because there is an exchange of views and ideas and members can thus have their fingers on the pulse of the community.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: Retiring 'not out' is the best way to go.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Exactly. I have been somewhat concerned about the nature of the contributions from the other side during this whole Address in Reply debate. I tried to condense the general tenor of the debate to three or four words and the best I could do was to think of a song which was recently in vogue and which is called, 'Don't worry; be happy'. In many respects, members opposite sought to present that philosophy. Some even went a little further and sought to denigrate the performance of some members in this place. The member for Stuart was quite vitriolic and it is unfortunate that he should depart on such a note. The member for Briggs was not much better, but the 'Don't worry; be happy' syndrome seems to have been adopted by the other side. Such a philosophy will be to the detriment of members opposite, because the community is not happy and it is worried.

This afternoon I will outline a number of circumstances which range over a broad band of policy or departmental areas and about which the community is justifiably very angry. I would not want members to think that I suggest that there is an immediate answer to a number of the problems that I will put forward, but my propositions should at least be considered and recognised for what they are. These factors are causing a lot of embarrassment in the community and people are wondering where they will go from here. They also wonder whether they will be able to provide for their families in the future.

High interest rates are having quite a disastrous effect on both urban and rural communities. Over a long period of time my colleagues, the member for Flinders and the member for Eyre, have brought to our attention the problems existing on Eyre Peninsula, but other agricultural areas of South Australia are equally affected by the high interest rates and the increasing Government and semi-government taxes. These increases are causing problems not only for farmers but also for those who supply the service industries, teachers and police. We should also not overlook the effect of these increases on small businesses in country areas and in the Adelaide metropolitan area.

As an illustration, I can cite the case of a mall which has had a tenant turnover of more than 60 per cent in the past eight months and, in two cases, the turnover has been doubled because in that same period there were two changes. People are not purchasing goods to the same degree as in the past. They do not have the opportunity or the courage to buy. So many, particularly the aged, if they have any left over, are putting money aside, because they do not know what is around the corner. Each time they hear of superannuation tax or the likelihood of people having to fund their own superannuation schemes or to provide for their

own retirement, they shudder with fear, because only such a short time ago they were told by the Whitlam Government and other Labor Governments that they should not worry about the future and that the State would provide. Very clearly, the State is not able to provide and, through the Federal Government and State Labor Governments, those statements are now being retracted. These people are being told that those promises will not materialise. That has caused that group in the community to become very angry and upset.

The other area to which I draw attention was also mentioned by my colleague the member for Davenport. This topic has also been alluded to by way of question in this House on a number of occasions in the past five days and I refer to the local government fiasco as it relates to Mitcham Hills and the undue speed with which the Government sought to take up a suggestion from the Advisory Commission as to the demise of Mitcham. Councils such as the Unley council sat on the side and waited to take the rest.

I am not suggesting that the commission has made an orchestrated attempt in this regard; I have greater regard for the membership of the commission than to suggest that. However, the attitude has been put abroad that there are too many councils, that 'we'll knock them off, we don't have to worry about polls', the 'we' in some cases being senior management of councils and in other cases senior elected personnel. They are seeking to orchestrate these massive councils against the wishes of the people.

An officer of the Woodville council, in discussions recently held between Port Adelaide, Woodville and Hindmarsh, astounded everybody by saying, 'Don't worry about what the people are thinking. Go ahead. We'll do what we want. We know what's best for local government and we'll achieve it.' As the people of Mitcham have shown in a positive way, the people cannot be forgotten in these matters. The people will speak, and they have spoken in a positive way.

One can conjecture that the failure of the Government to act quickly with the Henley Beach report, which it has had for over three weeks, is the result of learning a lesson from the Mitcham fiasco and seeking not to allow the matter to erupt between now and the election. One thing that needs to be said about Henley Beach and Mitcham is that unless we take positive steps in the not too distant future and should a Labor Government be returned to office—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Heaven forbid, but I recognise that possibility always exists at an election. I would not want it, but if the Government is returned the people of Mitcham will have no cheer whatsoever in the statements made by the Minister or the Premier that their position is positively being reviewed. Unless this House takes the action that we shall be considering later—I take it no further than that at the moment—the people of Mitcham will be as vulnerable after the election as they are now. It behoves everybody in local government, whether in country electorates, on the fringe of Adelaide or in Adelaide itself, to recognise that the Government has done nothing to clarify the future position. It has stalled for a short time the inevitability of a massive surge of disapproval from many areas, including Mitcham, Fisher, Davenport and Mitchell. There is another unhappy group of people out there who, in the past week or so, have collected their rate notices and for the first time have woken up to the effects.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: They're not unhappy in Mitchell. I'm still there.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the member for Mitchell, whilst he remains, strive to keep the electorate happy in the future?

The Hon. R.G. Payne: The next member will do that. It will not be a problem for me.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: We might yet see an Independent come in to give it the support that it needs.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: People across the State are now coming face to face with the reality of their 1989-90 council rates. In many cases there have been tremendous percentage hikes. Some, as Marion council has informed the people that it represents, are because of the Government's—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: What does that mean?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Gayler): Order! The member for Light is making an Address in Reply speech, and I ask him not to engage in dialogue across the Chamber.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: The point is that Marion council has told people why they find themselves in this position. It is the result of the actions of the Labor Government and the Democrats and the gutlessness of the Local Government Association in allowing minimum rating to be lost. The effect is devastating on large numbers of people. In addition water and sewerage rates are coming out at much higher percentages relative to the CPI than the Government indicated would be the case. The valuation system is not sensitive enough to adjust to one-off high sales. In October/November, those who receive land tax accounts will have the same devastating effects as occur with water and council rates, being rated on a valuation which represents a one-off sale, not necessarily an average or a figure operating at the time the tax is raised. Valuations are carried out earlier in the year. If we go to the *Government Gazette*, we find that, commencing in March this year, the Valuer-General said that he had concluded his values for the 1989-90 year for Brighton, Glenelg, Gawler, and so it went on. In the next *Gazette* there were a few more listed and in the following *Gazette* still more. Therefore, many of the values on which we are paying 1989-90 fees relate to early 1989 or late 1988 figures. That reflects poorly on those who are trapped into paying the necessary taxes which follow.

I suggest that anyone who has any doubt about a valuation which is shown on their water or council rates should take up the matter with the Valuer-General's Department. In recent years many people have benefited from such action. It makes a terrible mess of local government budgeting when it finds itself tens of thousands of dollars lighter in its income from council rates because of the adjusted valuations. An unfortunate aspect of our system is that we are working on antiquated figures relative to the financial or sales environment of the day. When there have been massive interest hikes and marked decreases in sales figures, the matter becomes even more apparent. I am pleased to note the acknowledgment of members opposite by the odd nod of the head. The system has served us well over the years and will serve us well while there is slow but steady progress.

Immediately we have these upsets, we get all sorts of problems. This is one of the reasons why a very large number of people out there in the community worry. It is not a case, as the Labor Party would have us believe, of having nothing to worry about. People are not happy, because they can see that this will affect them in many ways. Let us take the subject of housing. This afternoon the Minister of Housing and Construction stood up and said that the role of the trust was to provide stability in housing. I have

great regard for the Housing Trust, but I have very little regard at the present for the inflexibility in some of the decisions of the Housing Trust which bind the workers at the coal face and stop them from providing the assistance that is so essential if people are to be happy in their housing.

I refer particularly to the change of age balance in a number of Housing Trust areas, where people who are reaching the age of retirement or who want a quieter form of life suddenly find that the house next door to them, which has become vacant because a neighbour has moved to a retirement village or has passed away, is used as a youth hostel or a drop-in house. I am worried about the fact that there is no compatibility in some of the matches; a person who has been in complete harmony with the rest of the community may be harassed to the point where he or she does not feel competent to leave the house without hearing catcalls, noise and threats of harassment from some people who move into and wreak havoc in the community.

Some people might be recently widowed; some might have young teenage daughters. People find themselves in the very difficult position of trying to care for their family in the proper way while having to keep their family out of the environment in which they live, because of the nature of the people who are being housed in the area. One such circumstance in my own electorate was drawn to my attention recently; a person rang and complained to a trust housing officer, who responded, 'What do you have to moan about? You're anti-social. You don't want these people to live anywhere.'

That was not the point at all. The person who phoned the trust was asking, 'Please, can we return to the balance we had in our community? Please can my family continue to grow up in the environment it knew without being harassed in this way?' It is no good saying that the police will take care of it: each and every one of us knows that the police do not have the resources to take care of it. The Christies Beach area is an example. Notwithstanding statements by the Minister, probably with all due regard to the compilation of information, that there is adequate policing in that area and that 10 more people have been stationed there, so many police are not working because of the effects of stress and so many are required for other duties—whether by the NCA, the audit section or whatever the case may be—that, on occasions, the whole of the Christies Beach area has been without a patrol service after 12 o'clock at night. Someone has been sitting in the police station, but no-one has been available to go out on patrol, because a single officer cannot go out in a patrol car after dark and undertake the task.

An honourable member: You don't agree that they should be in cars on their own, do you?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: No, I am in full accord with the new arrangement in that area whereby single-person patrols are used during daylight hours so that there is an increase in the number of patrols available and the impact upon the district is improved as a result. The members for Fisher and Davenport, the Minister of Water Resources, the Hon. Trevor Griffin in another place and I recently attended a meeting at Reynella where Chief Superintendent McKenzie explained precisely what was to take place. To the credit of the Police Association, although it does not like the idea of single-person patrols, it did not stand in the way of their being implemented to see whether this was part of an answer to the importance of providing greater security for people in the district.

I suggest that, whether in the District of Light or in any district across the State, the people are concerned. They are not happy about the current service they receive from the

Police Force. They are not criticising individual police; they are not criticising the service; but they are criticising the Government for failing to make available resources to assist in that necessary protection right across the board.

One other aspect of the Housing Trust circumstance which I believe is too hog-tied and requires consideration is the transfer system. Some people who have been in a house for a period of time and who, because of ill-health or the ill-health of an aged parent, want to transfer to another locality to facilitate the nursing of the parent or to get assistance are denied that opportunity for up to eight years because of the existing inflexible system. It is quite impossible to allow for transfers on a daily or weekly basis, but the present policy is not fulfilling the role that the Minister espoused this afternoon, that is, stability. There is no stability in housing if a person is under threat or cannot receive or give the assistance he or she wants.

I refer now to teachers, who are obviously upset at the present activities of the department. They have announced this in a number of very positive ways, and have indicated their concern as individuals as to where their profession is going. I will read a few sentences from a letter I received from a high school senior in the past 48 hours. It states:

I write to you with regard to the present structure of the South Australian Education Department. I am a secondary teacher of substantive senior master status and I have had 25 years of service in the Education Department of South Australia. Although the promotion lists are now defunct, I was assessed eligible for promotion to special senior master and deputy principal (Secondary). Thus I consider myself skilled in my profession, and for 19 years I have carried out my leadership role as senior in charge of history, geography and social science.

I have also been senior in charge of all year 8 students at ... High School for seven years, and have acted as a Deputy Principal for 16 weeks. For 19 years I have served in country district schools at Mount Gambier and Nuriootpa. With my family I have occupied departmental houses. We value the life-style and being involved in the community. Our children have now become part of this community, attending high school and primary school and taking part in Girl Guides, Cubs, tennis, et cetera.

This next point is the one I want to make. The letter continues:

We were prepared (and still are) to put up with travel to and from distant specialists and ageing families, and we find ourselves at this point in time in a stable family situation. This is important to us as our oldest son is about to leave school. There are, no doubt, many teachers' families in this position—dedicated country teachers. I find the proposal to shift me on to another school after 10 years quite insulting and unacceptable. First, it assumes that I am providing reduced usefulness in the school which I am at. ... My leadership and innovative skills have somehow deteriorated.

He follows that with three exclamation marks and two question marks. I will not read any more. I read that part of the letter to indicate that many people within the Education Department are not happy. They do not take the philosophy that has been preached to us from the other side in the past few days of 'Don't worry; be happy.' They are not happy, because they are not being given just consideration. They are being used as pawns on a board by this Government, which is more interested at present in seeking another term of office than in providing real and just benefits to the whole of the community.

We could talk about the hospital system and the delays. We could talk about the courts system and its bogging down. We could talk about the system which allows people who have been charged with attempted murder to be released without having any knowledge of the victim's whereabouts but finishing up in a caravan in the caravan park where the victim is trying to live an anonymous life. The probation system did nothing to prevent the perpetrator of the action, when let out on parole, from staying in the same caravan

park as his victim of December last year. There is a whole host of those areas. The people of South Australia are not happy: they are worried, and they want a better way of life than the present Labor Party is giving them.

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

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): The Address in Reply motion has my support. I join His Excellency, Sir Donald Dunstan, in expressing sympathy to the families of those South Australian members who passed on during the last term of the Parliament. It also seems appropriate to acknowledge the commitment to office and the wide public respect and popularity of our State Governor and Lady Dunstan. Premier David Tonkin made a few mistakes when in office, but there is no question about his good judgment when it came to recommending Sir Donald Dunstan to serve as the Governor for South Australia. While on that subject, it is appropriate—on the eve of a State election and nearing the end of his term—to say that I hope his speech when opening the next Parliament refers to a Government of another persuasion. I believe it would be justice seen to be well done if that were to occur. On the other hand, it is fair to say that his last speech, while very lengthy, contained very little material on new initiatives by the present Government. It was a rehash of evergreens: Finger Point, a water filtration plant or two, staged development of various education venues and a bit about the submarine contract (which seems to have taken ages to get up and running). It was essentially boring for those assembled in the Chamber on opening day a couple of weeks ago, not that the public gallery on that occasion was as overflowing as it has been in past years.

It is no wonder, therefore, that the media were almost silent in its publicity on that occasion. Indeed, it was entirely silent on the State Government's program for this budget session of Parliament. It is no wonder that the Premier felt obliged on the first full sitting day of this session to make a ministerial statement about the State's economy, his supplemented program of achievement, proposed works and forward promotion in the lead-up to the budget and the announcement of the election. It is no wonder that the Premier has been jumping around like a cat on hot bricks, both in the Parliament and out in the public arena, in recent times.

Comparative results of his on-the-job performance indicate that the pressure of office is taking its toll. A classic example of this is the Premier's reaction to a recent Public Works Standing Committee hearing. It clearly demonstrates the anxiety, he is currently experiencing. I refer, in particular, to those events surrounding the committee's consideration of the Adelaide Entertainment Centre. Even more important in his condoning during the committee's consideration of that project, of a breach of the law of the State. Given the Premier's public utterings, and especially the undue pressure put on the Chairman of the PWSC during consideration of the Adelaide entertainment centre over the past few weeks, I want to put on record several points about that matter. I refer to the Cabinet minutes of the Governor's briefing to the committee on that project as of 20 April 1989.

Those documents and papers, and that briefing instruction by His Excellency, were dated 20 April 1989 and were given to the committee secretariat on 21 April 1989. At the committee's next meeting—that is, on 26 April 1989—details of the briefing were read out to us for the first time. Four witnesses attended the committee meeting on 2 May

1989, including the Premier's project nominee, Dr Lindner. He advised the committee (as discreetly as he could in the circumstances) that, even though the subject proposal had been around the State for nearly 10 years, it was now a matter of urgency, and that the committee was requested to deal with it accordingly.

In fact, two days later the committee was hustled to the Hindmarsh council chambers for a public hearing and site inspection. On that same day—after it had escaped the glare of the publicity cameras that were arranged for that occasion—the committee was asked to reconvene and did reconvene in the Australian Airlines building for the purpose of approving a public advertisement designed to attract registrations of interest in the massive structural development proposed. Incidentally, the value of the development proposed at the time of consideration was about \$40 million in respect of construction costs and some \$7 million for the land. The committee was looking at a State project to the collective value of about \$47 million.

Four days later, on 8 May, the committee left for Sydney to inspect the Darling Harbor entertainment centre. The next day the committee flew to Brisbane to inspect its Boondal entertainment centre. The evidence taken on those trips was collated over the next week or so and, on 22 May, the committee heard evidence from Mr Green, representing the South Australian Tennis Association; Mr Richardson, representing the South Australian Basketball Association; and Mr Heard from the Highways Department, telling us about the traffic and public safety aspects that had to be considered in relation to the proposed Hindmarsh site. A couple of days later, on 24 May, Dr Lindner, from the Premier's Office, came back to respond to the conflicting evidence between that which he had given the committee earlier and that which was given to the committee by the various sporting authorities I have mentioned, and specifically the evidence of Mr Richardson from the South Australian Basketball Association.

At the time, and even now, it is not for me to indicate whose evidence was considered to be right and, accordingly, whose was considered to be wrong. However, I repeat for the benefit of members who, as yet, might not have looked at the evidence in any detail that there was conflicting evidence between that given to us by Dr Lindner and that given to us by Mr Richardson in particular. Notwithstanding that conflict and given the continued pressure from the Premier's Department, the committee was asked to recommend that the project proceed with planning, while funding and other matters related to the basketball association stadium project under consideration by various Government authorities were still unresolved. Written evidence confirming those unresolved matters was received by the committee on 31 May.

For those who may think that there was not real pressure on the committee generally and, of course, the staff and, indeed, the Chairman in particular, let me say that, on the day that we were asked to approve the concept of the project in principle—so that planning and other associated issues could go ahead—and before that meeting concluded, one of the secretariat staff members burst into our meeting with an urgent request from the Premier's Department that the committee give an answer forthwith so that appropriate press releases could be prepared on the committee's assessment and decision of that day. If that is not a demonstration of very real pressure, I have never experienced it. With all the projects that I have dealt with as a member of that committee (previously in a harmonious and bipartisan climate) this was most stressful. There have been dozens of State projects considered since my appointment in 1986,

along with the Hon. Mr Wotton and the Hon. Mr Hill (who has since been replaced by the Hon. Mr Dunn), and we know what this pre-election pressure is all about. That aside for the moment—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I really do not want to respond to interjections at this stage, because I have some very important points to draw to the attention of Parliament. The writing of the entertainment centre report proceeded with no further meetings until the first draft was presented to us on 26 June. The draft report was further addressed a couple of days later, on 28 June, but all of that procedure—again carried out with undue haste—was found to be invalid because, according to the Act, there had not been a quorum during that consideration. Therefore, it all had to be repeated on 30 June. I will not mention the particular member who was absent at the time, because I believe he was absent for legitimate reasons. In any event, the whole exercise fell over in a big heap, despite the advice from the secretariat at the time. However, given the haste with which the Chairman was pressured to get on with that job, the mistake occurred and we were called back to repeat the procedure. We all make mistakes and the Chairman admitted that he had made a mistake in not taking the advice from the secretariat, but later did what he could promptly to redress the matter. I make no reflection on the staff or the Chairman and raise the point simply for the reason that I outlined earlier: the committee was under inappropriate pressure from day one to deal with that subject—that \$47 million entertainment centre project.

I wish to put on record a few facts to negate the facetious claims and allegations made by the Premier about the Liberal Party members of that committee, the Leader of the Opposition and members of his staff during the period up to that date. I again draw the attention of Parliament to the fact that the matter was first brought to our committee's notice on 26 April. On 18 April the Liberal Leader made a public statement about the Hindmarsh site proposal, at which time it was alleged he had been fed information from our committee. His press release, dated 18 April, commenced with the words 'Liberal Leader, John Olsen, today released a Government document which raises doubts about the validity of the entertainment centre'. The Government document had been placed in his hands before the committee had even received its briefing from the Government. It was fairly damning of the viability of the project but, again, that is another matter and I respect its internal nature. Indeed, I do not propose to take that any further as it was a Cabinet internal minute from Dr Lindner.

The Liberal Leader, John Olsen, made a statement on 18 April, prior to the committee having access to the briefing, or access to formal consideration of the subject. He was responding to an earlier public announcement by the Premier. Another paragraph in Leader Olsen's press release read:

The Opposition is concerned that this issue should still remain in doubt more than two months after the Premier's last promise to build the entertainment centre at Hindmarsh.

So, it was good enough for the Government and the Premier in particular (as early as February 1989) to be making wide-embracing public statements for publicity purposes, that is, long before the briefing came to the Public Works Standing Committee. Accordingly, in my view, it was good enough for the Liberal Party Leader to respond. Indeed, throughout the exercise it was appropriate for the Leader to respond to the Premier. Yet, subsequent to these events, we have received criticism from Government committee members of the Liberal members for allegedly leaking material to our Leader.

