

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 19 October 1989

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

HOLDFAST BAY RESERVE

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I move:

That this House request the Government to hand over to the West Torrens council the linear park known as the Holdfast Bay Railway Reserve.

This motion is necessary because of a statement by the Minister of Transport to the Estimates Committee on 19 September 1989. On page 325 of the *Hansard* report of Committee B, the Minister states:

I wish it was as easy to build an O-Bahn to the south as it proved to be building one to Tea Tree Gully . . . Over a period the cost will be manageable . . . The problems are not particularly financial problems. The question of engineering can also be coped with reasonably well. To get an O-Bahn from the city to Darlington is not an enormous engineering problem. The engineers can put something together and would be delighted to do so; it is an engineer's dream . . .

Further, the Minister states:

I do not suggest that it is impossible; rather, I suggest that some very major social problems must be overcome before we can undertake that degree of disturbance to those people in the south-western suburbs . . .

I do not write off the project; it is well worth further study and I hope that the people from the southern area who put the proposition to me will continue to think about the proposal and contact their local member or me so that we can continue to address the problem.

If we continue to work hard most problems can be overcome . . .

I believe that this this proposal should be further considered and I do not believe that anybody should understate the degree of disturbance that will occur if an O-Bahn system similar to that in the north-eastern area is built.

Those statements concern me and residents of the south-western suburbs, particularly the people who live along the Holdfast Bay Railway Reserve. For many years, we have been plagued with all sorts of proposals to build freeways and major arterial roads, and no-one has been able to plan or develop anything in that area because of the Highways Department's hold over the lands.

The Plympton railway station platform, which was built in 1929, remains in position today. It could well be considered an ideal site for Councillor Jennings' railway signal museum. He has acquired a considerable number of items and a large amount of material for such a museum. The West Torrens council has purchased a considerable quantity of equipment as well, and is proposing, at this stage, to build a museum on Marion Road at Brooklyn Park.

If the railway line could be handed over to the council, it would be an excellent choice for the siting of such a museum. What a wonderful contribution to the community. The West Torrens council has obtained from the State and Federal Governments grants exceeding \$1 million to upgrade and preserve the railway reserve. It has been beautified and is a credit to the local community who look after it extremely well. Playgrounds and walking trails are used by many local residents for recreation, walking and exercising.

More importantly, it provides from Mile End to Camden Park one of the longest and most attractive green belt areas. I go back in history on the Holdfast Bay line. *Historic Glenelg, Birthplace of South Australia, 1855 to 1879*, first written by Jeanes, describes the Holdfast Bay railway line. The Holdfast Bay Railway Company Ltd was formed with

a proposed capital of £30 000 to compete against the South Terrace railway line. It was felt, in the early days of the colony, that the South Terrace line was not providing the service. A quote from the book is as follows:

A Bill for the necessary Act was introduced in Parliament on 7 August 1878, and evidence was taken at considerable length regarding the short-comings of the South Terrace service. The passage of the Bill was opposed by the directors of the older company who, in a petition to Parliament, expressed their intention of duplicating the Victoria Square-Glenelg line. In the evidence before Parliament special stress was laid on the advantages of the proposed new route, including the development of goods services between Adelaide and Glenelg.

Difficulties regarding the use of a short length of South Australian Railways lines at the approach to the North Terrace station were eventually overcome and the original scheme was assented to by Parliament. One of the conditions of the Act was that the new railway company should pay to the South Australian Railway Commissioners £300 for the use of its services for the period between 1 November 1880, and 15 September 1881, and thereafter £1 000 per annum plus a charge of one shilling a ton on all goods loaded and unloaded by the SAR on behalf of the company. The Government also reserved the right to purchase the Holdfast Bay railway at any time within 21 years of the completion of the line. Mr Rowland Rees, C.E., at that time a member of Parliament, was appointed chief engineer of the new company, and he prepared the route plan of a line running from the railway station at North Terrace to Colley Reserve, a total distance of 7 miles 20 chains, inclusive of 1 mile 3 chains over SAR permanent way.

The single track was laid to a 5ft 3in gauge and a loop-line to permit the crossing of trains was provided at Plympton. A goods shed and siding were located at Camden, also a short branch line to the Morphetville Racecourse.

The company had purchased seven acres of land at St Leonards between Alison and Pasquin Streets, including a considerable frontage to the Bay Road, for the establishment of the headquarters of the line.

That building is still there on Anzac Highway, although not in good condition. I hope that the National Trust at Glenelg, which I formed some years ago, will ensure that the building remains a permanent reminder of the early pioneering days of our State. A further quote states:

Here an extensive goods yard with three tracks leading to various sheds, a two-road locomotive running shed, a carriage shed and workshops for the running repairs and maintenance of the rolling stock were constructed.

Although the construction work on the Holdfast Bay line was not commenced until August 1879, the line was opened for traffic on 24 May 1880. The cost to the opening date was £46 000, which included about £10 000 for land purchase. For the official opening of the line two first-class American-style six-wheel coaches were used. A contemporary newspaper said one of these was fitted up with seats and every convenience in the most complete manner possible and was a magnificent travelling luxury as regards comfort and ornamentation. The other vehicle used as a smoking car had not at that time been furnished with seats.

After a short stay at Plympton to inspect station arrangements the train proceeded to the Glenelg terminus, afterwards returning to the St Leonards depot, where about 300 guests did full justice to the banquet which was provided in the sheds. Great enthusiasm prevailed—for the vexacious monopoly of the old line was to be broken up and the prospect of cheap fares and courteous treatment made everyone delighted.

That was the beginning of the Holdfast Bay railway line. It is not surprising that competition between that line and the South Terrace line was such that eventually the two companies had to be amalgamated. Proposals were put to Parliament and there was considerable debate with the Government making all sorts of offers for the shares and share capital it bought. Quite a history is involved if we go through the whole of the company.