That criticism was really quite ill-founded. It was one that could not be supported on dates and in fact. I repeat, it was quite mischievous. It was bad enough for members of the committee, with a personal or political axe to grind, but it was quite inappropriate for the Premier to indulge in that exercise then or more recently, when he continued to blame the Liberal members of the committee for opposing the project. I think on a couple of occasions he criticised me in particular for having written to the Speaker of this House, not to complain about the decision taken by the committee as to whether or not an entertainment centre should be built but to draw to the attention of the Speaker of this House the fact that section 8 (5) of the Public Works Standing Committee Act under which the committee operates had been breached. In that letter I claimed that he as Speaker and recipient of the report out of session should have taken action forthwith to have it returned and corrected.

Simultaneously I, with the support of my colleagues (Messrs Wotton and Dunn) on the Public Works Standing Committee, sent a common letter to the President of the other place. The President also ducked the issue and indicated that the appropriate place for that matter to be raised was in the respective House of the Parliament when it resumed.

I recognise that I have a notice on public parliamentary file signalling my intention to move a motion in this House to have the public entertainment centre report returned to the Public Works Standing Committee for correction and in turn lodged back in the hands of the Speaker and the President respectively as a matter of importance and urgency. There is absolutely no desire for the Liberal Party to hold up the action determined by the Government—albeit hastily considered by the committee—for the establishment of an entertainment centre in this State.

As far as I am concerned, the entertainment centre for Adelaide is clearly wanted by the younger element of the community at large. I recognise their call and wants in that direction. I am not so sure that it is needed. I know damn well that we cannot afford it: \$47 million spent in that sort of direction, in my view, is indeed treating the funds of this State out of order in terms of the priority in which they should be addressed. I can think of a host of proposed State water schemes, effluent systems, hospital improvements and bed and ward facilities for those needing attention that would, in my book, rate above the entertainment centre as items of priority.

We are talking about \$47 million for a project that we know, on clear evidence from a whole range of experts, is never intended, let alone likely, to return a dollar on capital investment; it is not intended and never was intended to return interest on the money borrowed for the purpose from whatever source; it is intended, hopefully, only to return sufficient to cover the operating costs of the premises. Thus the proposition is that it may return enough to cover the operating costs of that centre, when it is established. Against that background of the business factors that ought to be taken into account in this issue, I have grave doubts about the project meeting even the limited objectives that have been put to us, albeit cautiously.

I raise that issue because it is important to recognise that members of that committee (and I was sworn in again recently as a member for some five years) have an obligation to acknowledge the terms of the Act, especially section 24, which provides:

1. The Committee shall—

and I remind members present that the word is not 'may', 'could' or 'should' but rather 'shall'—

subject to the provisions of this Act, consider and report upon all public works which are referred to it under this Act.

(2) In considering and reporting on any such work, the committee shall have regard—

- (a) to the stated purpose thereof;
- (b) to the necessity or advisability of constructing it;
- (c) where the work purposes to be of a reproductive or revenue-producing character—

and that is a joke in relation to this project—

to the amount of revenue which such work may reasonably be expected to produce; and

(d) to the present and prospective public value of the work; and generally the committee shall, in all cases, take such measures and procure such information as may enable them to inform or satisfy the House of Assembly or Legislative Council (according to the circumstances of the case) as to the expediency of constructing the public work in question.

That is a clearly written section of the Public Works Standing Committee Act and one of which members of the committee should remind themselves periodically in recognising why they are on the committee and what their function is—and they should observe it. Section 24 of the Public Works Standing Committee Act was not properly and diligently observed in the consideration of the Adelaide entertainment centre project this year. I am very uneasy about what occurred. On this occasion I have deliberately not dealt with section 8 (5) of the Public Works Standing Committee Act in any detail, because it is the area that I propose to debate in relation to the motion which I have signalled intent to move on 24 August in private members' time. I will canvass the wider details at that time.

However, in the final minutes available to me I wish to raise two more points on the subject of the Public Works Standing Committee. Its handling of the Adelaide entertainment centre project set a new dimension in the function of the committee. The Acting Secretary made efforts, in his capacity as a senior executive officer servicing that committee, to draw the requirements of the Act to the attention of the members generally in session and to the Chairman in particular. A ruling by the Chairman not to observe the Act—as outlined in correspondence to you, Sir, as Speaker, before the session commenced and also in correspondence to the President—was a matter that constituted yet another erring of the rules and of the law. It was bad enough for that to have occurred; it was even worse for that to have been demanded of the committee by way of resolution, irrespective of the division on Party lines that occurred on that occasion; but it was significantly worse for the Premier of this State to have condoned that breach of the law. It has been clearly drawn to his attention by your officers, Mr Speaker; I am aware of that. But he has ignored it.

It only requires correction and no-one need eat any crow or be embarrassed about it. Let them recognise that yet another mistake has been made, albeit in good faith, by our Chairman, who happens to be very sick at the moment. In that regard I am disturbed that I must raise the matter in his absence, let alone that it should add more pressure to his situation. However, the matter is of sufficient importance that it be raised and addressed in this place. The quicker it is corrected, the better for all concerned, so that the report is amended—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is clearly anticipating debate on his notice of motion that is before the House. While it is difficult to pick out individual sentences that are clearly part of that debate, it is obvious that the totality of the honourable member's remarks over the last dozen or so sentences concerns things that he should not be putting before the House as part of the Address in Reply debate but should be reserving for his contribution to the debate on his notice of motion.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Mr Speaker, I hear what you say. I took advice on this matter before getting on my feet today and, although I made every effort to preserve the detail for the motion of which I have given notice, if and when it comes up, I am of the opinion, following that advice, that at this stage it is not a motion but only a signal of intent. In that context I am not breaching any Standing Order of this House in mentioning what I may say if and when the motion comes up.

Be that as it may, I am fussed not about the details but about the principle that has been breached. Also, I am fussed about another situation that has occurred within the activities of the Public Works Standing Committee. In evidence it has been drawn to the attention of members of that committee, in their consideration of the reference concerning the Supreme Court precinct (courtroom No. 12)—and the report tabled in this House as a public document—that the Premier and the Cabinet of South Australia have flogged off yet another parcel of South Australian assets comprising land in King William Street, prime land described in the real estate industry as core land of the City of Adelaide, for around half its value.

Indeed, less than 12 months ago the Valuer-General of this State, John Darley, valued a parcel of land owned and occupied by the South Australian courts system at \$3.5 million, given the structural improvements thereon. Within a short time, efforts were made to determine whether or not the Commonwealth Government was serious in its desire to buy that land and it took some months to confirm the desire to purchase it.

Following some across the table discussion, the land was finally sold to the Commonwealth Government for \$1.951 million. I have not the time today to discuss the details of that transaction. However, I draw to the attention of members and the media—if they are not too lazy to get off their butts for long enough to do a little homework on such an important matter of State significance—a statement on page 17 of the committee's report on the Supreme Court precinct (courtroom No. 12), especially item 11 in the committee's findings, which states:

The committee has not usually involved itself with project land site valuation, acquisition or disposal. The committee is, however, concerned with the cost difference between the South Australian Valuer-General's valuation of the land to be sold to the Commonwealth in the first instance and the figure actually paid for the land following arbitration.

The arbitration was a bit of a joke, according to the Department of Lands officer who was a witness before the committee—in fact, it was a real joke. Members will see from page 44 onwards of the papers tabled with the report in the House last week how furious and disgusted was that senior officer of the department.

Further, in its report the committee saw fit to say, unanimously, that it recommended the proposed public work of establishment of courtroom No. 12 of the Supreme Court precinct at a cost of \$2.26 million based on costs as at May 1989, but it drew attention to item 11 of its findings. That item I have already read to the House. Again, there is no time to go into detail on this issue, but it is a classic and disgraceful example of how we are being sold out by mismanagement of the Government—again by an action condoned by the Premier of this State.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. Before calling on the next speaker, I draw to members' attention the crystal clear intention of Standing Order 230. The honourable member for Hayward.

Mrs APPLEBY (Hayward): In responding to His Excellency's Address delivered on Thursday 3 August at the opening of the fifth session—

Mr Lewis: You're reading this, aren't you?

Mrs APPLEBY: No, I am not.

Mr Lewis: You can't even make a speech.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Hayward.

Mrs APPLEBY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. In responding to His Excellency's Address delivered on Thursday 3 August at the opening of the fifth session of the 46th Parliament, I am reminded of the responsibility placed on me by the residents of Hayward in representing them in the South Australian Parliament. On 5 June, those of us serving the Parliament, as well as many past members, joined in the formal celebrations marking 100 years of the Assembly and 50 years of the Legislative Council of this Parliament meeting in their present building.

On behalf of those who shared in those celebratory proceedings, I place on record our appreciation for the preparation and the action that took place over the many months leading up to that day. Not only have we celebrated but for those of us who have served in this building only recently the historic and traditional information, both written and pictorial, that has been collected will be valuable in raising the interest of members of the community in their seat of democracy in this State. I hope that much of the written and pictorial material can eventually be printed and made available to the community and future members of Parliament.

I trust that my expressed sentiments will be accepted by officers and other staff members who contributed to the planning of this great event. As part of the celebrations, a mock Parliament was held in the afternoon. Several of our State high schools took part in that mock Parliament under the guidance of the recently appointed Parliamentary Education Officer (Barbara Guthrie). I was an observer of the activities in both Chambers and it was pleasing to see that the youth of our State took an active and enthusiastic interest in our parliamentary process. I was very proud that two of the schools in my electorate (Westminster and Brighton) participated in that event.

In late July the Premier and I were guests of a Parliament of Warradale. The Speaker invited the Premier to take his place for Question Time and maintained decorum. The depth of questioning left no doubt that the quality of work being undertaken in our schools that enables our youth to participate in such events will increase their understanding of our parliamentary process and that members of the community will be better informed in future years.

While on the topic of young people, I am led to question the responsibility of the adult population in fostering optimism as an example of positive action balanced against the doom and gloom attitude. The undermining of young people's optimism about the future is far more destructive than the issues which from time to time become the focus of public attention, would indicate. As the broader community responds to issues, the impression of gloom is often given in an emotional atmosphere prior to the facts becoming evident and actions being taken which encourage participation in problem solving.

It is important that young people be given the challenges and empowered to use their creative ideas and skills in contributing to issues of importance to the community. When given this challenge, young people willingly respond. I urge the broader community, including the media, industry, business, and the general community to promote posi-

tive values and attitudes among youth so that optimism can be fostered among them.

Self-esteem should be the first point of recognition, and it should be encouraged. Respect for positive actions has an encouraging demonstrated result, both in behaviour and in willingness to participate. Through the schools and the Marion youth project in my own electorate, I have come to respect many young people. I do not suggest that all youth are perfect or that they all come from the same mould, but is this not the case with any group in society? I therefore suggest that some good news stories might help increase optimism and encourage some positive involvement where our young people can be respected for their actions and can develop strong values. They can then equip themselves for the challenges of the twenty-first century.

In his speech, His Excellency referred to this Government's positive response to our elderly population's needs. This State has the oldest population in Australia and, in more ways than one, we have set standards in quality services and quality of life which must be preserved and improved. Appropriate responses must be assessed and undertaken.

Services are, and should be, flexible. It is vital that our community develop responsive attitudes to the aged. We should ensure that relevant and targeted actions are implemented. Services should continue to be prioritised to meet demonstrated needs. Since the enabling legislation to establish the Commissioner for the Ageing was passed in 1984, the Bannon Government has maintained a high profile on issues relating to the State's senior population. This Government has pursued mechanisms which continue to provide for consultation with individuals or representative organisations of the aged.

In January the Premier established the State Government Age Discrimination Task Force which had a specific agenda of consultation and reporting. The task force consists of nine Government members and I have the responsibility of chairing and coordinating information acquired through consultation. The response from the aged has been outstanding, with a great deal of positive input. Most responsible suggestions and ideas have been suggested for improvements of existing services, reallocation of resources or annual programs to enhance the quality of life of this section of our population who have contributed, and continue to contribute, their experience of life and a great wealth of skills.

I thank the many individuals and groups of our aged who have shared many facets of their lives with me and with members of the task force. As the Bannon Government now has a Minister for the Aged (the Deputy Premier, the Hon. Don Hopgood), I look forward to the results of the task force's work being implemented and overseen by the Minister in Cabinet.

I now turn to a Government health initiative which has been established in Hayward and which service provides for residents in the local government areas of Marion, Brighton and Glenelg. The commitment to strengthen and better coordinate primary health care services, with an emphasis on effective community involvement in health and welfare planning and decision-making through the establishment of health and social welfare councils, is proving to be most effective. The council in my electorate is part of a two year pilot project announced recently by the Minister of Health and Community Welfare, with councils already established in Woodville, Port Adelaide, Hindmarsh and the Riverland. The council is made up of a group of local people who are interested in the health and well-being of their communities and who are willing to work towards making their communities a better place to live.

The focus of the council is on ordinary people who are not necessarily professionals providing health and welfare services. The aim is to help consumers and users of health and welfare services to have a say about the method of running such services. In the past the views of ordinary people have not been listened to in any systematic way. The new health and welfare councils can provide the channel for people to raise issues of concern in their local area. Eighteen people have been appointed by the Minister for a period of two years in order to establish the health and social welfare council in the Marion, Brighton and Glenelg area. They will also develop local projects and tackle issues about service provision with the agencies on behalf of and with consumers.

The Marion, Brighton and Glenelg health and social welfare council already has more than 100 members, many of whom are keen to start addressing important local issues. The range of issues include hospital care; needs of children and adults with disabilities and their families; costs of pharmaceuticals; mental health issues such as isolation, stress and loneliness; transport services for dementia sufferers and their carers; pregnancy and birthing services; health care for those on low incomes; and environmental issues. The executive officer, Kathy Mott, is to be applauded for the assistance she has given the community since her appointment. As the community involvement and participation grow, I look forward to the two year pilot project being extended to a regular service.

While the school community in the electorate of Hayward has participated in some major adjustments in recent times there is no doubt that when parents' involvement is encouraged and supported the outcome is a very effective approach in the interests of students, parents and staff. In the area of education the continued commitment to the redevelopment of structures at Brighton High School is most welcome and the work done thus far is a tangible example of the priority given to students by this Government to providing efficient and acceptable working environments.

The Brighton High School redevelopment is all but complete, and the new facility will be a magnificent resource. At present the temporary classroom accommodation is being removed from the site. The facilities from completion of the new building far outweigh the inconvenience of the last year or so. On 16 September, in the presence of the Premier, the \$7 million redevelopment will be officially opened.

The Seaview High School (which, as you are aware, Mr Speaker, is also a cooperative with your electorate) serves the school community now under the Seacombe and Dover campuses. Seaview High has a dual campus facility with strengthened curriculum options and resources under an 'A' principal who, since his appointment, has led the school community effectively in the initial stages of the joint campus school. The committees of council, students and staff who are working through the processes should be recognised as setting an agenda of cooperation in practice and will provide an excellent model for similar propositions throughout the State.

It is no easier for communities which face declining student populations than it is for those in developing areas requiring new facilities. Declining student areas face the added dilemma of traditions and loyalties built over time, and in some cases family history of attendance and involvement. Such an example was the closure of Oaklands Primary School. I wish to place on record my appreciation for the dedication displayed by all who were involved at Oaklands primary over the years—in particular, those parents who were involved in the final year and became part of the closure process and alternative relocation of students. I am

sure that the schools which have received students from Oaklands have benefited from the incoming parents whose commitment I had the pleasure to share and support as the final year of Oaklands Primary School concluded.

Dover Gardens, Darlington, Paringa Park, Sturt, Marion and Warradale Primary Schools continue to be innovative and to provide curriculum and life experience for students with the participation of parents in many aspects of the day-to-day activities of the schools. The benefits which have now been passed back to the schools of this State from the recently distributed \$10 million back-to-school program grants leave no doubt about the Bannon Government's commitment to ensuring that closures return funds to provide facilities and resources to staff and students, thereby upgrading the environment of schools across the State.

One subject that continues to cause concern to individuals and groups is age discrimination. Having given some priority to adult unemployment prior to and since becoming a member of this place, I consider that the aspects of age discrimination in employment have led to my resolve to see the matter effectively addressed and measures initiated to diminish the discriminatory practice. Having initiated the call for the age discrimination working party, I applaud the Government's action in establishing the age discrimination task force. Age discrimination can be seen as a denial of equal opportunities arising from incorrect assumptions about a person's abilities and needs on the basis of age.

It is fair to say that there are possibly two aspects to be considered for action. One is the certain or deliberate practice and the other is the perceived blame-induced aspect. His Excellency announced the introduction of legislation to make it unlawful to discriminate on the basis of age. This legislation should be utilised to address specific aspects of age discrimination. I believe that there will be a need for awareness and practice guidelines to complement the proposed legislation. While examples can be given about practices that exclude people from jobs on the basis of age, it is suggested that there is contention relating to whether insufficient or reduced accessibility constitutes grounds for discrimination.

Age legislation is to be introduced. Grounds would be in employment practices, training practice, forced retirement, denial of financial facilities, and unequal payment for similar services—for instance, motor vehicle insurance is one such practice. I look forward to the passing and implementation of the proposal in the interest of skill and ability recognition of an important contributing section of our State.

My position of Government Whip has been made most challenging with the inclusion in the back bench line-up of highly respected former Ministers who are to retire at the State election later this year. The members for Gilles, Stuart, Spence and Mitchell have added great depth to the benches in this Chamber. I thank them for their responses to requests and their readiness to participate in all aspects of their duties to the Government and in this House. In addition, I thank the members for Playford and Peake and wish them health and happy pursuits in their coming retirement. I support the motion.

Motion carried.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 9 August. Page 133.)

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): Although I am not the lead Opposition speaker in this debate, I intend now to go through

some of the problems that the South Australian Timber Corporation has had, comment on the ministerial statement that the Minister put out last week and point out to the House and to the public of South Australia how inaccurate that statement was. In fact, the South Australian Timber Corporation is made up of a group of investment companies, namely, Mount Gambier Pine Industries Trading Trust, situated at Mount Gambier; International Panel and Lumber (Holdings), which is International Panel & Lumber (Australia); and, of course, IPL New Zealand (the corporation's famous investment in which has been the subject of an inquiry in another place). I refer finally in this respect, to the Shepherdson and Mewitt Trading Trust; it has had the secondhand sawmill equipment which has lain on the wharf for two years and which has not yet been installed. Although I note that the Minister has announced that something will happen to it, it has already deteriorated to such an extent that it will cost \$100 000 to get it in working order.

The corporation also includes Satco Melbourne, which is the trading arm of the South Australian Timber Corporation; it is also the residence of Mr Sanderson, who has had great involvement in the entire operations of the South Australian Timber Corporation. Another famous member of the group, which keeps dogging the Minister, is Scrimber International.

When one looks at comments made over the years by the Auditor-General on the South Australian Timber Corporation, one finds that they make very interesting reading. I will deal with them first, before getting to the ministerial statement. The Auditor-General started commenting on the corporation in 1985. In 1986 he said:

Last year I expressed concern that, unless the corporation could increase revenue from its investments, losses would continue to accumulate.

He also observed that, if an equity base were provided to the corporation, implicit in the arrangement should be a requirement that, within a reasonable time, the corporation provide an annual return to the Government (which, in this case, is SAFA) representing an appropriate dividend payment and a statutory taxation payment. The Auditor-General made that recommendation four years ago, but until now nothing has been done about it. He went on to observe in his qualified report of 1987, in respect of the accounts of the corporation for the year ending June 1987, that his main concern related to the Government's investment in the New Zealand timber venture. It became apparent when the audit review was done that the value of the assets of the companies that had been taken over were overstated, that liabilities were understated, that the profit projections were overstated and that substantial operating losses were being incurred. He concluded that IPL New Zealand was poorly managed and in need of capital funds. The Auditor-General was so concerned that, in March 1987, he referred the matter to the Treasurer, noting that the New Zealand company was bought without its financial statements being audited.

That would be unheard of in business circles—yet Cabinet gave its approval to purchase the New Zealand company on unaudited financial statements. The ministerial statement presented to the House last week also referred to unaudited financial statements, yet the Minister expects the House to take that statement seriously. I can assure him that we will not. When the panic started in March 1987, the Premier, of course, started running for cover. He then obtained some consultants' reports—in fact, there were three consultants' reports which all told him different things. Of course, the Auditor-General had already said that the financial investigations of the New Zealand company should

have been done earlier, before it was purchased, and it should not have been purchased on unaudited statements, anyway.

It is quite staggering that the Government called for the reports. The Auditor-General points out that a prior arrangement with the consultants was that the profit projections for each company did not take into account interest and servicing costs on funding. These costs, as anyone would realise, have a substantial bearing on a company's profitability, and no-one in private enterprise in their wildest dreams could think of putting up a proposition to a bank or any lending institution in which interest and servicing costs were not taken into account when profitability was being assessed.

At that stage (30 June 1987), the amount owing to the South Australian Financing Authority was some \$37 million, including capitalised interest of \$5.9 million. We then go to the 1988 Auditor-General's Report, where it is noted that a substantial turnaround in the New Zealand operations, together with improvements in returns from its subsidiary bodies, would seem to be essential if the corporation is to become profitable and is to eliminate its accumulated losses. It is also essential if further taxpayer funds are not to be placed at risk. This is after four years of warning. Even after the report from the other place, nothing is being done about it.

At 30 June 1988, accumulated losses of the corporation amounted to \$16.8 million and a valuation of International Panel and Lumber (Holdings) showed that it had an excess of liabilities over assets of some \$11.2 million. So, that company is technically insolvent. Having regard to that valuation, some quite substantial write downs were done on the balance sheet to provide cover for losses on capital invested.

In the 1988 supplementary Auditor-General's Report, the Auditor-General noted, after all this had happened and this advice had been given over the past four or five years, that the audited financial statements were still being qualified on all the investment companies in the South Australian Timber Corporation except the Mount Gambier Pine Industries Trading Trust, which was found to be trading profitably and well. So, there is a history which has been brought before the public by the Auditor-General for some five years suggesting that something be done.

We have heard *ad nauseam* the Minister—two Ministers since I have been in this place—trying to cover up what is really going on; we have had a select committee of the Upper House which has brought down its findings; and we have had guarantees that something will be done—and each time we find that it is not done. It is rather interesting when one looks at the capital structure of the South Australian Timber Corporation and how the Government has attempted to hide the facts of the corporation. In 1988 the Auditor-General put on record the company's capital structure and noted that it had liabilities of about \$37 million and, of course, could not trade on.

The Auditor-General recommended to the Government the conversion of \$21 million of the corporation's existing advances from SAFA to equity at 30 June, and to transfer to SAFA as compensation for that interest forgone a total of 16.2 per cent of the Woods and Forests Department. So, we are not charging this company interest but we are reimbursing SAFA for not charging interest by giving away 16 per cent of a kindred organisation which is under the same umbrella, thereby hiding from the public the true facts of the South Australian Timber Corporation.

More importantly, though, the Auditor-General noted that the equity in the Woods and Forests Department, the 16.2

per cent which is provided to SAFA, is expected to return a dividend payment sufficient to compensate SAFA for the interest forgone, which at that stage was \$3.5 million. This dividend is based on a reported profit of the Woods and Forests Department of \$22 million in the 1986-87 year. Unfortunately, \$28.5 million of that profit was not generated from cash flow—it was generated from the revaluation of the forest. So, in cash terms, the Woods and Forests Department had a deficit in 1986-87 of about \$5.5 million, and the Woods and Forests Department is expected to pay to SAFA the interest rate on the \$21 million.

The Auditor-General states quite frankly that, based on recent years, the Woods and Forests Department would need to borrow funds to make the dividend payment, but this is not a recommended course of action. In other words, he said that it should not do it this way as it was not making a cash profit, that it was making a profit only because of the revaluation of the forest asset. In fact, another of the Auditor-General's recommendations is that the two organisations should be merged, and that is in order to try to stop the Government and the Treasurer from hiding the true facts in respect of what is happening with the South Australian Timber Corporation. I believe it is a scandal of the greatest proportions that the Auditor-General's Reports and findings since 1984 have been totally ignored by the Government and the facts kept hidden from the public.

Next we turn to the ministerial statement delivered to the House last week. It makes pretty interesting reading. The Minister first claims that the statement has been extracted from draft accounts, subject to the Auditor-General's fine auditing. He expects us to believe it, but we are not quite as foolish as was the Government when it believed the unaudited accounts of the New Zealand timber company when Cabinet made the decision to purchase that company and was, quite honestly, taken to the cleaners. These unaudited financial accounts must be taken with a grain of salt.

It is rather interesting to note the claim that Satco has a consolidated profit of \$1.498 million. That is incorrect, because \$2.8 million of interest should be paid on the equity that SAFA has converted from the South Australian Timber Corporation—but that is hidden in the Woods and Forests Department's accounts. The Woods and Forests Department will have to borrow the funds to pay SAFA to keep that side of the deal. So, we do not get a \$1.5 million profit in round figures, but we get a \$1.3 million loss—

The Hon. H. Allison: If you're honest.

Mr D.S. BAKER: If you're honest. But the Government has never been honest about this whole South Australian Timber Corporation performance. We have asked many times that it be cleaned up, but nothing has been done.

The Hon. H. Allison: SAFA would have a notional debt of about \$50 million.

Mr D.S. BAKER: The member for Mount Gambier is right: there is a notional debt at present of about \$50 million in the South Australian Timber Corporation, and Scrimber has yet to get off the ground. It is noted that IPL (NZ) has supposedly—according to the ministerial statement—had a trading profit of \$55 000. However, once you take into account the dividends appropriated out of it—which are interest on shareholders' funds—it then transfers to a deficit. There is not a profit in the New Zealand timber company, but a deficit. The Minister is trying to con this House that he is trading at a profit.

The Hon. H. Allison: Do you think these accounts will be qualified by the Auditor-General?

Mr D.S. BAKER: I would think that seeing the Auditor-General has qualified the accounts of the South Australia

Timber Corporation, all bar the one Mount Gambier trading trust, I am sure that he would be qualifying it again. He then says that the New Zealand timber company will soon be able to pay out the preferential shares but, in the next line, he states that the arrangements are in place to meet the financial requirements of IPL (NZ) for up to the next three years. What will happen to the interest on those funds? Will that be forgiven again? Where will the interest show up? In all of those subsidiary holdings, nowhere have the South Australia Timber Corporation's interests been considered. Apart from that, \$2.8 million worth of interest is hidden in the equity provided by SAFA in the Woods and Forests Department. That will have to be funded out of that department. This document is the greatest sham ever put before this House. It is totally incorrect, and it misleads the true trading facts of the South Australia Timber Corporation.

One of the competitors in the South-East is Softwood Holdings (CSR), which trades in the South-East in the same terms and conditions as the South Australian Timber Corporation. It is interesting to see how it trades. That would be a fair and reasonable way to assess the performance of the corporation.

Softwood Holdings pre-tax profit grew from \$16.3 million to \$35.1 million last year. That is double. It made \$35 million profit, including interest costs, servicing costs and developmental costs. That difference indicates what we have been saying all along. Softwood Holdings' turnover grew very mildly in the past 12 months, but the profit increased dramatically because these are boom times for the timber industry. The timber industry has never gone through better times, but the South Australian Timber Corporation, of course, cannot manage to get a profit from its operations.

We were told by the Minister that he would fix this by 30 June last year. Is Mr Sanderson still employed in the South Australian Timber Corporation—the man who advised it to go into the New Zealand operation, the man that we showed had shares in the New Zealand operation? We have not heard about that from the Minister. Has Mr Higginson reported to the Minister about what will happen? Will there be any more rationalisation? None of these questions has been answered. It is interesting to note that not once have the directors of the South Australian Timber Corporation, or the Government, listened to the advice nor carried out the recommendations of the Auditor-General, who has been advising them to take action for the past some five years. The directors have continually tried to hide the true facts.

Today, in reply to a Dorothy Dix question, we were told all about the money that has been lost in the South-East through the effect of the Sirex wood wasp on the timber industry. I notice this has not shown up in the Softwood CSR annual accounts. It must be a pretty selective wood wasp, since it only looks after those people in the South Australian Timber Corporation. It is about time the Government gave us the facts about the South Australian Timber Corporation and did something about it. It is an absolute disgrace that, notionally, \$50 million of taxpayers' funds are at risk and absolutely nothing is being done about it. In fact, the Government is trying to hide the true results by hiving some of it off to the Woods and Forests Department.

The Hon. H. Allison: Writing off the debt transfer.

Mr D.S. BAKER: That is exactly right. In anyone's terms this is a scandal, and I contend that it is just another blunder by Klunder.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): As is traditional, the Opposition supports this Supply Bill. In relation to newspaper headlines speculating about an early election—

23 September and the like—fuelled by the Premier's attendance at the PSA conference just over a fortnight ago, it will be interesting to see whether, in fact, the Parliament has the opportunity to debate the budget proposals in full, before going to the polls, or whether the Premier will carbon copy John Cain, as he did in 1985; drop the budget on the table and then run to the polls immediately after, but before any scrutiny of the budget and before the Auditor-General has had an opportunity to present his report to the Parliament. However, time will tell what the position will be.

Mr Speaker, with this Supply Bill, and the first passed in the last session, the House will be approving about a third of total appropriations for this financial year. In addition, we have already been informed about some of the revenue side of the budget for this financial year in the Premier's statement last Tuesday. We have also been informed of some revenue issues in terms of stamp duty, land tax and payroll tax. The Premier's statement last Tuesday sought to give the impression that he has been a fair taxer—even a low taxer—to fund the level of appropriations now before the House. As this may be the last opportunity to do so, I put this matter in proper perspective by looking at some of the revenue decisions to fund the spending we are now asked to approve.

Last week's revenue announcement by the Premier means that, since he came to office, he has increased collections from State taxation to just over 155 per cent. This represents a real increase of 93 per cent. In the same period, average weekly ordinary time earnings in South Australia have risen by 51.2 per cent. In other words, the average wage movement in South Australia while this Government has been in office has fallen almost 104 per cent behind the movement in tax revenue. The Government has expected individuals, families and businesses to accept a level of restraint it has not been prepared to impose on itself. The impact of this on living standards also can be demonstrated by an analysis of per capita State taxation. When this Government came to office, the level of per capita State taxation meant it was the equivalent of 11.1 per cent of the weekly earnings of the average family. Now it is 16 per cent.

The Premier's constant claims that South Australia is a low tax State also ignores the fact that there have been some significant shifts since he came to office. In 1982, annual State taxation in South Australia was \$25.48 per head less than in Queensland. Today, South Australians are paying \$111.28 per head more in State taxation than Queenslanders. We are also closing the gap on the States which traditionally have been the highest taxers. In 1982, our per capita State taxation was 70.1 per cent of Victoria's. Now it is 76 per cent. I turn now to State charges. ABS figures show that only Melbourne has had a bigger rise than Adelaide in growth in State charges since the election of this Government. We have had the highest rise in public transport fares, and I will say more about this in a moment. We have Australia's second highest electricity tariffs. And, according to a recent report published by the Industries Assistance Commission, this is because ETSA's productivity has declined in recent years. This has occurred because the Government allows union officials to dictate trust policies on work practices and other labour-related issues.

Union officials are also forcing additional costs on the trust through their refusal to allow the Victorian interconnection to be used for base load power on a permanent basis. This means that a third unit will be completed at Port Augusta long before it is needed, at further unnecessary capital cost to South Australian power consumers. Under this Government there has been a real increase of 17 per cent in the average household's electricity bill. For that other

essential, water, the price per kilolitre has gone up 125 per cent under this Government, or a real 63 per cent. This Government's fiction that the average water bill will rise by 45c a week this financial year is the invention of someone whose calculator is obviously malfunctioning. Massive rises in property valuations, movements well in excess of those indicated by actual property sales, mean that this is another example of taxation by stealth.

In debating the revenue side of the budget, this Government often makes comparisons with the former Liberal Government. For example, the Minister of Transport was at it last week, trying to excuse the fact that this Government has done nothing to improve the efficiency of the STA as recommended by the Fielding report and to keep the lid on fares. Last Wednesday, he told the House that the former Government had increased the two zone public transport fare by '100 per cent over the rate of inflation'. It is no wonder South Australians have been taxed and charged so much when senior Ministers cannot honestly make such basic calculations. The two zone fare did not even rise by 100 per cent in money terms under the last Liberal Government. The actual rise was 75 per cent and the real rise was about half of that amount. Under this Government, the rise has been 171 per cent—from 70c to \$1.90. That is a real rise of about 109 per cent.

The Premier makes much of public sector indebtedness. In fact, it has not reduced at all in real terms since his Government took office. His massive increases in revenue collections from taxes and charges have not been applied to making any significant reduction in the public sector debt. I compare this with the record of the last Liberal Government which, in three years, reduced the debt by a real \$275 million at the same time as reducing State taxation to the lowest level per capita in Australia. Our real 3.8 per cent reduction in State tax collections compares with this Government's real increase of 93 per cent. In other words, our record was almost 100 per cent better than this Government's record. Despite this record, the Premier continues to claim that he has been beset for seven years with the problem of paying off a \$63 million accumulated budget deficit.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: The Premier currently is fond of ignoring history when it does not help him. In fact, I have previously produced to the House documentation—

Mr Rann interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: The member for fabrications is at it again. He is the only guy we have known about who has been able to take the front page from a document stamped 'confidential' and distribute it around the place. That is the sort of tactic and antic that the member for Briggs is up to. If we talked about honesty in actions, he would be about the last member in this House to talk about any honest actions of any individual.

I have previously produced to the House documentation to prove that the deficit blowout in the 1982-83 financial year (and I hope that the member for Newland listens to this) was due in the main to lax administration by this Government. The day before the 1982 election was called, the former Government received written advice from the Treasury that its proposed election commitments would leave an accumulated deficit on the Consolidated Account by 30 June 1983 of \$19 million with a continuation of the control that was applied before over Government outlays that was a manageable deficit which had been turned around in a relatively short time. However, this Government, immediately on coming to office, took off the controls on spending. Ministers failed to manage. This was illustrated

by a minute from the Premier to all Ministers in February 1983. He told them:

It is disturbing that some agencies appear to have adopted interpretations of the Government's policies and acted on them without specific Cabinet authorisation. This has already led to unauthorised cost overruns and further difficulties are likely unless a consistent approach is followed.

That was in a minute from the Premier in February indicating that budget determinations of the previous Government were out of control and that Ministers were no longer controlling expenditure of departments. In fact, by the end of the 1982-83 financial year, Government departments had overspent their budget allocations by \$23.2 million. That accounted for 34.6 per cent of the recurrent deficit as at 30 June. Another \$15.8 million, or 23.6 per cent, was due to the unavoidable cost of the drought, bushfires and floods, while \$17.5 million, or 26 per cent, was paid for salary and wage increases during that period.

The Premier continued to insist that the former Government left him with a massive debt, but what does he mean? Does he mean that the last Liberal Government should have foreseen the tragic Ash Wednesday bushfires that occurred three months after we left office or that we should have refused to pay public servants increases determined by industrial tribunals? One thing is certain: it would not have taken a Liberal Government seven years to turn around the situation.

The Premier should remember one other point. After those bushfires, in a bipartisan gesture, I offered the support of the Liberal Party and the Opposition in this House for revenue-raising measures sufficient to cover the cost to the Government of the Ash Wednesday bushfires. Of course, as is the Premier's wont, that was distorted to claim that my Party was in favour of higher taxes for general expansion of Government activities. That was the press release the Premier put out, despite the fact that I said that it was an extraordinary cost and there was a legitimate basis for recouping those costs to Government. It is something to which we on this side of the House have become accustomed whenever the Premier deals with the State's finances.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Misrepresentation.

Mr OLSEN: Yes, total misrepresentation and lack of honesty. He is as careless with the truth as his Government has been with the hard-earned money of South Australians. That attitude has flowed over and affected his Ministers.

Last Thursday the Minister of Forests made a statement implying that all was now well with the South Australian Timber Corporation. What he omitted to tell the House was that the corporation was carrying accumulated losses of almost \$16.8 million. More importantly, the Government decided to convert a \$21 million loan to equity. This new term 'non-interest bearing equity' is a new creative accounting term which means that one gets all the money for nothing and pays no interest on it. I can imagine that a few business operators out there would like to have their overdrafts or capital at no interest cost. They would turn in some sort of profit at the end of the year if they were able to do that.

The Government's decision saved the corporation about \$2.8 million in interest repayments. With the stroke of a pen the Government wiped off the debt. Without that the trading profit of almost \$1.5 million announced by the Minister last Thursday becomes an operating deficit of more than \$1.3 million. As is the wont of this Government, it does not worry about the truth but gets the headline, setting a perception. It does not worry about reality. It is a case of getting up the perception for the mob and worrying about reality later.

The Premier last Thursday became so euphoric about the \$41 000 profit of the Grand Prix that his enthusiasm prompted the *News* to refer to it on page one. He got away with it and got it up front. What he did not say in the pre-release of the report to be tabled in Parliament was that the profit was created by a change in the depreciation provisions, without which the operating results would have been in the red to the tune of more than \$500 000. That is a loss of \$500 000 instead of a profit of \$41 000.

Mr D.S. Baker: Creative accounting again.

Mr OLSEN: Well, in business if people did that they would have the Tax Commissioner on to them and they would be charged. People are charged if they change their accounting rules, because one fundamental in accountancy is consistency of interpretation and presentation. That is one thing of which this Government could not be accused—consistency of presentation of its budget papers. It changes every year. We know the objective. The \$41 000 profit would have been a \$500 000 deficit. It is important to put it in its proper perspective. We recognise that the Grand Prix in Adelaide is an event of which most Adelaideans are proud. I do not take credit from the organisational skills of the board; in fact, I have praised them on many occasions. However, one cannot manufacture documents such as that. It is for the quick grab, the quick headline, to set a perception, to push on and to hope that any problems will be dissipated.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Are you suggesting that it was fabricated?

Mr OLSEN: There is absolutely no doubt that this Government fabricates many things for the purposes of public consumption. The Premier has no cause to exaggerate the board's financial results for pure electioneering reasons. Tickets for general admission and sales of seats declined by \$1.2 million for the 1988 race, and this was the first time that there had been a dip in sales. I am informed that ticket sales this year have again been somewhat slow. I hope that the event will continue to be an affordable attraction for South Australians, as well as attracting people from other States and overseas, but I stress that the escalation of ticket prices means that South Australians will be priced out of the event.

Mr Rann: This is more knocking.

Mr OLSEN: The honourable member could not think of anything original to say, so he resorts to that sort of comment. If he cannot do better than that, he ought to go back to journalism and his misrepresentations for public consumption. Let us not pretend, as the Premier seems to suggest, that achieving this will be all plain sailing.

I have put to the House today issues of concern to my Party and to South Australians. I have put some historic matters into their proper perspective, because it may well be the last opportunity in this Parliament to raise such matters.

Ms Gayler: We haven't heard anything about a policy.

Mr OLSEN: The member for Newland, in her ignorance, obviously has not read a newspaper over the past 12 months or been doorknocking in Newland. She is certainly a little nervous, and I suggest that the oncer for Newland ought to be looking for other opportunities for the future. I have no doubt that the policy direction of the Government will be judged appropriately by the people at the next election. As usual, the Opposition supports the Bill before the house.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I move:

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

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I draw to the attention of members a matter of concern that currently prevails in the fishing industry. It involves the recent replacement masters policy. Before I talk in detail about that subject, I inform those members who have never been within the boundaries of Alexandra that, geographically divided into two areas, the electorate encompasses Kangaroo Island and Fleurieu Peninsula. It has more kilometres of coastline than any other electorate in the State.

Mr Meier: Have you measured it?

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: The Lands Department has, with its chronometer.

Mr Meier: I reckon Goyder would have more.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: It is not in the hunt. The honourable member is seeking a claim to fame in that respect, but I invite him to go to the Lands Department and get a chronometer, which will show that the boundary of skinny little Yorke Peninsula represents the distance of only a little over that of Kangaroo Island, without the distance of the Fleurieu Peninsula coastline extending from Noarlunga to the Murray mouth.

Be that as it may, I will take up that matter with him at some later stage. The situation is that there are some very significant ports around the natural boundary of Alexandra, and with the great fishery resources existing in those waters form very important fishing industry activities occur. It is on behalf of those fishermen, in particular, that I raise their reaction to the cited policy.

We all know how the Fisheries Act has been added to over the years, and we have now reached a point where, together with the regulations, the legislation is almost at the stage of drowning those people that it purports to look after, advise, regulate, and so on. The regulations have become quite suffocating in many respects. At this stage I will not proceed with comments on the Fisheries Act generally but I want to draw attention to a paper produced by the Department of Fisheries on the matter of a notice to holders of marine scale fishery licences expiring on 30 June 1989. Typically, this Department of Fisheries notice does not carry a date on the front. Under the signature of the Director of Fisheries, Mr R. K. Lewis, the date is shown as '1/VII/89'. Under the subheading 'Replacement masters', the following information is provided:

Following extensive discussions with industry and department enforcement officers, the Director of Fisheries has advised that there will no longer be provision for the use of a replacement master in the marine scalefish fishery, except upon application to the Director of Fisheries for exceptional circumstances. Any request should be made in advance of the period sought and accompanied by a doctor's certificate specifying the period and nature of the illness or incapacity.

I can understand the ire of fishermen when that matter was first drawn to their attention and when subsequently they found that, at least initially, the Fishing Industry Council, which sets itself up as an authority to act on their behalf, was, if not wholly, indeed partly, in bed with the Minister and the Government on this proposal.

The Opposition recognises that, under the Fisheries Act of South Australia, there is provision for certain authorities to be vested in the Director of Fisheries and that, in many cases, these authorities pertain to quite historical elements of the Act. It is not so historic for directors to use, or indeed abuse, their authority by exercising the powers that are there in writing. However, the current Director appears to have done just that—when he says, in relation to a replacement master:

Any request should be made in advance of the period sought and accompanied by a doctor's certificate specifying the period and nature of the illness or incapacity.

How ridiculous can you get! What happens, for example, if a fisherman at Cape Jervis—in my electorate—wakes up in the morning with a dose of this Asian or Indonesian flu that is floating around at the moment and he is as crook as a cat and cannot go fishing? It might be a good day, the fish might have been biting the day before and it might be a good time to make a quid. This fisherman cannot go to sea himself, but in these circumstances he cannot ring a mate, as has traditionally been the case in the industry, and arrange for him to take out the boat, or his own boat, as a replacement. The fisherman has to go and get a doctor's certificate. The doctor nearest to Cape Jervis is at Yankalilla, and if he is not available one must go to Victor Harbor. The fisherman then has to get the doctor's certificate and his application up to the department—but by that time the fish could be off the bite or the sun could be overhead at midday and the job would be over.

I put it to the House that the exercise of that authority in recent times by the Director of Fisheries is quite irresponsible, and it is unacceptable to the fishermen in my electorate generally. This relates particularly to the area that I referred to by way of example. I went to the trouble of inviting the fishermen at Cape Jervis to get together and have a talk about the matter and to advise me of their feelings. I can assure members that their feelings are consistent with those which I reported.

This Director of Fisheries—and again I will name him—Mr R.K. Lewis, is a bit of a Johnny-come-lately. He has just come onto the scene, but he does not appear to be very popular or competent, either. In his letter in which he advises or instructs the industry of his decision, he notes that he has had extensive discussions with industry and departmental enforcement officers. He may well have had extensive discussion with departmental officers—that matter is not in dispute, because I do not know whether or not that is the case and I accept what he has said in that regard—but, from information supplied to me by fishermen in my electorate, it is clear that he has not had extensive discussions with them. Only recently Mr Peterson, the fellow who is now set up in plush offices in Walkerville Terrace and who purports to represent the fishermen under the banner of the South Australian Fishing Industry Council (SAFIC), appears to have finally recognised the anomalies, inconsistencies, irregularities and unreasonableness of this departmental decision. It has finally agreed with its members, the fishermen, that the decision is unacceptable and too inflexible.

It is unfortunate that I do not have sufficient time to expand further on this matter, but I draw one other issue to the notice of the House. I will address this topic in much more detail at a later date, but it involves the same department and officer that I have mentioned several times in the past few minutes. Since he was a little boy, a young Kangaroo Island fisherman has gone fishing with his mother and other members of his family. Upon deciding to become a professional fisherman, he attempted to purchase a licence, as was his right under the scale fishery rules. He paid for that licence, lodged his application for transfer and had it refused by the department because he was considered not to be a fit and proper person. I will not go into the details at this stage, but at the time it was only assumed he would be convicted of an offence that he had allegedly committed, that is, sold fish without a proper licence to do so.

One would expect that under those circumstances the empire's decision would be accepted. Under the direction of this Mr Lewis, the new departmental Director, the Department of Fisheries was represented at court. Of course, this young lad, who was unable to represent himself, engaged

a solicitor. The case was heard, but he lost and was fined without a conviction being recorded, thus destroying the Director's case of the fisherman's not being a fit and proper person. This is only rumour, but I understand that this Mr Lewis, because he will not accept the judge's decision, intends to lodge an appeal against the judgment. I understand that that matter is with the Minister. If that is the case, I guarantee that this subject will be addressed in more detail at the very earliest opportunity. It is a disgrace!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The member for Briggs prompted me to give him an honourable mention at the start of my contribution, because of the question he raised in the House today. His remarks suggested that it was something out of the ordinary to ask the Minister of Mines and Energy whether or not the Government anticipated building a uranium enrichment facility in South Australia. We all recall vividly that the member for Briggs was the leader of the ratpack whose main function it was to disseminate incorrect information to the public of South Australia during the nuclear debate in earlier days.

The member for Briggs is well known for this type of activity. He vehemently opposed any uranium developments in this State and used every trick in the book to stop them. There was no surprise to anybody when he got up this afternoon and asked his silly question about the attitude of the Labor Government to uranium enrichment. Unfortunately, the member for Briggs is not on the same wavelength as some of the more intelligent members of the Federal Labor Cabinet—Senator Button and Senator Walsh, or the Federal Minister for the Environment, the redoubtable Senator Graham Richardson—who advocate a relook at the nuclear option. These people have long held the view that uranium will supply a sizeable part of the world's energy in future. The Prime Minister made no secret, before his entry to the Federal Parliament, of his support for nuclear energy. He has not changed his view; he has simply had to accommodate the views of the loony Left and types like the member for Briggs who have closed minds and demonstrate no intelligence on this question.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He was well named the fabricator. He was the peddler of propaganda during the earlier debates on uranium. He would say anything to stop this terrible industry from going ahead, particularly the terrible Roxby Downs project. He was the leader of the ratpack and certainly the prime mover in terms of spreading misinformation, doctoring reports, and using every trick in the book to defeat any moves to develop or process any uranium resources in this State.

History is repeating itself with his present antics. He will use any trick in the book to stop a uranium enrichment facility from coming to this State. I repeat, for his benefit and that of others whom we told in the late 1970s and early 1980s, that uranium enrichment is probably the safest part of the nuclear fuel cycle, particularly the centrifuge method which was developed by Urenco-Centec, a group with which South Australia has had detailed negotiations over many years stretching back to the middle 1970s when Premier Dunstan was all fired up to have a nuclear industry in South Australia, including a uranium enrichment facility. That Administration opened up the negotiations, until the loony Left beat him. Premier Dunstan was overseas with several of his leading advisers, including Guerin and Ben Dickinson. However, while he was away, the then leader of the loony Left, the Hon. Peter Duncan, now a Federal

Minister, was busy subverting him in South Australia. He had a phone call and they had to doctor some reports.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: They did doctor some reports, as Ben Dickinson—later Sir Ben—could display to us clearly when we came to government. The then leader of the ratpack, who was actively involved in doctoring reports about uranium enrichment, was none other than our friend, the propagandist from Briggs. Therefore, it is no surprise that he should ask this loony question today: does the Government intend to establish a uranium enrichment facility? The next point would be, 'If the Liberals come to power, it will be built next to your backyard; your kids will be poisoned with uranium excrement,' and so on. We have been through it all before.

We remember all the hoo-ha about uranium transport and nuclear-free zones. What happened to all the hoo-ha about nuclear-free zones through which no nuclear material was allowed to pass? The Government managed to find a few fellow travellers in local government to declare some municipalities and districts nuclear-free. How absurd!

The Hon. H. Allison: The sun is our biggest nuclear reactor.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course it is: the source of all our prime energy. So, up gets the honourable member today and asks his dopey question. I refer him to one of his brother conservation groups, although I hardly like to associate him with conservation groups, because it gives them a bad name. Last week I spoke in this House about a very sensible article by Jacque Gillen in a local government publication. Incidentally, I took the trouble of sending her a copy of my remarks. I really do not like to damn these environmental groups by associating the member for Briggs with any of them.

Nonetheless, I draw his attention to an article which was sent, I understand, to all members. The article, in the 6 June 1989 edition of the newsletter from the Uranium Information Centre, is headed 'Nuclear energy and the environment: time to think again'. This is a direct quote from the leading environmental group in the United States. Although time will preclude me from reading much of this article, in part it reads as follows:

The following article appeared under the above heading as an editorial in the October 1988 issue of the respected American magazine *Environment*. It was written by William C. Clark, one of the magazine's three executive editors and is reproduced here with his permission.

I quote briefly, as follows:

The time has come for a new look at the possibility that nuclear energy may have a role to play in strategies for environmentally sustainable development. Barely two years ago, the cloud from Chernobyl had reduced the attractiveness of nuclear options to an all-time low. Since then, however, events have led to increasing concern about the role of fossil fuel combustion in damaging human health, forests, and the climate. Moreover, as recent issues of *Environment* show, every significant source of energy services now available—whether it originates in efficiency improvements, hydroelectric dams, biomass, fossil fuels, or nuclear fission—has produced its share of problems and surprises. The brownouts that have plagued parts of Europe, America, the Soviet Union, and many developing countries over the last two years are relatively gentle warnings that the development and deployment of new sources of energy cannot be postponed indefinitely without serious economic consequences.

As a result, a number of environmental leaders, politicians and scientists have begun to think again about the circumstances under which nuclear power might be part of an energy strategy for environmentally sustainable development. During this summer, such reconsiderations have been proposed in a report by the Inter-Action Council of Former Heads of Government, a declaration by the International Conference on the Changing Atmosphere and a number of Bills tabled in the US Congress.

I suggest that the honourable member read all of that. I point out that, as far as mining at Roxby Downs is concerned, the nuclear cycle is universally accepted and applauded by most of South Australia.

The Labor Party has taken this so much to its bosom that it now claims Roxby Downs as its project. So, the member for Briggs lost that round. His Party claims and loves this wonderful development at Roxby—so he has been done. It accepts that nuclear energy is part of the energy make-up essential to world development. You cannot use uranium for peaceful purposes without enriching it. To suggest that you can mine uranium but it will not be enriched is absurd.

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

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

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Recently I interviewed a number of small business persons in my electorate. I was particularly interested to learn of the impact of interest rates, amongst other things, on small business generally. As most members of this House would know, I represent a semi-rural electorate and most of the interviews were carried out in areas such as Mount Barker, which is a fairly typical area employing a number of people in small business. I was interested to learn from the latest edition of the *Business Council Bulletin*, issued in May 1989, that 732 400 enterprises in Australia currently employ 6 883 900 persons. Small enterprises, defined here as those employing fewer than 20 persons, comprise 95 per cent of the total number, employ 44 per cent of the work force in the non-agriculture private sector and produce about 30 per cent of private sector output. So, small businesses are a vital component of our economy, both in their own right and in providing input into larger enterprises.

I was interested to learn from those people involved in small business what were their concerns—obviously, high interest rates was very high on the list. One could expect that these people would be concerned about a situation where 12 months ago they were probably paying 14 per cent and are now probably paying between 19 and 23 per cent. While we may look at the increase being in the order of five or six points, in many cases that represents a 40 per cent to 50 per cent increase in interest rates paid by those people. However, it was only after talking with small business people that I realised the extent of their problems, which include payroll tax, land tax, WorkCover, licensing, Government charges generally, regulations, stamp duty—and one could go on. That total lack of incentive to employ is of particular concern to me.

We are now in a situation where we are continually reminded of the difficulties faced by those who are unemployed—young people and older people alike—and it is of particular concern that these people who could and would employ more people if they were able are finding that it is virtually impossible to take on more staff for the reasons that I have mentioned. It is a great pity that that is the case, because the health of the small enterprise sector is vital to the health of this State and of this country. This is because of its ability to generate employment; and its efficiency is important for the performance of larger enterprise.

While small business is still relatively more important in this country than it is in some other countries overseas, recent data seem to suggest that small business is not growing as rapidly here as in the United States, for example. I reiterate that encouraging growth in small business is important for employment growth and a dynamic economy, and it is a great pity that more incentive is not provided so that

small business in this State is able to employ. I will also refer to the problems created by unemployment.

I recently received a copy of a letter from a constituent who lives in Mount Barker. The letter is addressed to the manager of an office of the Department of Social Security. The letter states:

Ever since I became redundant in 1988 I have done everything in my power to obtain employment, and have endeavoured to fulfil every criterion of your office, and more. It is felt that it is impossible to do any more than I am doing at present and, in fact, not possible to continue to do as much as I am doing in the future.

For my own personal pride and financial need, I shall continue to try to find a job, but I wish to officially lodge my feelings as to the injustice of at my age having to fulfil the same criterion of finding employment as a 20 year-old.

On 13 May last, I attained the age of 60. Reaching this milestone now further reduces my possibility of obtaining employment.

During my unemployment I have applied for hundreds of jobs by personal application, interview, letters of application etc., I have had interviews, and, in two cases obtained the position, only to have it cancelled because of the economic situation.

The writer goes on to say that recently he has become very ill and in seeking a medical certificate was informed that most of his medical problems were as a result of stress. The constituent goes on to explain that, unfortunately, the added stress has not helped his health. Being under constant medication to control blood pressure has increased his health problems. The letter goes on:

There are no local employment opportunities in Mount Barker for the likes of me. It is impossible to keep asking the same few employers for a job that is not available. It is dreadfully embarrassing to have to do this for anyone. Not only is there no full time work but there is no part-time work, either.

As a result of reading that letter, I can see that the more senior people in our community are experiencing considerable difficulties with the criteria expected of them if they are to obtain financial benefits from the Government.

I realise that there is much debate about the subject at present. I personally support work being provided to young people who are on the dole, because it gives them a sense of purpose—it gives them a sense of satisfaction to be able to achieve something and receive a financial reward for their work. I understand fully the frustrations experienced in that area. However, for older people, such as the person to whom I have just referred, who is 60 years old, it is an extremely difficult situation. To work all one's life in a country town and find oneself out of work, with no transport to the city, and no local work available is a real problem to a large number of people.

I also wish to speak briefly about the lack of productivity in this country. The Oxford Dictionary describes 'productivity' as the 'capacity to produce.' We certainly have the capacity to produce in this country—but we do not. Until people stop talking about fiscal policies, budget surpluses and foreign debt and so on, and recognise the importance of productivity and everyone doing a good day's work for a good day's pay, Australia and this State will continue to have the economic problems that we are now experiencing.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Earlier today in the course of my remarks on another matter, I drew attention to the way in which this Government seems to be unable to come to terms with its responsibilities to all South Australians, particularly those South Australians whom I represent—the people in small country communities. I made the point that it was unfortunate that the Government had chosen to spend unwisely and unnecessarily far greater amounts of money than was really necessary on providing welfare housing for people on a unit by unit basis.

I drew attention to the fact that some of the dwellings that had been constructed, for instance, here in the very centre of the metropolitan area of Adelaide had cost three, four or up to five times more than it needed to cost to establish a very commodious and comfortable dwelling suitable for welfare recipients in the communities that I represent, where it would have been to the benefit not only of the welfare recipients and the members of their families but also to the communities involved.

I made one miscalculation which was immediately drawn to my attention by the member for Price, who pointed out that instead of \$200 000 it was about \$50 000 a housing unit in Port Adelaide as being the approximate average cost for housing constructed in the course of the Port Adelaide reconstruction project over the past nine years. I thank the member for Price for drawing my attention to that. However, I also make the point that it has been a profligate expense undertaken by both the Housing Trust and the Minister, instigated more for political reasons than for reasons of genuine compassion to meet the needs of people. No one can deny the truth of that assertion on my part.

I now wish to turn my attention and the attention of the House to some background on a matter of grave concern to me since well before I entered this place. When I was living at Athelstone I was very distressed at the way in which I saw the hills face zone, particularly Black Hill Native Flora Park, being abused by people using it for recreational activities for which it was ill suited, that is, by people riding trail bikes up and down the steep slopes of those hills in the hills face zone and causing erosion.

People used gum trees—blue gums, white gums and red gums—as butts for their targets. They took their firearms into the gulleys of the foothills, nailed targets to trees and simply sat down for some target practice. The resulting impact on the trees was fairly unsightly, to say the least. This activity was inappropriate for people to be pursuing in a national park, and there were other ways in which my sense of appropriate behaviour was outraged.

I am not antagonistic to people who wish to own firearms—I never have been. I am not antagonistic to those who wish to ride trail bikes—I never have been. My concern is that activities are done in a responsible way. Having drawn public attention to that as an ordinary and responsible citizen, I continued to use the same basic value in making my judgments about a sense of the appropriate or otherwise. For instance, for many years I had known that the proposal of the Dunstan Government of the 1970s to establish a petrochemical plant at Redcliff was ill advised because I had intimate knowledge of the ecosystems, their delicate nature and the risk posed to them by that kind of development in that location.

Red Cliff is adjacent to Chinamans Creek and, without going into detail, which can now be found in the budget Estimates debate of October 1979 where I first expressed in this place (from the seat now occupied by the member for Fisher) my opposition of such an ill-advised plan. I pointed out that we did not need the project in that location anyway. It was altogether too dangerous. The risk to those ecosystems was far greater than either the proponents or the Government had been prepared to admit. I have continued to make plain that I believe in the desirability of retaining, for aesthetic as well as genetic reasons, sufficient amounts of our natural environment, whether aquatic (fresh or salt water), dry land (desert or semi-arid), rain fed or mountainous. We must be cognisant of the need to retain sufficient areas of each of those ecosystems to ensure their survival in perpetuity, no matter where they are.

There are well researched and documented means by which we can determine how much of each ecosystem in each location must be retained to ensure the prospective survival of the species with that ecosystem in perpetuity, notwithstanding that no species on this earth, including homosapiens, is entitled to regard itself—and I do not think that any other species should be credited with sufficient intelligence—as being entitled to think that it will be in existence in perpetuity. All species will pass into oblivion sooner or later: it is not a matter of if but when. There will be disasters beyond the control or prediction capacity of even homosapiens.

Lumps of junk flying around the solar system (call them what you like—comets or meteorites) will sooner or later produce the kind of destructive impact that will result in the mass destruction of many species of mammals, the higher animals which cannot survive what is described effectively as a nuclear winter. If we were to explode several nuclear devices in the ill-advised course of conflict, we would produce that scenario where the sun would be blotted out for so long that temperatures on the surface of the earth would fall to a point where life upon which we depend for the sustenance of our species would simply die out as would we with it. That would not take many days. Heat loss would be the most important and significant factor in all that. I will not pursue that now. I place it on the record as background information for members so that they know where I am coming from.

I believe that Arbor Day should be reintroduced. Minister Hudson despatched that day into the history books, whilst Minister Allison returned it as an option in the curriculum in schools. This Government has retained it to this point, but it should be returned as a compulsory part of the curriculum to draw the attention of children to the necessity for respect for life forms other than their own and those of species with which they identify easily, namely, pets.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: Are you saying that they do not have that now?

Mr LEWIS: They probably do not have it as well as the honourable member and I might like, given our awareness of the fragility of the infrastructure of life as we know it. The stupidity and hypocrisy of the present situation is that we are compelling farmers at their own expense to retain native vegetation on their farms without giving them reasonable compensation for so doing and, regrettably, at the same time, we still endorse the continued abuse of the environment by allowing the existence of effluent treatment ponds for evaporation purposes within 20 feet of the reservoir of water in the Lower Murray, from which Adelaide is supplied with water. The E&WS Department has its common effluent disposal evaporation ponds on the flood plain only 20 feet from the river, south of Murray Bridge. The Government argues that, if farmers are allowed to continue clearing their vegetation, they will contribute to an increase in the salt load but that the E and WS Department's practices cannot contribute. How stupid!

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Robertson): Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The member for Mount Gambier.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I should like to raise an issue relating to the urgency for providing easier and safer slipway facilities at the Port MacDonnell fishing harbor and safer facilities in the form of a landing ramp or jetty at Carpenter Rocks.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: There is a breakwater there; fair go!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I point out to the honourable member that the breakwater is one of the factors contributing to the increasing silting at Port MacDonnell. Grateful as we are for the breakwater, getting boats in and out of the water, in order to bring in essential export revenue for South Australia and Australia, is of primary importance.

The Port MacDonnell and Carpenter Rocks fishing fleets are the most southerly on the South Australian mainland. They experience the worst weather because they lie full in the track of the westerly wind systems. The Port MacDonnell fishing fleet is the largest in South Australia, with 70 boats operating crayfishing. The fleet has been reduced over the past decade from 100 boats to 70. The fishermen have a reputation for pioneering the crayfishing industry some 40 or 50 years ago. They are intrepid fishermen and are worthy of better facilities than they have at present. The ideal position would be to provide a mobile straddle boat lift, such as those provided in the district of Victoria at Beachport and Robe.

The Port MacDonnell slipway is a simple concrete ramp that leads down to increasingly silted water. It is extremely difficult to get boats in and out of the water, particularly at low tide. No dredging facility exists, other than a tractor with a dredge on it, which regularly excavates the sand, only to see the sand move into place once the boat has been taken out of the water. It is an incessant battle against the weather.

The former President of the Port MacDonnell Fishermen's Association, Mr Ron Ollrich, and the current President, Mr Cawthorne, have repeatedly brought this matter to the notice of the Minister of Fisheries and the Department of Marine and Harbors. I urge that money be provided from this year's allocation of funding as a matter of extreme urgency. Last year only \$300 000 was provided to the Department of Marine and Harbors for boathaven work. I understand from departmental officers that this year, \$600 000 may be provided in the budget—that was the required estimate. It is still a relatively small amount, given the needs of all ports in South Australia. I assume that \$300 000 would be used for recreational boating, to provide launching ramps such as the one required at Port MacDonnell, and \$300 000 for the commercial fishing fleet, which generates a tremendous amount of export revenue in South Australia, as do the other cray ports in the South-East.

The Minister has commissioned the Maunsell report, which was handed down in May. I was disappointed that, despite my representation to the Minister and his department, my name was omitted from the circulation list for the Maunsell report. As a result, my copy arrived with a letter from the Director of Marine and Harbors on 25 July (although the report was dated May) after I had solicited it from the Minister of Marine. I do not know whether that was an oversight or deliberate, but it has given me very little time to analyse the report and come up with fair comment.

However, I strongly urge the Minister not to delay any further the implementation of work on behalf of the Port MacDonnell fishermen. I also refer to the needs of the Carpenter Rocks fishermen. The Von Stanke family settled there at least 50 or 60 years ago when Carpenter Rocks was one of the most inaccessible spots on the South-East coast. They established a local crayfishing industry there, and the family has developed quite considerable expertise not only in fishing but in a range of other human endeavours—and this was simply due to the isolation. Currently, there are members of the Von Stanke family who are master mariners and boat builders in their own right. They are also home

builders: initially, members of the Von Stanke family virtually constructed the Carpenter Rocks villages with their own hands. They are engineers, marine and electrical, and the Von Stankes are experienced at plumbing, painting and carpentry. As I have said, they are marine navigators and ship masters in their own right.

They are a very competent group of people who helped pioneer the crayfishing industry. They, too, have been promised improvements to that small sheltered harbour (which has a rocky barrier across the middle of it) for many years, and about three or four years ago I was told that some \$50 000 or \$60 000 would be made available for the construction of a jetty and for simplifying the egress and ingress of the harbour through that small rocky barrier. So far that has not happened, despite a number of surveys and commitments that have been made each year. Therefore, on behalf of the Port MacDonnell fishermen and the Von Stanke family, which pioneered the Carpenter Rocks fisheries, I ask that they, too, be given some urgent consideration in relation to funds being made available from that allocation of \$600 000 which I understand is to be included in the 1989-90 budget.

Another issue that I want to raise in the short time that is left to me in this debate concerns a matter which the Opposition has raised with the Minister of Education. The member for Mitcham (Stephen Baker) pointed out to the Minister of Education that schools in his electorate were being promised money for facsimile machines and cash for computer equipment by a campaigning Labor Party candidate. The honourable member asked the Minister whether this promise would be made to all schools in South Australia. I do not know whether he has received a response to his letter to the Minister of 21 July. However, I wrote to all schools in my electorate asking what commitments had been made. Since then I have been informed by schools that there seems to have been a spate of activity. Most of the schools in my electorate have now been given between \$1 300 and \$1 500 towards a facsimile machine, but have been told not to purchase until advised of what type of machine to acquire. It seems that the Minister in his haste did not call for tenders first. Most of the schools have been given amounts of money ranging from \$6 000 to \$8 500 towards the provision of computer equipment for administration.

However, a couple of schools have written to me. The Mil Lel Primary School Council and the Yahl Primary School have written saying that, while they have been promised a fax machine, they have not received any commitment for funds. They could certainly use the money, because each of the schools has put in an application for a computer accounting system and computer administration equipment, under the former school betterment grant. Is the Minister, in fact, giving more schools an extra grant of money plus the fax machine or is he simply taking money which was formerly allocated to schools under the school betterment program, and saying, 'Here you are; I am promising it to you twice'? Some of the schools appear to have had their school betterment requests redirected from their preferred option into school computer administration equipment. That is an issue I would like the Minister to resolve as a matter of urgency.

Have all schools been promised the fax and the \$6 000 to \$8 000 for computer administration equipment, and is this promise one which removes the school betterment program grants and reallocates them in the form ostensibly of a new program under the initiative of the Minister? Was he caught on the hop by promises made by the Labor Party

candidate, and is this more a source of embarrassment than a genuine generous offer to all schools in South Australia?

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

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Hear, hear!

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): I appreciate that encouragement from one of the members of the next Opposition. I want to continue on from my Address in Reply remarks. Members opposite would be aware of my passion for the environment and how much in our business enterprises we care about that environment. Members opposite would also be aware of how the Liberal Party has shown that the environment is paramount in its policy making. I had to sit here the other night and listen to the drivel from the member for Briggs who made motherhood statements on the environment all round the world. He talked about the environment everywhere else other than in South Australia.

What has happened to our waterways and gulfs in South Australia has really been sacrilege. In fact, the present Government has not done one thing to help the environment. About 140 megalitres of effluent a day pours out of Bolivar into the gulf, causing extreme damage to the seagrasses in the gulf. That discharge of waste also affects the coastline. About 30 megalitres a day is pouring out from Apcel, and that is not Apcel's responsibility but, rather, the Government's. However, no-one in the Government has said a word about that problem, which is destroying one of the largest freshwater lakes in South Australia, all because this Government does not have the guts to act.

It is about time that the member for Briggs stopped making these motherhood statements, because he knows as much about the environment as flying to the moon. We should begin to look after South Australia's environment, because that is what really counts. The Liberal Party has been very vocal about how it will clean up the waterways in this State. One of our recent policies announced a commitment to a wood lotting and tree farming scheme. We have given the people of South Australia a commitment that by the turn of the century no liquid effluent will flow into any waterway, river, lake or gulf in South Australia.

The Government is also doing very little to help the rural environment in this State. The Liberal Party has developed a policy that I believe will help people on the West Coast of South Australia because, if ever there was a group of people who have been forced into bankruptcy by Government policy, it is that group who have been forced into bankruptcy by the lending methods of the Government and by the present Minister of Agriculture, who does not quite understand what agriculture or land degradation is all about.

In relation to the lending program for those South Australian farmers who do suffer drought situations, over the past seven years this Government has said, 'What we will do is sit down and do absolutely nothing when there is a drought or a natural disaster in this State. We will wait and see if anything happens but, after the situation attracts some publicity, we will then come out and say to these people who are in severe financial difficulties, "We will give you some rural reconstruction."'

That is what they did on the West Coast. They did nothing for three years. The previous Minister, Mayes, was more interested in what was going on in his street and, under the Planning Act, putting section 50 onto a genuine organisation to stop it building a church. That is what he did instead of looking after agriculture.

Interest rates on the debts of people on the West Coast started to multiply because they did not have any income

for the three or four years of the drought. Interest on interest was accumulating and it was not long before those people, who had the potential to produce 30 per cent of the State's grain income and to earn more income to maintain the standard of living of people in the city, suddenly became unviable. When it became a big issue in the media, the Government said, 'We will help you. We will design a package which will look after your needs.' But it was too late.

As we have seen with the South Australian Timber Corporation, the Government does not have an inkling of financial expertise. It does not understand the effect of interest on interest. It has said, 'When you get into a disaster situation we will reconstruct you.' That is probably one of the most cynical things that has happened to agriculture in this State. It is crisis management and not understanding the fundamentals.

The Opposition has announced a policy which looks at the problem from a different tack. We will ensure that the crisis into which people have been allowed to get is identified in the first year when there is a cash flow problem. We will get the banks to identify to the Government those farmers in drought affected or disaster areas who have a cash flow problem. We will get the Rural Assistance Branch to address the farmers and say, 'You have a cash flow problem and you need assistance. We will help you in year one with an interest rate subsidy.' We will not wait until they become unviable with interest on interest. We will help them in year one with an interest rate subsidy at the Federal disaster relief rate which is openly acknowledged around Australia. It takes guts for a Government to say that it will help. The Government must say that it will help the farmer and go to the Federal Government and ask for support. However, this Government and Ministry have done nothing.

We will subsidise the interest rate so that interest on interest will not become a problem for the farmer. At the end of the drought or the natural disaster he will therefore be viable, because he will have had a subsidy during that time, and that will enable him to produce again and produce income for the State.

What has gone on is sacrilege. The West Coast problem has been magnified many times by the Government's attitude. When those people get into an absolutely horrific financial situation, the Government says, 'We will subsidise the next door farmer to enable him to buy out those people who have got into trouble.' If ever a policy has caused unrest in an area, this one has caused unrest on the West Coast because it is a cynical attitude. The Government does not have the guts to design a policy which will help those people in the early days, so that the effect of interest on interest will not make them unviable.

We have a glabag of policies that we chuck out every day. The member for Briggs, the fabricator, writes them every second day. In this case the announcement of a special package to prop up Eyre Peninsula business was made not by the Minister of Agriculture, but by the Premier. I could not believe it when I read it—\$500 000 for assistance, with maximum assistance at \$75 000 per person. That was for all those businesses in those rural towns on the West Coast which have seen their incomes slashed because the farmers could not pay.

What does this assistance do? It helps six farmers! How could the Premier get out and cynically announce that? The Minister of Agriculture did not even have the guts to come out and do it: he hid under the seat, because he was not going to announce it. I give him credit: he could probably add up, but the Treasurer of the State could not add up.

The Treasurer stood up and announced it—and it is a sham!

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

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I take the opportunity to grieve again at this point over the local government issue, an issue which has disturbed many people in our community and which, if not corrected in a democratic way, will disturb many other people. The Minister in her press release of 19 July made certain points which I think are important as we look at this local boundary issue but, more importantly, they matter to those whom they are likely to affect.

The Minister announced on that day that she would refer the matter of council boundaries in the Blackwood area back to the Local Government Advisory Commission for further consideration. She said:

If people feel there was inadequate consultation before the decision was reached by the Advisory Commission, this will enable further consultation to take place... I have the utmost confidence in the independence, integrity and commonsense of the commission.

In other words, she was really saying that the commission has all the commonsense, integrity and intelligence but 20 000 people have not—that they do not know what is good for them. Referring to the commission, she went on to say:

They [the commission] have the important job of determining council boundaries, and I will always accept their decisions.

In other words, here is an advisory commission and a Minister of the Crown is saying quite clearly that the advice from the advisory commission is enough to determine council boundaries—not that the Minister will look at it and see whether or not in the Government's view it is the correct decision. Of course, we know that that is the case, but that is not what she is saying. She is saying that a non-elected body of three people is affecting the lives of these people—in this case the council area involved does affect their lives—and the type of council that they have. It involves approximately 100 000 people, and three non-elected people, who are not responsible to the voters, to the residents or to anyone except for giving advice to the Minister of the day and, thereby, the Government of the day, have such an effect on them. Those other persons are not even responsible to the Parliament of the day.

I find it absolutely astounding that any Government would try to hide behind (although I hate to use the term) the skirt of a Minister, trying to say that it is a democratic decision. The Minister stated further:

I will therefore be asking them [the commission] to consider whether the Mitcham council boundaries should remain in their current form... If the advisory commission decides that it should now consult widely, I trust that all individuals and groups will take the opportunity to express their views to the commission.

Just imagine if 15 000 or 20 000 people, perhaps more, want to put a point of view to the commission. There is no way in the world the commission can hear them all, and there is no such thing as everyone having exactly the same opinion on anything. There can be consensus of opinion, but the only just way, in the end result, when the advisory commission brings down the report, is to make it available publicly, let the community study it and, if there is a big enough problem, those who study it will make sure that others know about it and see whether they agree. Then, the people can be given a say in each of the areas to be affected.

As I said the other evening, if there are only 200 people in a local council area (such as in Carrieton) and 100 000 in the council next door, what justice is there in having a collective vote if the 200 do not wish to join with the 100 000? There is no justice in that. Each area should be entitled to a vote. The Minister then went on to say:

Furthermore, if the Mitcham council wishes to conduct a poll on the matter, it can do so. It will then be able to present the poll results as evidence to the commission.

Evidence to the commission should be decisive, not indicative: it should not just indicate to the commission what the people want, it should decide what the people want. There should be no ifs or buts about that. The Minister further said:

The main issue, after all, is the provision of the best possible local government for Blackwood.

In whose opinion? The Minister says it is not her opinion but that of three non-elected members—a lawyer who gains his income from representing councils, a person who served on council and a person appointed from three nominated by the trade union movement. Of course, each one is nominated by the Government. As I said, no Government approves a hostile person's election to an advisory committee or any other committee. We know that, and commonsense would support it. You do not put yourself in the hot seat deliberately. In Government you can get there without that, as this case has proved. The Minister says, 'The best possible local government' for the area. Who better to judge than the local people themselves? The Minister went on:

Extravagant and emotional language in recent times has tended to mask the real issue.

The people asked for democracy. A petition, with many signatures, states:

Your petitioners therefore pray that your honourable House will take whatever action it can to have—

1. The Bannon Government have the State Electoral Department conduct a poll of the electors of Mitcham city council to determine whether the majority of people support or otherwise the Government's decision to have Flinders city council established.

There is nothing unjust about that—that is a fair request. The petition continues:

2. The Bannon Government introduce legislation to change the law, so that no Government in the future can use its power to deny the people of a local government area the opportunity to express their will on any proposed changes to their local government boundaries.

I guarantee that, if that petition was circulated throughout the State, more than half the total number of adults would sign it willingly, because it is justice.

Some people have written an anthem to mock democracy. I will read out the words so that they are on the record for all time. The words, sung to the tune 'Battle Hymn of the Republic' or 'John Brown's body lies a moulding in the grave', are as follows:

Mine eyes have seen the sadness where the people are denied, where oppression rules the country and the citizens have cried. And the power of the Government is more than we abide. Democracy is light.

Glory, glory hallelujah, glory, glory hallelujah, glory, glory hallelujah, democracy is light.

Democracy is for the people, power to have their say. It is the way of justice now, forever and it's for today.

For citizens of ev'ry State it is the only way.

Democracy is right.

Glory, glory hallelujah, glory, glory hallelujah, glory, glory hallelujah, democracy is right.

The right to vote our way of life, it gives the people power.

It is the freedom we enjoy each year and ev'ry hour.

The Government may come and go, but we retain the power.

Democracy is might.

Glory, glory hallelujah, glory, glory hallelujah, glory, glory hallelujah, democracy is might.

Those words were produced for the people of South Australia in a fight to retain true democracy in local government against the executive power of the State Government. The words mean a lot to the people who produced them. Believe it or not, around the time that this dispute first began the Minister launched a campaign, promoted by Hungry Jack's,

which advocates young people to enrol to be able to vote and have their say.

Mr Groom: What is the point?

Mr S.G. EVANS: The point is that she is a hypocrite, because she is denying them a say. A few years ago the Government produced a booklet for local government. It is worth reading that publication, entitled *Have A Say*, because it says that the council—not the commission or the Government—decides the level of rates. It goes on to say that people choose the council they want for their area to provide the services they want; and that no two councils are the same, which is sometimes why people choose to live in a particular council area.

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

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I rise this evening to bring to the attention of the House a very unfortunate case concerning a constituent of mine who is a former employee of the Electricity Trust of South Australia. This gentleman has specifically indicated that I should use his name in the debate. While it is not my normal practice to do so, he wants to ensure that the case is particularly identified so that there can be no doubt about his particular concerns. Mr Trevor Cox of Elizabeth South is a former employee of ETSA who suffered a significant injury while employed with the trust in 1977. That is now some 12 years ago and the case is still proceeding. The fact that it is still proceeding and is still unresolved despite all of these years is not a credit either to the legal system of the State or indeed, unfortunately, to ETSA itself.

While Mr Cox's employment was terminated on 6 July 1988, as a result of an out-of-court settlement of his worker's compensation case, the issue of his superannuation payment from ETSA is still current. I have approached the present Minister of Mines and Energy who of course has only recently taken up his duties and therefore had no substantive role in the prior history of this matter. The present Minister has been very cooperative in assisting us to resolve this matter. In fact, in a recent letter he indicates that ETSA is arranging a review of the superannuation payment in relation to the question of whether Mr Cox is entitled to an invalidity payment, and he further indicates that this issue will be reconsidered by ETSA.

It is unfortunate in some ways that the ETSA superannuation scheme is as close to the management of ETSA as would appear to be the case in this instance. These kinds of questions can sometimes become confused in management's mind and the issue of superannuation payment and that of making very delicate and difficult decisions can become confused with other employee policy, and that indeed may have been the case in this instance.

Whilst there is no proof of that, if justice is to be seen to be done it is important that totally independent people separated from the employer should make these decisions. Despite the fact that Mr Cox was significantly injured while at work and his condition has been subsequently exacerbated by his work, the fact remains that he has not been paid an invalidity payment by the superannuation fund. This is quite unjust. Mr Cox's medical condition certainly seems to warrant an invalidity payment from his superannuation fund.

Accordingly, I am very pleased with the Minister's intimation that the matter will be reviewed and, if necessary, additional medical evidence will be taken so that a fair and equitable outcome can be achieved for this gentleman who

had a long and creditable employment history with ETSA until his unfortunate accident.

Since the time of the accident in 1977, I believe that Mr Cox has sincerely and genuinely attempted to return to duties; perhaps not the same duties that he held at the time of the accident, because that would probably be prohibited by his medical condition, but certainly light duties or different duties. Unfortunately, the system has not allowed him to do that. It is unfortunate that ETSA claims that his employment was terminated, and I quote from the Minister's letter:

... on the ground that he had persistently refused to carry out his light duties for which he was certified fit by a number of medical specialists.

Unfortunately, Mr Cox strongly disputes that statement. He is definitely of the view, and I believe him because I have spoken to him at length and I consider that he is a very genuine person, that he has repeatedly sought to return to work. I believe that that has been his sole intention over this whole period. Obviously there has been a substantial communication breakdown between ETSA and Mr Cox about this issue. Mr Cox has formulated 33 questions on this issue which he believes remain unanswered and which he has put to me. I do not have time to raise all of those questions in this debate.

On looking through the list of questions (which I will make available to the Minister for consideration), I believe that they point to the case of an individual who clearly believes that he has not been fairly treated by an employer to whom he gave considerable loyalty. One of the most predominant issues that comes through this whole sad and unfortunate case is the question of the rehabilitation and return to work of employees injured under the old Workers Compensation Act: how are they to be integrated, if at all, into the rehabilitation system now applicable under WorkCover?

The arrangements under the new legislative scheme appear to be very satisfactory and a number of employees who have been injured at work since the change in the legislative scheme have been well looked after. Unfortunately, many people in the community were injured under the previous legislative regime and have not been able to properly integrate into the rehabilitation system. They are still locked in intractable legal battles with their former employers—be they in the Government or private sector—and they are unable to participate fully and freely in the rehabilitation program under the new scheme. It is a major failing of the present arrangements because some of the people, such as Mr Cox, were injured 12 years ago and desperately wish to return to work. The legal system we replaced, with very good reason at the time, prevents them from so doing because their cases are still predominantly treated under the old Act.

The Government must seriously consider ways in which these people can be integrated into the new rehabilitation provisions, even though their compensation must be determined under the old Act. By all means let the legislative provisions stand in respect of compensation; there would be no way of merging those two systems. However, rehabilitation in many cases is the most important thing in the mind of the injured worker and, I believe, in the overall economy of South Australia.

The case of Mr Cox and ETSA points this up clearly. The general argument is equally applicable. His case is an excellent example of why we must look very seriously at ways in which we can change the WorkCover rehabilitation scheme to incorporate those injured under the previous Act and whose lives are still seriously disrupted by the injuries which they incurred years ago but which still, even though

they may be now partially resolved in the medical sense, are not resolved in the legal sense. The frustration these people feel is overwhelming. Indeed, it can be such as to threaten their medical rehabilitation, and I strongly commend to the Minister of Labour the view that we must urgently reconsider these people and ways in which we can assist them.

I believe that ETSA could have done more for Mr Cox in the way of rehabilitation. There remain substantial differences between ETSA as an employer and Mr Cox as a former employee on what was made available to him in respect of light duties. Mr Cox maintains that he was never offered light duties, whereas ETSA terminated his employment on the grounds that he refused to accept them, so this fundamental and total contradiction must be resolved. ETSA must further consider the question of his invalidity retirement benefit, and I hope that the Minister's commitment to do just that will lead to a more positive outcome of that aspect of the case.

There can be no doubt that the long period during which this matter has dragged on has been detrimental to the injured worker. The legal system has been a further detriment. While the Parliament has acted to resolve for other people the vexed question of the workers compensation legal system, we have not helped those who remain locked into the old scheme. I look forward to the day when Mr Cox and others can rejoin the work force, participate fully and feel that they have been fairly treated by a system which this Parliament has replaced and under which the injured workers of 1977, in the case of Mr Cox, and many other people in the community, remain unaddressed.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I should like to use the time available to raise some issues of importance, particularly as they relate to Government expenditure. Before doing so, I refer to the remarks of the member for Victoria and thank him for the interest he is showing in the West Coast. I wish that more interest had been shown by people when the drought was causing considerable problems, as it still is in that area. I regret that the Government acted as it did, because greater Federal funding might have been available if a different action had been taken.

When the announcement was made the member for Victoria chastised the Government for making available only \$500 000 for small business and local government. I reacted in a similar way to him, as I believed that making available only \$500 000, while at the same time indicating that loans of up to \$75 000 could be available, made a mockery of the whole thing. However, an examination of a further press release emanating from the office of the Minister and the Premier showed that that was not the case. It had been misrepresented. The Government had originally intended to make available \$500 000 as its share of the interest subsidy. That is how it should have been interpreted.

I acknowledge that the funds could be of some benefit to some industries in the area. I welcome that concession by the Government, because no doubt small businesses and local government were facing considerable disadvantages and were carrying the can for the drought as much as the primary producers. Many small businesses had been forced out of the area, and those that were left were having difficulties surviving because the farmers were unable to pay their accounts. I hope that the scheme will help some businesses—it cannot help all—and that they will get the assistance originally intended by the Government.

We have been debating the Supply Bill, which appropriates some \$1.07 billion. I refer to the Premier's statement last Tuesday when he indicated that \$55 million would be put back into the community. I believe that those funds

should go into the capital infrastructure, such as roads and permanent services, which will aid communications in the community and will enable all citizens to be treated equally. Roads are a basic form of communication and good roads mean a saving in freight costs. Good communications helps the tourist industry and primary and secondary industries; reduces the cost of living for people in remote areas; helps city dwellers by reducing the cost of commodities coming into the city; and reduces the costs of manufactured goods that go out of the city. Roads are of immense importance.

In my electorate there has been a degradation of roads over the past few years. The net amount of Federal funding for roads has been reduced by 30 per cent, and one can easily see the result of that. Recently I travelled on the Cleve-Kimba road. Having travelled on that road during daylight in the first instance, there was no way I would return on it after dark. It was dangerous, and in one instance I had to slow down and crawl through a gutter. Several other washaways would be dangerous if they were hit at night at speed. I could mention many bad roads in my area, and no doubt other country members could give similar examples.

Given that the Government's fiscal management has enabled it to save some funds over the years and to bring forward a surplus, those funds should have been used on the capital infrastructure of the State, not dissipated in the community, so that next week, next month or next year we cannot see any tangible benefit of those funds.

Where we can get a profit, let us put that surplus into capital infrastructure. One of the problems with road funding is that the State Government has adopted a formula basis for the allocation of funds to local government. That formula is based on a rather complex series of events, taking into account population, length of roads, the area of a council and the percentage of rate revenue that has been turned back into roads. That formula is supposed to take into account some catch-up provisions. It was introduced by the Liberal Minister of Transport (Hon. Michael Wilson), and at that time local government bodies were willing participants and they welcomed the idea because they believed that there was some benefit in it.

As time has progressed it has been found that those areas which began behind the eight ball, those councils which did not have a reasonable percentage of sealed roads or built-up roads, will never catch up. As to the Lock to Elliston road, on the rate of funding that was begun, it was found that it would take 22 years to finish that road. It would also take 22 years to do the Kimba to Cleve road. So, it was utterly ludicrous to apply that formula basis for funding of Eyre Peninsula roads—taking a total of 44 years to fix up only two roads.

So, there was a problem with the system. I went to the Minister at the time and asked why the Minister could not keep a percentage of that road funding allocation and then at ministerial discretion allocate those funds for the purpose of fixing up a major road in an area, then concentrating on another road in another area in the following year. I suggested to the Minister that 80 per cent of the funding could be made available on a formula basis with the other 20 per cent being made available at ministerial discretion. The Minister expressed some sympathy with what I had to say. However, it was more convenient to go along with a formula, because the Minister did not then have to become involved in decision making in relation to road allocations.

I have put this same reasoning to each subsequent Minister of Transport but, while acknowledging that there was some merit in what I had to say, no-one has wanted to do it—because it would mean that the Minister himself or his

department would have to become involved in some decision making on the matter of allocating funds to the areas in need. There is a problem, and it needs to be addressed with some urgency. In the communications and transport area roads play a very important part for all sections of the community.

I now refer to the wide variation of fuel prices throughout the State. I was dismayed last week when I found that there was a 19c a litre difference between the price of fuel obtainable in some outlets in my area and some outlets in the metropolitan area. No-one in their wildest dreams could justify that sort of differential. To this end, I repeat my call for a State fuel equalisation scheme. It is possible to institute such a scheme so that all people throughout the State will be treated as equals. This should be done. It would mean that the price that I have to pay, or that my constituents have to pay, for fuel in the western part of the State would be no more—other than perhaps with the cost of freight—than the cost paid by a metropolitan user. This is not an unreasonable request, and it should be done.

Federal Governments of the past had a fuel freight equalisation scheme, which meant that the freight component of fuel was never more than .4c. No-one would argue over that; in fact, no-one would argue if there was a 2c a litre difference, but when it gets to almost a 20c difference it is time for Government action or for people to sit up and bring this matter to the attention of the Government. This cannot be tolerated and no Government should allow it to continue.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Mitcham): Tonight I will take up the issue of corruption. There will be a number of versions relating to this subject, because I believe that this Government is corrupt. When I first entered Parliament in 1982, on occasions I received phone calls from people who were concerned about various matters. Those people worked in State Government departments and authorities. Normally, they gave me their name, address and details and stated how they would like the matter to be treated. On every occasion I guaranteed confidentiality. People were quite willing to tell their story. However, in recent years, particularly during the past two years, those people have been unwilling to give their name and address, despite the fact—

Ms Gayler: They don't trust you.

Mr S.J. BAKER: If they did not trust me, they would not have contacted me—that is the point. They were unwilling despite the fact that I promised them anonymity and the protection of the information source. In the past five weeks two people have said to me, 'Mr Baker, what if someone goes through your office and finds the source of this complaint?' I said to them, 'Nobody but nobody will get into my office and go through my files.' On a lighter note I also said, 'They probably wouldn't be able to read my writing anyway.' However, that emphasises my point: why do people feel oppressed and that they cannot have any confidence in members of Parliament or in the system? It is a very strange and horrifying development for me because, if people have complaints, and they feel that the system has not catered for them, they should have confidence in giving the full details to members of Parliament. I know that I have never broken those confidences.

I will now cite smaller examples and build the wider picture. Two examples highlight that the ALP Government will do anything to remain in power. The first example (and this is fairly close to home) relates to the member for Unley, who has been involved in two skirmishes where I believe principles of fair play have been thrown to the wind. The first incident involves Friendly Transport.

During the 1982 election campaign, the member for Unley promised that he would have Friendly Transport removed. That promise had not been fulfilled by 1985, so what did the ALP Government do? It forced Friendly Transport onto the West Torrens council and broke a few rules in the process.

Ms Gayler: That's not true.

Mr S.J. BAKER: That is true; go back through the records. The member for Newland should know what she is talking about, but she does not. He corrupted the system. He said, 'I am going to be elected at all costs', so he called on his little band of ALP Government helpers and said, 'I want the rules broken so that I can be elected.' In a more recent example the same member—

Ms Gayler: That is disgusting.

Mr S.J. BAKER: You can say what you like. The same member—

Ms Gayler: Say it outside the Chamber; you go outside.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Come on!

Ms Gayler: That is a lie.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Newland should not be interjecting in the first place and she should certainly know that the use of the word 'lie' is considered to be unparliamentary.

Ms Gayler interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to withdraw the word.

Mr Ingerson: We're waiting.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms GAYLER: I withdraw.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mitcham. In the course of his remarks, I ask him to be very careful about making reflections on other members. From what I overheard before entering the Chamber, I believe that he was very close to the sort of remarks that can be used only in a substantive motion directed against another member. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On the next point, the members of a little church in Unley wished to locate in the street in which Mr Mayes lives. Those people went through the proper planning procedures and the council gave planning permission to erect a church, but what did Mr Mayes do? How did he think that he would solve the problem? He went to the Government and said, 'This church is horrific. It is involved in terrible things. I want you to stop this development. Let us use all the power of the Government to come down on this poor little church.' He used section 50 of the Planning Act to stop some poor innocents from putting up something that they were legally entitled to build. That is corrupt. That is the exercise and maladministration of power by this ALP Government.

Those are two small examples in terms of the micropicture and even smaller in the macropicture, but they reflect the Government's willingness to use anything at its disposal to subvert people's rights. I have a number of examples, and I shall use later debates to further the argument because it gets better.

The hospital system has been under enormous stress. For example, in 1982, when the Tonkin Government was replaced by the Bannon Government, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital had 690 beds. By the end of 1988 there were 580 beds. The Adelaide Children's Hospital had 274 beds in use in 1982. By the time the Bannon Government had finished with it there were 165. In 1989, a further 122 beds were removed from the system. The Premier said, 'You have to live within your budgets.' He knew that those budgets were unworkable, but he said that they had to work within them.

At the same time, Mr Bannon is gathering taxes at an extraordinary rate. For example, for the year ending 1988-89, revenue collection resulted in a surplus of \$83 million—\$27 million more than was budgeted for. Not only did the Government have the surplus for which it had budgeted, but it got another \$27 million. We know that \$5 million could have made all the difference to those hospitals, but the Premier said, 'I am not going to spend that money to help people on the long hospital waiting lists. I am not going to help those who need hip replacement and eye operations or those who have limb problems, because I want the money in the kitty for the election. I want some sweeteners.'

Of course, he got sweeteners to the tune of \$83 million. Now that he is having a few problems, he has said, 'I had better give some away in the areas that I have overtaxed in the past.' What happens to those poor people in the queues? Does no-one opposite care about people who are waiting for vital operations? That is corrupt, because money was available. Certainly budgets have to be controlled, but many people are hurting out there. Many are my constituents. If the Government has money available for election purposes, it should be decent enough to use some of that money for the good of the people of South Australia. It is corrupt to allow people to suffer for electoral purposes. The Government says that the greatest imperative is to win government, not to fulfil the role of government. That is corrupt. It goes to the basis of government in this State.

Over the next few weeks the story really does unfold. At every opportunity that I have I shall relate to the House the elements of corruption which I believe have found a place in this Government which has taken away people's rights and reduced them to mere numbers in the ALP Government system.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): As members are aware, this is Federal budget night. It looks as though we are gearing up for a Federal as well as a State election. We have seen our Premier giving away lots of goodies lately. I guess that the prediction in the *News* that there might be an election in September could become fact. After tonight's budget, it would appear that the same will occur federally. I must say that it is high time that the Federal Government acknowledged some of the groups, such as the pensioners, to whom it has given money. They have been shabbily treated for such a long period by this Government, and at least some money seems to be going towards them. Homeless youth and a few others are receiving some money. The money going to homeless youth, I guess, is to fulfil Mr Hawke's promise that no youth will be living in poverty by 1990, but I question whether directing money to youth will actually help the poverty situation, and whether we may not see some young people still living in poverty in 1990 or 1991 and beyond, as I suspect we shall.

What concerns me about the budget is how it will affect this State. For months now we have heard the Treasurer say that the economy is overheated; that we must restrain spending in some way and give incentives for our manufacturers to export. I should have thought that this budget would provide a massive input into industry and trade so that we could gear up to export much more than we are exporting. That is what most people and the unions have been calling for, yet my reading of the budget so far shows that trade and industry once again will be the sufferers; that they will not get anything.

In fact, one of the points I heard mentioned was that pay-as-you-earn deductions will now have to be made twice monthly instead of monthly, which will cost industry some millions of dollars per annum. It is tragic that this Govern-

ment is ignoring the real problems in our economy, problems involving, first of all, high interest rates, and little if anything will eventuate from this budget. It will not help the home-owners and, equally importantly, the businesses—particularly the small businesses—struggling with high interest rates.

It will not help inflation, which apparently will continue at the 7 to 9 per cent rate for the immediate future—twice that of our overseas competitors. We all appreciate what would happen if the Government decided to bring down interest rates now: our inflation rate would skyrocket out of all control, yet in real terms the effects on the economy are very similar and are hurting the people just as much.

So, the Federal budget will see this State that much worse off, in my opinion, during the coming year. The incentives for our industry to gear up to export, in order to combat the massive rise in imports, will not occur from this budget, and the Government should be condemned for taking the easy option and for saying 'As we'll be having an election within the next six or so months, it has to be a give-away budget.' It will not help the people as it should.

I was very pleased to have the opportunity during the recent parliamentary break to survey quite a few businesses in the electorate of Goyder as to the effect interest rates are having on those businesses. It was very revealing to realise the predicament so many small businesses are in in country areas—a predicament which this Government seems to be ignoring, almost certainly to its detriment and to the detriment of the State. Interest rates in so many cases (with the businesses I surveyed) have risen during the past 12 months from 14 or 15 per cent to 20 to 24 per cent.

Several businesses that I surveyed had not checked up on whether their interest rates had risen during the 12-month period, and people got a real shock when they telephoned their bank manager to say, 'Have my interest rates gone up during this time?' and were advised accordingly. In some cases, they realised that they had not been able to pay anything off their capital in the past few months; that it is simply a holding time. They are not making any progress, and that is a great shame for small business in this State.

As one small business proprietor said under the heading 'Any comments':

Just look around and see how many shops which were previously occupied are now 'to let' or empty. This has a two-fold effect: 'Landlord investor' and 'Retailer out of business'. How long can we last? That is the question, with rates and charges so high.

How true is that statement. Is it a great shame to see businesses suffering as they are. I was amazed to see how many small businesses have loans or overdrafts of amounts from \$50 000 to in excess of \$200 000. Some of the businesses have been established for many years, and I would not have credited that they had to borrow so much money to keep going. They are finding the pinch and are wondering what is the use of continuing in business.

What are the effects of some of the high interest rates on businesses? I have indicated that some shops are 'to let', where they could have been occupied. Also, fewer people are being employed. One small business indicated that it is employing two fewer people, and I think it was employing only about five altogether. So, seven could have been employed in that business. That is having a real effect in small towns. The incentive is not there to employ, let alone the fact that other imposts, from this Government particularly, are having an effect. As one proprietor said under 'Any comments':

WorkCover and licences have increased costs; changes to wage structure; 38-hour week, and the coming superannuation have had a big effect. Increase in purchase costs of fuel and lowering

of profit margins to remain competitive all have effect. We are now working far longer hours just to survive.

Then there is a comment that I would not be able to read into *Hansard*. Small businesses are really suffering and the tragedy is that the employees and those who potentially should have work are also suffering because of the policies of both the Federal and State Governments in 'Tax, tax, tax'.

Coming back to tonight's Federal budget, I believe that we will see an increase in tax revenue of about \$40 billion. In other words, it is take, take, take, and this Government is known as a high taxing Government. We think of the upper threshold at which one starts paying 47c in the dollar. It commences at \$35 000, yet, if that had been adjusted for inflation, no one would be paying 47c in the dollar until they earned nearer \$200 000. We are completely out of kilter. No wonder people from other countries wonder how we continue to survive with our high tax policy. It is a shame that this Government has not corrected any of that in the current budget.

I wish to turn briefly to education and the fact that I believe the Government has done a real sleight of hand with its back to school grants of, supposedly, \$10 million. In the first instance I applauded the money that was supposedly to come back to the education system. However, I found out that it has been a sleight of hand and that so many of the projects mentioned on the list actually had been completed already, before the \$10 million was allocated. Many schools that badly need the money are still suffering as much as ever, and the Government is trying to fool the parents, teachers and students. I believe that the truth is coming out, and so many parents are very upset and annoyed at what they see as a sleight of hand by the Government. I believe that the people of this State can see through the tricks and, hopefully, at the next State election will vote accordingly.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I will talk about the deception of this Government and how the ALP has deliberately manipulated the media and the Grand Prix profit. I would like to quote from the report that the Premier tabled in this House last week. He said:

The financial result for the period ended 31 December 1988 was one of an operating profit of \$41 000. The 1988 profit of \$41 000 is to be compared with the 1985 result of a \$1.6 million deficit... the 1986 deficit of \$1.5 million and the 1987 deficit of \$54 000.

The \$41 000 profit sounds good until one examines the income and expenditure report. At page 1 we see that depreciation has decreased from \$1.9 million to \$935 000. One thinks that that is a significant drop in depreciation and that it must have a significant impact on the gross margin or profit at the end of the day. One can then refer to the reasons why that has occurred. Under the heading 'depreciation' on page 8, the report states:

As explained in note 2, the term of the agreement has been extended to the year 2000. As a result of a reassessment of assets lives, depreciation expense is \$549 000 less than that which would have been charged had the term of the agreement not been extended.

If that is not the greatest con, I would like to know what is. Here we have a Government which says that it has done a magnificent job and reduced the 1987 deficit of \$54 000 to a positive return of \$41 000, but it has forgotten to tell the public that \$549 000 of depreciation has been changed. The Government claims that this change does not involve sleight of hand. It claims that the changes referred to are in the report, but they are deliberately not put so that the South Australian community can see them.

If the Government includes the information in the report, why is it not fair dinkum and say that it lost \$509 000 and that it has produced a significant economic development for the State? If the Government had said that, no-one would have complained, but here we have again this deliberate sleight of hand by the Government in which it has not told the truth to the media. It has just put out a bit of a fudge and deliberately misled the South Australian public.

An honourable member: What is your point?

Mr INGERSON: The point I make is that, if the Government was fair dinkum in this instance, it could simply tell the people of South Australia what the real story is, instead of fudging. Let me look at another issue that has been deliberately fudged, that is, water and sewerage rates. Last week we had the Minister of Water Resources explaining to the House that 'the minimum rate will be dependent on the capital value of each individual's property relative to the average State-wide change'. The Minister went on to say that the State-wide change was 16.8 per cent.

The other evening, in my Address in Reply contribution, I tabled 20 examples from the District of Bragg of people who had come in and complained about increases varying from 22 per cent up to 82 per cent in capital value. They vary in payment increases, which is what it is all about—in the end what matters is how much extra one must pay—from \$18 to \$47 per quarter. As I said the other night, all these accounts are now required to be paid a month earlier than previously. Is this another sleight of hand act by the Government?

The interesting thing about this is that the Minister said how important it was that capital value be part of this exercise. Last Friday we had an Italian gentleman aged 82 who worked in the E&WS and knew all about the system saying, 'Our capital value of \$206 000 is exceptionally high and a 49 per cent increase from \$138 000, is a bit high in one year.' So, I suggested that he go down to the Lands Department office in Glenside, which he did. When he went down there the officer at the table said, '\$206 000 is a bit dear, so I will slice off \$6 000'. It is interesting that he was able to immediately remove \$6 000 from the capital value. He came back to my office and said, 'This is crazy. How can this officer immediately remove \$6 000 off the capital value?' He asked me whether I could help him. I thought that I would give it a try. I telephoned the Glenside branch of the Lands Department, spoke to the officer and asked whether he would be prepared to see my constituent again, and he said that he would. My constituent saw him again this morning. Guess what happened this morning? Another \$30 000—not \$6 000—was knocked off the price! So, in four days the capital value of his property has been reduced by a departmental officer from \$206 000 to \$170 000.

Mr S.G. Evans: Without an inspection?

Mr INGERSON: No. He went around to have look but, because the gate was closed, he reckoned that \$30 000 ought to come off the capital value. How can we possibly have a situation in this State where a person can suddenly find that the capital value of a property has been reduced by \$36 000? What an amazing situation!

The Minister got up in this place last week and said that the capital values are set by an organised, well programmed market value system and yet, within 48 hours, a person can go in and have their property value changed, not once but twice, from \$206 000 to \$170,000. I will tell every constituent of mine to go into the Glenside branch and have the capital value of their property in the area looked at. This increase is the greatest sham of all time. If it is not a sleight of hand by this Government, I would like to know what it is. It is an absolute con.

I have another letter regarding E&WS rates, which are also part and parcel of the same exercise. The letter arrived in my office today and a copy was also sent to the Minister of Recreation and Sport (the member for Unley). Perhaps a copy was sent to me as they know I will fix it up. The letter states:

Dear Sir, I write in order to protest at the savage increase of some 40.96 per cent as evidenced in our recently received water and sewerage rates account. I realise that others, percentage wise, have been hit much harder than this, but we being aged pensioners will be severely embarrassed to meet this additional impost each year from our meagre income. Water and sewer rates are likewise calculated on the capital value basis—

I hope that in this instance they can obtain a reduction, too. This has to be the greatest con of all time. The point clearly is that, if you send people into the Lands Department, they can get the capital value of their property reduced significantly if they are prepared to argue their case.

I will conclude on an issue regarding the Crouzet system. I put a sad story to the Minister today. A young school girl was picked up because she did not have her identification card to the Crouzet system. She has now been penalised by the court, having done all the right things. She went before the court on the advice of the inspector. She took in her identification card and was taken to the cleaners by the system.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I should like to make some comments on this Bill and the \$1 070 million that the Premier is seeking permission to appropriate. I ask the Government to explain to the House the financial arrangements of the rural industries assistance branch. Over the years the Government has loaned money to various primary producers, and the money has been repaid with substantial amounts of interest. It is difficult to determine, from reading the Auditor-General's Report and the budget papers, how much of the money has been retained, how much has gone into general revenue, or where it has ended up. I raised this matter with the Premier when we debated the last Appropriation Bill, and he said that he would give me a considered response. It must have slipped his memory because his officers have not responded.

The Commonwealth and State Governments have provided funds for rural assistance and the people who need the funds would like to have a break down of where the money has gone. The only way to find out what has happened to the money, or whether the Government has been making money out of the scheme, is to have a complete break down of what has happened to the money over the past five or six years. The Minister of Agriculture is in the Chamber and I ask him, in the absence of the Premier, to provide the information that I have requested. The debt structure facing many people in my electorate is significant.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Is this the question on notice that you asked in the last session?

Mr GUNN: I asked the Premier to give me a breakdown of where the money has gone over the past three or four years, and I am still waiting for the reply.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I posted the reply to the question on notice in the previous session.

Mr GUNN: Well, I am a most patient person, as the Minister should know. The amount of debt incurred by the rural sector of the economy is some \$8 400 million, which has increased from some \$2 082 million in 1970. The people who must carry this heavy indebtedness want to know how the rural assistance money has been spent.

Another issue about which I have been concerned for some time is the right to legal assistance. One of the hallmarks of a democratic society is that people have the right

to appeal against arbitrary decisions of boards and committees and to have access to legal representation. South Australia has some 270 statutory authorities or boards which make decisions affecting people's daily lives. Many people who are dissatisfied with those decisions have no right of redress because the cost of engaging a lawyer is beyond their financial capacity. It is impossible for an ordinary citizen to take on the Government without the backing of a large organisation, because the cost involved would be astronomical. It is long since past the time that the Parliament should have enacted legislation to set up an administrative appeals tribunal to give people an automatic right of appeal against arbitrary decisions.

Not only should they have an automatic right of appeal, without having to have legal representation, but these tribunals, boards and committees should be compelled by law to give written reasons for their decisions, so that people can clearly understand them and so that if they are dissatisfied and want to make an appeal against them they have details of the basis of the decisions that they can use. If the Parliament does not enact legislation of this nature the average citizen will continue to be discriminated against—and not only that, they will be deprived of reasonable justice.

The Government processes are becoming very involved and complicated, and the Government is arming itself with tremendous powers, many of them quite draconian and unreasonable. The average person does not have access to the people who are making these decisions—the heads of departments or the chairmen of the boards or statutory authorities—as it is impossible for people to communicate with them. Further, many people do not know how to defend themselves. Many of these people are hard-working members of the community but they have not had an opportunity to learn the basis of defending themselves. It is high time that this Parliament improved the situation.

The Commonwealth Government and a number of State Governments, including Victoria, have enacted relevant legislation, as have the United Kingdom and New Zealand. The 1984 Law Reform Committee clearly set out the urgent need to do something about the matter. Unfortunately, nothing has happened. Not only is it essential that we establish a mechanism to give people an automatic right of appeal but we should also review the operations of the statutory authorities. In my view, many of them are no longer required, have outlived their usefulness, or are acting in a manner which is not in the long-term best interests of the people of this State. In many cases, the costs involved are quite astronomical.

Recently, I had the opportunity to visit Roxby Downs, which is situated in my electorate. I have been appalled at the campaign of misinformation that certain people in the environmental movement have attempted to put about—led by the leader of the Australian Democrats in South Australia, one Mr Gilfillan. The basis of the public debate and criticism should be based on fact and not on the figment of someone's imagination, and nor should it be based on the desire to get a headline, arising from an outrageous statement which has no basis in fact, which is quite misleading and which, in many cases, is quite devious and dishonest. This, of course, is an attempt to create fear in the minds of the public. Any reasonable person would take the view that the developments at Roxby Downs are in the long term best interests of the people of South Australia. In fact, the only thing wrong is that we do not have three or four developments of that size taking place in this State.

This continued campaign of misinformation by the Australian Democrats—and their hangers-on and supporters—

is quite scurrilous and it should be condemned. Associated with this campaign, there is another group which, relatively soon, will be demonstrating in my electorate. This group will try to blockade the Nurrungar joint defence establishment—an organisation which employs over 200 South Australians and which is doing nothing but good. Unfortunately, a group of left wing derelicts—and their hangers-on and associates—will travel up the road to Woomera and attempt to blockade this facility. It will cost the taxpayers of South Australia a great deal of money to have extra police on hand. It will cost the taxpayers of Australia a lot of money to have extra Australian protective services people and Commonwealth Police on hand. It is about time the Premier clearly indicated to the public that we will not tolerate any more of this nonsense. The overwhelming majority of Australians support the continued operation of this joint facility, which employs a lot of Australians and which is helping to keep a stable international scene.

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

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I wish to use the limited time available to me to highlight another example of the fact that, when the Government is in trouble, it appoints another committee. A problem existing at Glenelg is of very real concern to those Glenelg residents who are environmentally conscious. The Patawalonga at Glenelg has been well known in the past as a tourist facility which was used for water sports and for relaxation when people could enjoy the aesthetics of it. It has now been closed and, because of the run-off from the streets and backyards of metropolitan Adelaide, there is no longer any access to the lake for any water sports.

This problem built up during the mid-1980s to such an extent that the lake was closed but, to put it in its historical context, in late 1987 a concerned group of Glenelg residents formed an organisation called the Friends of the Pat. That organisation, together with the council and me behind the scenes, requested that the Government become involved and assist in the clean up of the mess. Quite clearly, despite what was written in the South-East drainage scheme legislation, it was the responsibility not only of the Glenelg council but also the 11 adjoining councils whose areas feed into the Keswick Creek and the Sturt Creek. They are pouring rubbish into the Patawalonga, so it is the responsibility of those councils and, through them the Government, to help us, so the Patawalonga Trash Abatement Committee was established. It comprised representatives from the Department of Environment and Planning, the Department of Local Government, the E&WS (our specialists in the water field), the Highways Department because it had responsibilities relating to the Sturt Creek, the Glenelg council and Friends of the Pat.

That committee met initially to discuss how it would resolve the rubbish problem in the lake. It became patently obvious that it would have to address not only the surface rubbish but also the pollution problem, including the *E.coli* bacteria level and the heavy metal contents of the water. Was that committee competent to carry out that extra research?

I have correspondence from the Deputy Premier, who at that stage was the Minister for Environment and Planning. The letter, which is addressed to the Town Clerk of the Glenelg council, states:

I agree in principle with your suggestions to have a special committee address and attempt to resolve those problems referred to.

Those problems related to the silting, the bacterial pollution and the bank erosion of the lake. It was agreed in April

1988 that that committee would upgrade its terms of reference so that it would now look not only at the surface problem but also at the water quality below the surface. The committee was given 12 months in which to report.

As we moved into 1989, we had received no response. The representative from the Friends of the Pat who was a member of that committee found that, whilst it conducted meetings and talked about the surface rubbish (and to its credit it constructed a very small boom to test whether that would catch some of the surface rubbish and that boom floated out into the lake only some 20 or 30 feet, so really it was nothing more than an experiment), the committee never reported on the quality of the water.

I asked the Minister for Environment and Planning a question and he said, 'Yes, the committee will report by April 1989.' Well, the committee has not reported by April 1989; it has not reported at all and that committee has now been disbanded. I have in my possession a minute dated 1 August from the Glenelg council. Under the Town Clerk's comments the minutes state:

The council's works manager was a member of the Patawalonga Trash Abatement Committee, which has now been disbanded. What do we find now that it has been disbanded? There is further pressure on the Minister for Environment and Planning to come to grips with the pollution problems. What does she do? In an article in the *Advertiser* of 18 July 1989 we see that a spokesman for Ms Lenehan said that the Minister had called for the formation of a task force of Government and local government representatives to study and solve the problems of the Patawalonga.

A task force? We had a committee charged by the Minister for Environment and Planning consisting of experts from the Department of Water Resources, from local government, from the Highways Department and from the Department of Environment and Planning. Glenelg council was also represented. How can we get any more expertise by calling it a task force? The Minister for Environment and Planning does not know where she is going. She is floundering around. She has no answers, so she jacks up a task force. Has anyone heard anything more ludicrous? It has happened in other departmental areas and it is continuing. When the Government is in trouble, it comes up with a task force. I do not know what we shall have next. The Minister will probably have a battle group to look at the problems associated with the Patawalonga, or she might appoint some divisional headquarters group. How far should the farce be taken? It is an unmitigated farce. Where will it finish? We have a task force, and it will be interesting to see whether that task force, which has the same departmental and council representatives, will do a better job than the previous committee. I suggest that it will not, because the data from which it is working are the same.

I have two further quick questions that have been raised in Glenelg about the whole Patawalonga saga—and that is what it has become. This year I started to pick up vibes from the Department of Local Government that the committee was not looking at water quality. It said 'Do not spend too much time on water quality. There are big projects in the wind there, but we cannot talk about them.' We started to put probing questions. We knew that something was going on in West Beach, but we were not allowed to ask. The shrouds of secrecy were brought down. It was not too long before we found out that the Government was encouraging a ferry proposal for the outlet of the Patawalonga, that the ferry developer was prepared to build a ferry which would go to Kangaroo Island in 1½ hours, that he would clear the longstanding sandbar and spend \$2 million or \$3 million on dredging, and that he would do something about water quality. Over the weir there were to be shops

and restaurants. In general, the council, Friends of the Pat and the Residents Association have given qualified support pending the plans being released and their decision whether to support the project 100 per cent.

Everything seemed to be going well and the project seemed to be moving forward. But, as with most projects, the shutters were lowered. The developer found that his telephone calls were not being answered by the Premier's Department. The shrouds of secrecy started to descend. The developer, who was based in Western Australia, was wondering why his telexes between Western Australia and South Australia were not being answered. He has \$85 million, he wants to start work, but he is not getting any answers. We, in Glenelg, want answers, too. Is the Government serious or not? We must know. Is it serious about the marina at West Beach? Is the marina project at West Beach attempting to hijack the ferry proposal from Glenelg?

Is it also trying to hijack the sand technology and will the Government go ahead with this project at West Beach? I am sure that the member for Hanson will monitor that situation with great interest and report back to the House. These are important questions for the Glenelg community and for anyone concerned with environmental issues in this State. We must have those answers.

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

Ms GAYLER (Newland): I would like tonight to reply to some of the most outrageous claims made this evening by the member for Mitcham. The member for Mitcham reminds me of the boy who cried wolf: he cried wolf so often that, when he really had a story to tell, his credibility had so evaporated that no-one took any notice. The outrageous claims of the member for Mitcham this evening remind me of something out of Grimm's Fairytales. I want to concentrate on the claims made by the member for Mitcham about the member for Unley and his dealings in the relocation of Friendly Transport Industries from South Road, Black Forest. I speak with some knowledge about this matter because at that time, before the 1985 election, I happened to be the adviser to the Minister for Environment and Planning in this State—and a very good one at that! The member for Mitcham made a—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Probably a degree of restrained frivolity would be in order. I also make the point that, when the member for Mitcham made his contribution which, I gather, provoked the current contribution, he was heard with a degree of decorum and respect, and I would ask—

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker, I was called some unmentionable things by members on the other side of the House, so I did not have the respect of the House.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member taking a point of order?

Mr S.J. BAKER: I did.

The ACTING SPEAKER: He is out of order. The member for Newland.

Ms GAYLER: The member for Newland was in fact replying to comments by the member for Mitcham claiming that this Government was corrupt on the basis of a fanciful proposal in relation to Friendly Transport. Let me remind the House, from my experience, what happened in that instance. The member for Unley, being a very good local member, having at heart the concerns of his residents, and knowing very well that for a number of years Friendly

Transport, located on South Road at Black Forest—and this is all from memory, I might say—

Mr Becker: Where are they now? They sold the building.

Ms GAYLER: You be quiet: you don't know what you're talking about. I did not bring my notes with me. I did not anticipate this debate tonight, so I give you what I recall from my memory of that incident. Trucks were regularly backing out from the Friendly Transport depot on South Road at Black Forest into the traffic on South Road. The residents had put up with this for years, having great difficulty in getting out of their properties. The South Road traffic on this major arterial road had to contend with trucks backing into its pathway in the morning peak hour and during every other hour of traffic.

Not only that, but Black Forest Primary School children were at risk from this traffic that the member for Mitcham seems to think is perfectly all right. The member for Unley decided, in his wisdom and acting for his local residents, that he ought to do something about this quite unsatisfactory situation, and he set out to do so. The member for Mitcham was absolutely wrong. He said, 'That promise had not been fulfilled by 1985.' That was the promise to relocate Friendly Transport from this dangerous situation. I assure the member for Mitcham, from my own accurate memory (because I was very busy on this matter) that it was solved before the election of 1985.

The member for Mitcham goes on to say, 'So what did the ALP Government do? The ALP Government forced Friendly Transport onto the West Torrens council and broke a few rules in the process.' That is absolutely wrong! I can assure the House that what we did in arranging, offering and renegotiating the relocation of the Friendly Transport Company from South Road, Black Forest to the West Torrens council was done absolutely scrupulously, in conformity with the Planning Act and, if you want to challenge that, come outside and accuse me of breaching the Planning Act!

I find it absolutely scurrilous that the member for Mitcham can base a claim of corruption on the part of the Bannon Labor Government on unscrupulous half truths. That is a hopeless set of ignorant allegations that do not stand up to the facts. If the member for Mitcham proposes to allege that this Government is in any way corrupt, he had better come before this House with a bit more substance than he has done tonight.

The member for Unley, in dealing with this particular problem in his electorate, did no more or less than any member of Parliament would do in trying honestly, conscientiously and persistently to solve a local problem—not an imaginary problem but a real problem—for his constituents. He put a lot of energy into it. He was persistent. He badgered us in Government in 1984 and 1985, and he got results. He got the problem resolved. The Friendly Transport Company went to its new site. South Road, Black Forest is free of this problem but, no, the member for Mitcham prefers to call that corruption. I can only conclude that the member for Mitcham has no credibility in this place.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): That was one of the most incredible speeches I have heard in this House in 19 years. It was the last speech we will hear from the honourable member, so she can put her scarf and coat back on and go home. We know what happened to the Friendly Transport Company: it moved into the West Torrens council area, and no sooner had it moved in there and made a few dollars than it moved out and went to Victoria. That was a shonky deal if ever there was one. It was absolutely shonky. The West Torrens council was threatened with its planning regulations because it would not submit to the demands of the hon-

ourable member. Now she has identified herself as the very person responsible for the whole fiasco.

I am glad that the Minister of Housing and Construction is present tonight. We have just spent \$200 000 in renovations to Parliament House. We have seen over \$150 000 spent on water cleaning the exterior for the centenary of this side of the building, yet on the northern wall of Parliament House facing the plaza is some of the worst graffiti I have seen on a Government building in many years. I beg the Minister to have his officers inspect the northern portion of Parliament House with a view to having that graffiti removed and instituting some method of security so that either graffiti cannot be put there in the future or, if it is, it can be removed easily. It is a disgrace to have a Government building of this stature spoiled by such graffiti. It is a beautiful building and we are all very proud of it. I would be grateful if the Minister could make available a few dollars to have that graffiti removed. If not, we could possibly look at correctional services involvement and community service orders.

The other issue that affects my electorate and the people of South Australia generally is the demands and needs of people requiring good, affordable housing accommodation. The South Australian Housing Trust is experiencing grave difficulty in meeting these needs. I am quite disturbed to have received documents such as the report before me on meetings between State and Commonwealth Government representatives. I quote from the document given to me recently, as follows:

Additional information from recent seminar on proposed changes to Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement (CSHA).

Average rent covers maintenance and rates but does not cover capital. South Australia's public housing funded largely by borrowings and current Federal grants go mainly to service this debt. Federal Government is not prepared to continue to do this and wants to see new houses built with its funds. Federal Government believes the South Australian Housing Trust must take measures to economise—can improve its maintenance system or computerise systems.

Whoever wrote this report is a little behind the times because the Housing Trust has been taking measures to economise in the maintenance program area and has cut back several million dollars already. No matter how much one cuts back on a stock of 67 000 housing units, one will have problems. I can understand what has happened. This is what disturbs me, and no doubt disturbs the Minister on the front bench at present because he and his Government are having tremendous difficulty negotiating with the Federal Government on the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. The document continues:

The Federal Minister's representative said 'the time of reckoning has come for South Australia'.

I hope that that is not an accurate report. If it is, I am gravely disturbed to think that a Federal public servant or a representative of the Commonwealth Minister involved with the housing agreement has made such a statement. The trust has been built up over the past 51 years by Liberal and Labor Governments with a determination to provide to the people of this State the best quality of housing that we can afford. We will not reduce that standard because the Eastern States have not been able to provide that type of housing for their people.

That is what I fear: that under the federalism being practised by the Hawke-Keating Government they will reduce the standard of South Australian housing to meet the other States that have been backward in providing that type of housing. I hope that the Minister will check that situation and stand firmly with his Premier to ensure that the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement that is being renegotiated will be the best deal that we can get for South Australia,

and that he will not give in on one point. If necessary, he should hold out until we can get them to conform and come up to the standards that we have built up. The document continues:

The proportion of public housing in South Australia is currently 11 per cent. Other States have lower proportions and the Federal Government's aim is to increase each State to 10 per cent so South Australia is not seen as a priority.

It seems that we will suffer cutbacks. The document continues:

Predictions by Paul Edwards, SAHT: Development in South Australia will drop from 3 000 units per year between 1983-84, and 2 000 between 1987-89; will expect this to drop to 1 000 in the 1989-90 period.

This will be a disaster if we can provide only 1 000 units of accommodation in this financial year. It means that the waiting queues will grow. It means also that people who are desperately in need of affordable accommodation will have to struggle a little longer because of the cutbacks that have been put forward by the Federal Government. The document continues:

Will have large impact on employment in the building industry, and on rents. Under new CSHA rent rebates will have to be paid internally by the trust.

We estimate that that will amount to about \$100 million. It is unfair to expect the trust to set aside \$100 million

when that money should be provided by the Federal Government, which owes it to people to provide that type of assistance. The document continues:

The introduction of income based rents was strongly opposed. Income based rents were a disincentive for people to work and, by forcing 'better off' tenants to move out, would increase the recurrent expenditure cost to the Housing Trust while discouraging a good social mix. Security of tenure will be written into the agreement (although it basically applies in South Australia anyway).

That is one of the big problems that the trust has in respect of unruly tenants who do not conform to modern society's standard of living. They create tremendous maintenance problems for the trust and they cause much damage.

A profile taken on housing statistics in South Australia was compiled to show the range of family incomes of South Australian Housing Trust tenants in 1986 and the equivalent for 1989. I seek leave to table a list of statistics entitled 'Family income of families renting from South Australian Housing Trust 1986'.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Robertson): Do you give the usual assurance that it is purely statistical?

Mr BECKER: It is purely statistical.

Leave granted.

FAMILY INCOME OF FAMILIES RENTING
FROM SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST 1986

SLA in Metrop. Adelaide	Weekly Family Income (1986)						NS & other	Total
	0-172	173-227	228-421	422-613	614-766	767+		
Adelaide	18	38	22	13	9	5	13	118
Brighton	7	43	13	13	3	2	10	91
Burnside	4	28	7	6	5	0	0	50
Campbelltown	90	131	96	71	24	20	59	491
East Torrens	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Elizabeth	613	1 265	829	581	199	146	420	4 053
Enfield	664	1 718	972	674	299	222	587	5 136
Gawler	70	140	116	64	22	17	53	482
Happy Valley	19	15	34	26	7	7	10	118
Henley/Grange	9	55	20	12	4	5	13	118
Hindmarsh	54	102	62	40	18	10	33	319
Kensington/Norwood	24	34	16	12	2	6	7	101
Marion	381	859	463	355	159	101	212	2 530
Mitcham	12	44	28	24	10	9	10	137
Munno Para	347	644	444	327	116	80	270	2 228
Noarlunga	373	642	396	300	91	60	201	2 063
Payneham	22	50	38	23	5	5	27	170
Port Adelaide	147	385	234	188	58	64	144	1 220
Prospect	27	37	16	18	3	2	14	117
St Peters	9	19	12	9	3	2	2	56
Salisbury	451	914	745	545	214	162	369	3 400
Stirling	2	—	—	2	—	—	—	4
Tea Tree Gully	42	67	56	40	15	11	18	249
Thebarton	29	57	18	13	5	10	13	145
Unley	20	49	21	16	4	4	15	129
Walkerville	7	23	15	8	4	2	7	66
West Torrens	64	186	90	58	20	17	46	481
Woodville	346	888	499	365	151	110	296	2 655
Willunga	3	6	—	—	—	2	—	11
Total	3 854	8 439	5 262	3 803	1 450	1 081	2 849	26 738

(N.S. = noted stated, Other = spouse absent)

Mr BECKER: The other statistics that I seek leave to table relates to the annual income per family for 1986 and the equivalent amounts today.

Leave granted.

TABLE OF ANNUAL INCOME PER FAMILY

Family income per annum 1986	Equivalent today	No. families	Percentage of total
Under \$9 000	under \$11 000	3 854	14.4
\$9 000-\$11 800	\$11 000-\$14 500	8 439	31.6
\$11 800-\$21 900	\$14 500-\$27 000	5 262	19.7
\$21 900-\$31 900	\$27 000-\$39 000	3 803	14.2
\$31 900-\$40 000	\$39 000-\$49 000	1 450	5.4
\$40 000 and over	\$49 000 and over	1 081	4.0
not stated		2 849	10.7
Totals		26 738	100.0

Mr BECKER: These statistics show that in South Australia 3 803 families have an income of between \$27 000 and \$39 000 or 14.2 per cent of the 26 738 families surveyed. There are 1 154 families with an income of \$39 000 and \$49 000, and 1 081 families have an income of \$49 000 and over. This has prompted the Real Estate Institute of South Australia to comment on the matter, although I do not necessarily agree with its statement. Under the heading, 'A case for income-testing public tenants', the institute states:

In February-May 1988, 17 300 married couple 'income units' and 700 one-person 'income units' in Government housing all had one thing in common. They all enjoyed an annual income of \$31 200 or more. Nearly 25 per cent (4 100) of the married couple 'income units' earned at least \$45 000 a year, according to the Australian Bureau of Statistics. Facts like these reinforce the need for income testing of public tenants to ensure that only the real under-privileged are helped from the public purse.

I do not necessarily support that attitude expressed by the Real Estate Institute of South Australia. Under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement we are locked into a situation where we must provide affordable housing for all.

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

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): It is fair to say that in the almost 10 years (it will be 10 years on 15 September) that I have been in this place I have been, most members would agree, a very reasonable, calm, quiet and reserved person who has rarely interjected. It is not often that I criticise Opposition members. However, there are a few exceptions, one of whom is the member for Morphett. That member is fortunate that he has a reasonable margin, because that is the only reason he retains his seat in this place. If he did not have that reasonable margin, he would lose his seat, as he is basically a lazy person. His contribution on Thursday, 10 August, reflected how lazy he is. It is quite clear not only that the honourable member rarely goes out to door knock in his own electorate but also that he is indoctrinated by the gaff fed to him by his own people. In the few short moments that I had this afternoon to read his diatribe, I saw his many inane comments. He said, for example, about the Premier's aged task force:

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.

If the honourable member for Morphett was not so damn lazy—

Mr INGERSON: On a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker, there has been a reflection on a member of the House, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I have taken advice on the highly technical point raised by the member for Bragg. I am advised that the honourable member for Morphett is capable of deciding whether he finds those words offensive and taking a point of order if he so desires.

Mr HAMILTON: One would have thought that the honourable member would have the intestinal fortitude to stand up and defend himself, but he has not; he has to get a wimp on the front bench to stand up and defend him. The member for Morphett does not accept the reality—

Mr OSWALD: On a point of order, the honourable member is trying to goad me into some response, but the reality is that there is no point of order. All members know that there is no point of order; we have to just sit here and put up with a lot of ridiculous diatribe from a member who is very bitter and twisted.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

Mr HAMILTON: One thing I have learnt, being from the working class, is that if one dishes it out one must learn to take it. I have never cried about those members who want to dish it up. I believe very strongly that one must accept constructive criticism. It is obvious from the past two points of order taken by members opposite that they do not like the truth.

The member for Morphett talked about marginal seats. I will not use emotive language, because members opposite get offended by it, although they tip it all over us. For the edification of members opposite, the members of the task force were the Hon. Carolyn Pickles, M.L.C., the Hon. M.S. Feleppa, M.L.C., the Hon. Anne Levy, M.L.C., the member for Briggs, the member for Price, the member for Albert Park, the member for Bright, the member for Adelaide, the member for Henley Beach and the member for Newland. My seat is always a marginal seat because I want to get the best for my electorate.

The member for Morphett does not understand about marginal seats, or he cannot read. I will explain it slowly: the member for Price has one of the safest seats in this place. For the member for Morphett to say that it is a marginal seat defies reality. What an inane statement! He said that it is a marginal seat, and that is recorded in *Hansard*. What a foolish statement! He said that there has been no input. The Chairperson of the committee has been to my electorate and has been involved in meetings of two groups at West Lakes: the West Lakes Community Club and the meeting on Delfin Island. One would not suggest that Delfin Island is Labor oriented, but one was well received.

There is also the Royal Park area and the Seaton North Senior Citizens Club, and one was well received in those places. Yet, here is this foolish man talking about going into

the more marginal seats. One should ask the member for Bragg about his attempt, back in 1982, to take the seat from the member for Albert Park. He concedes that the Labor Party has consolidated that seat. It is not a marginal seat, but a very safe seat. The member for Morphett peddles this diatribe in his community in an attempt to influence people in his area about what are or are not marginal seats. The reality is that, if the member for Morphett really wanted to service his electorate, he would go and talk to a number of clubs in his area. The seniors college is in his area, and then there is the Brighton-Glenelg centre which he has not even addressed. The honourable member has not even gone to the people in his own electorate.

One of the basic and fundamental things I have learnt in politics is that one looks after one's own patch first. One should knock on every door and talk to all the organisations and clubs. If one has the intestinal fortitude, one should perhaps even venture into the hotels and find out what the workers really feel about the various policies and issues. But not the member for Morphett—he does not have the intestinal fortitude. He stands up here and makes inane interjections and talks about marginal seats. He said that the member for Price and the member for Albert Park are in marginal seats, but anyone with an ounce of intelligence would know that neither of those two seats are marginal. This has been achieved by Government members over many years. It does not relate to the sort of political gimmickry referred to by the member for Morphett in this House last Thursday in an attempt to try to influence people.

The reality is that this Government is concerned for the elderly and for all those working-class people in the community. The member for Morphett does not understand this. He is a silvertail. We know he is a silvertail, born and bred out of silvertail stock. He does not understand the problems that people encounter and he has rarely ventured into the working-class areas of this State. The sooner he does, the better. I challenge him to come down to a working-class area. He should visit the front bar of a hotel like the Hendon Hotel or the Woodville Hotel. Never once has he ventured into those areas.

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

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): The sight of horse-drawn carriages in the great metropolises of the world—Paris, New York, London—or the sight of the small horse-drawn carriages in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, where the Amish Dutch still carry their old-world charm, or the horse-drawn carriages in Williamsburg, an old colonial-style city in the United States, are all great tourist attractions. Australia, oddly enough, now has more horses than it had in the early colonial days and yet we find, on perusing regulations which have recently been exhumed—regulations which were passed in 1976 as amendments to the Road Traffic Act 1961—there is now a danger of them regulating off our roads all those horse-drawn carriages which are still in existence in Australia.

I refer specifically to a 130-year-old phaeton carriage which is owned by Jim and Cynthia Mason of Mount Gambier. For some time that carriage, along with the ancient and historic harness, has been used to bring traditional charm and elegance to weekend weddings in the South-East. The Masons now find that, after having been left in abeyance for 12 or 13 years, the new regulations are now being enforced. The new regulations require that this elegant antique carriage should be equipped with hydraulic brakes, which is almost an impossibility on those delicate wooden spoke wheels. The regulations also require that the carriage

have reflectors on the sides, the front and the rear; that the antique horse harness should also have reflectors; and that the horse should have reflected gaters.

In addition, there is a requirement that the horse should not be exercised in 35 degree centigrade heat or above; that the vehicle should not be allowed to make U-turns in the streets; that, before use, the horse should be subject to a veterinarian examination; and that Mr Mason, who is a first-class reinsman of many years standing, should be given a vehicle driver's test. Who better than Mr Mason could administer the horse-drawn vehicle driver's test in the South-East?

If that is not enough, we are all well aware that the addition of horse manure adds a certain acceptable dimension to the perfumed rose gardens of the world but this elegant carriage is required to carry a steel box, along with a dustpan and brush. Should the horse misbehave while in transit between the church and reception rooms, the driver has to stop the carriage, sweep up the horse droppings and place them in the box in the carriage. This adds an additional but undesirable and unacceptable dimension to the perfumed bridal carriage. I do not think that the person who compiled these regulations had such an occasion in mind.

Although the Masons are willing to comply and have already investigated the possibility of insuring their carriage with the State Government Insurance Commission for use on these occasions, they nevertheless feel (and I believe quite rightly) that there is hardly the need for such stringent regulations in a quiet rural city such as Mount Gambier, especially when the carriage will be used intermittently for such an elegant occasion as a country wedding. The Masons asked the Department of Transport whether it would be possible for them to obtain an annual exemption from compliance with these very stringent regulations which, if complied with, would really ruin the character of a country wedding. There is every possibility that the installation of hydraulic brakes would cause the delicate spoke wheels to disintegrate. In fact, the horse would be quite capable of drawing the carriage along and destroying the wheels, even if hydraulics were applied.

The Department of Transport sent to the Masons an application form which stated that they could have the exemption, provided that they complied with the regulations as set out. Of course, those regulations are the ones which I have just cited to the House. The Masons then sought the assistance of another Mount Gambier office where they were told that they could obtain an exemption. They were again sent the same set of exemption forms which stated that they could obtain the exemption if they complied with the regulations.

I ask the Minister whether it is possible, in a small country environment where there is relatively little danger, for an annual exemption to be given to the Masons, provided that they insure the coach for celebratory occasions. If anyone doubts the relatively slight risk of accident on these occasions, Mr Mason has always sought police permission when he wished to use his 130-year-old phaeton for a wedding and he has never had an accident in the course of those celebrations. I ask that common sense should apply and that Mr Mason and others like him should be given annual exemptions.

I have had experience of being driven by Mr Mason and his family in their horse-drawn carriages—they have several—during the South Australian Sesquicentenary celebrations and the Australian National Bicentenary celebrations. He is a fine horseman and reinsman. I feel sure that everyone who has ridden with him has felt secure without the

enforcement of the 1976 Department of Transport regulations. Will the Minister of Transport give an annual exemption to Mr Mason and others like him in country areas so that they can conduct their intermittent trade without having to deface their wonderful old carriages?

During a recent deputation to the Minister of Health with representatives of the Mount Gambier Extended Care Centre, the Minister was informed that, following the transfer of the Port MacDonnell kindergarten to the Allandale East area school, where it was renamed the Kirinari kindergarten, the Port MacDonnell district nurse was left without any acceptable premises because the old kindergarten premises at Port MacDonnell were ancient, very damp and dilapidated. Therefore, the district nurse had to move out when the kindergarten was vacated.

The Minister was asked whether it would be possible to provide a transportable home by way of relocating the building, in good condition, currently located at the Mount Gambier Hospital. An officer of the South Australian Health Commission undertook to investigate the matter on behalf of the Port MacDonnell District Council, the matter being raised by the chairman of the district council, Councillor Tony Glenn, and the Minister said that, if it were possible, he saw no reason why the relocation should not take place. Will the Minister ascertain whether that investigation has been completed; whether the wooden building is available; and, if so, how quickly it can be transported to Port MacDonnell so that the district nurse and possibly visiting medical practitioners can make use of the much improved accommodation, with a great deal more privacy for doctors, nurses and patients than was available in those rather limited kindergarten premises which were used formerly?

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): It will soon be Deafness Awareness Week, and I should like to make a few observations about deafness and its causes in our modern society. In the *Advertiser* a couple of weeks ago there was an article which referred to a number of very prominent, but perhaps now ageing, rock stars. Pete Townshend of The Who in particular made the categoric and unambiguous statement, 'Don't listen to loud music at all, ever.' Audiologists say that they could not have put the exhortation any better.

Townshend has been joined over the past few months by a number of other rock stars, including Mick Jagger, Joe Cocker, Bruce Springsteen and others, who have started turning down the sound on stage. But for them it is too late; they have started to lose their hearing. Townshend in particular is starting to alter the volume and the amount of acoustics that he uses on stage. He is trying to play in what he calls the 'quiet zone'.

Robert Harrison, Professor-in-Chief of the University of Miami's Audiology and Speech Pathology Department, says, again quite unequivocally, 'Once incurred, audile damage is permanent and irreversible.' One of the main reasons for people suffering hearing loss in Australia as well as in most other modern societies quite simply is noise, and noise induced hearing loss has increased, particularly with the growth of technology. Noise is a constant part of our urban environment. We are subjected to noise at home, at school, at work, while shopping, at leisure and while travelling.

Many people react differently to the levels of noise to which they are subjected. In South Australia, there is a maximum permissible noise level for lawn mowers and power equipment. For domestic air-conditioners in residential areas it is 45 decibels between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m. Monday to Saturday. The decibel measure is used because it is the unit of measurement of sound. The types of sound to which we are subjected vary in the amount of decibels that are

produced. They produce varying degrees of stress to different people at different levels. Work place regulations limit acceptable noise levels to about 85 to 90 decibels. Any higher, and damage may occur. The louder the sound and the longer the exposure, the greater the risk.

Rock concerts have sound levels which routinely top the 120 decibel range, which is about the same as a commercial jet taking off, and people attending rock concerts are subjected to that level of noise for anywhere between 1½ and 2½ hours. The point about the intensity of the noise produced is the impact that it has on the ear. Sound moves through the air in waves, much as ripples move across the surface of a pool. When funnelled into the ear, the sound waves make the eardrum vibrate against the first of three tiny bones in the middle ear which pass the vibrations along to the fluid filled cochlea of the inner ear.

The cochlea is lined with tiny hair cells which sense the vibration and pass the information along the nerves to the brain. Damage is done when waves reach the cochlea so violently that the hair cells are destroyed. The first sounds to go are those in the upper range of normal conversation of about 3 000 to 4 000 cycles a second. The ear tries to protect itself when the sound levels hit about 75 decibels. At that level, the body's tiniest muscles flex to stiffen the middle ear bone movement and reduce the amount of vibration which is passed along.

This causes temporary threshold shift, which explains why the stuffiness and ringing sensation almost everyone feels after a very loud show take about one or two days to go away. The thing that one can say about hearing loss induced by noise is that it is slow, it is painless—and it is permanent. It can affect everyone. It cannot be cured, but it can be prevented. People must be sensible in their exposure to noise and take appropriate and sensible remedial measures.

The sounds we need to be alerted to in order to protect our hearing are those which are extremely loud, particularly if we are exposed to them for any length of time. As I said earlier, very loud sound is anything that measures 90 decibels or more, which includes factory machines, heavy trucks, jet engines, rock bands, loud stereos and, possibly, many more types of equipment of that order. With technology becoming more sophisticated, amplification systems are much more powerful than they used to be. It is estimated that just two minutes in the deafening atmosphere of a rock concert which is producing sounds in excess of 120 decibels is enough to start to have an impact on one's hearing ability. The closer one stands to loudspeakers, the greater the level of damage caused to the ear, first, temporarily and, subsequently, in incurring permanent hearing loss.

Probably one of the most innocent causes of hearing loss, particularly in younger people, is the Walkman radio. It is used by many young people and also, increasingly, by those involved in gymnasium work or in a repetitive activity, such as walking, riding to work in a train, mowing the lawn or things of that sort. One should try to avoid turning the volume control up to maximum, putting it way over the safety level.

It is important to note a few sensible precautions in the wearing of headsets, whether for Walkman radios or other devices. The first and most obvious commonsense approach is that, if people cannot hold a normal conversation, the volume is too high. If people's words are muffled or hard to distinguish when you take off a headset, come out of a disco or come from any other noisy environment, you have probably suffered some hearing loss. Thirdly, if there is ringing in your ears after exposure to any of these high

volume sounds, again the volume has been too loud or you have been too close to the source.

The South Australian Education Department employs an education audiologist at the Special Resources Unit who can provide checks for students to ensure that their hearing has not been impaired either by exposure to excessive noise levels or because of other medically-related circumstances. This unit can provide advice as to how the teaching staff and other individuals should locate themselves in the classroom or in other educational environments. It is important to raise the awareness of students, particularly in Deafness Awareness Week, because, unless they themselves recognise the risks of noise to their physical and emotional wellbeing,

over time they will suffer permanent and irreversible hearing loss. It is that hearing loss which will cause them extreme emotional and psychological stress as they get older. However, it can be prevented. People must be sensible, and I encourage members of this House and everyone in the community to be more aware during Deafness Awareness Week and subsequently of the steps that they can take to ensure that they do not suffer any short-term or, more tragically, long-term hearing loss.

Motion carried.

At 10.19 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 16 August at 2 p.m.