Unfortunately, the North Terrace line, as it was finally known, continued to run until 16 December 1929. It is almost 60 years since the line was closed, by which time the electric tramway service was in operation along the old South Terrace route. As a matter of fact, the Glenelg tram celebrates its 60th anniversary in December this year, and some stamps were issued a few days ago commemorating

the tramway services of Australia. The last train was timed to leave Wigley Reserve at 11.45 p.m. and it is recorded that 300 or 400 people congregated on the platform and adjoining roadway to witness the closing down of a system which had served the town for over 50 years.

As we all know, any railway system or service tends to open up the country. There is no doubt that the Holdfast Bay railway from Glenelg to North Terrace helped to open up the areas that we now know as Plympton, Camden Park, Kurrulta Park and Marleston through the south-western suburbs. Prior to the Minister's announcement in State Parliament, the *Guardian* newspaper, on 26 September, and subsequently the *West Side* newspaper, reported, 'Release of two plans confuses south to city O-Bahn proposal.' It is important to get the facts on the record on this issue by quoting this article, because it is timely. The article was written by Janet Woolcock, who says:

Confusion surrounds the proposed south to city O-Bahn route due to conflicting plans released by two different groups. The O-Bahn was first suggested four weeks ago by the newly-formed Southern Transport Implementations and Needs Group (STING). The State Government released its proposal for an O-Bahn route from Darlington to the city last week. The two proposals follow different routes in different areas but have been confused as being the same plan.

The State Government route, drawn up by the Transport Policy Office and the Road Transport Department, shows a proposed route from Darlington to the city passing through Seacombe Gardens, Morphettville, Plympton, Marleston and Mile End. STING's preferred route would be built in four stages and eventually stretch from Willunga to the city. Following the old Willunga Railway line, the route would run through Seaford, Noarlunga, Hackham, Morphett Vale and Reynella. The track would then connect to Morphett Road at O'Halloran Hill and continue in a straight line to the Morphettville Racecourse where it could run parallel with the tram route to the city.

STING chairwoman Anne Villani said the Government had 'jumped the gun on the O-Bahn' issue. Ms Villani said it seemed the Government 'got wind' of the proposal and quickly put together its own route in an attempt to cancel out anything STING presented.

'We were pre-empted. We had no time to get our act together,' Ms Villani said.

'When we have had discussions with the necessary departments and researched it as much as possible then we will be presenting it to the Government.'

STING's south to city O-Bahn plans will be presented at a public meeting on Wednesday, 1 November at 7.30 p.m. in the Noarlunga Health Village auditorium.

Following the Minister of Transport's statement to the Estimates Committee on 19 September, I advised the City of West Torrens of what was proposed, because I wanted to ascertain the opinion of that council. The Town Clerk wrote to me on 20 September 1989, as follows:

With reference to your advice concerning an investigation into a possible O-Bahn busway along the route of the old Glenelg/North Terrace Railway Line Reserve through West Torrens, I advise the matter was referred to council last evening and in reply I am to thank you for bringing this matter to the council's attention. Without exception, members expressed their opposition to a proposal of this nature which it is considered would have a highly detrimental effect on the residential amenity and environment of the residential areas that would be affected.

As this was the first indication council had that a proposal of this nature was being suggested, however, the council has resolved to seek further information from the Government to enable a more informed response on behalf of the ratepayers that would be affected.

Councillor Jennings, who represents a large area affected by this proposition, has provided me with a copy of a letter he wrote to the Premier dated 19 September and it states:

O-Bahn

On behalf of the residents whose interests I represent I protest most strongly against the proposal announced today in Parliament for an O-Bahn route from Mile End to Camden Park/Glenelg/Bedford Park along the route of the old Holdfast Bay train line. This objection is as the local government elected representative and I will ask the West Torrens council to formally take the

matter of protest up on behalf of the citizens who will be deleteriously affected by this disgraceful scheme.

The people of the western suburbs have already had to tolerate years of uncertainty in respect of transport matters relevant to their properties. We have had the prospect of the infamous MATS plan hanging over us for two decades. We have seen innumerable properties acquired by the Highways Department, and then disposed of. We have seen successive Governments changing their minds in relation to transport corridors. It is only 20 years since one of your opponents thought he would close the Glenelg tramline and convert it into a freeway. Recently we read about tram lines along the Sturt drain. In April this year rumours spread that the Highways Department was again looking into the construction of a freeway along the Holdfast Bay park.

Sir, we are heartily sick of the philandering with esoteric transport schemes and the clouds of dust which blow over attempts to find anything out. Any proposal to acquire land or construct major public works inevitably tends to have a most deleterious effect on property values. The uncertainty which hangs over the future of any particular area see, over a period of time, a gradual running down of neighborhoods, and their decline from desirable residential areas. Speaking of the majority of the homes in the vicinity of the Holdfast Bay train line, they are occupied by people who have grown up and lived in the area for many years. Many were children here and have married and raised their own families. On a purely personal level, I have lived in my own home on Marion Road for nearly 20 years, and have lived in Plympton, apart from breaks in my misspent youth, since 1947. I have four children and I trust they can live in and grow up in this area without the threat of concrete induced residential destruction and upheaval.

I am sorry that I must harangue you, for I realise that the lot of a politician is indeed a wretched one, but if I may warm to my subject, may I suggest that your transport advisers are a few bricks short of a load? I imagine the purpose of the proposed O-Bahn route is to alleviate the delays which the poor citizens of the southern sprawl must endure when travelling to the city to spend their social security benefits in Rundle Mall or the casino. The problems of transport from the southern suburbs are real ones, but why the heck did a Labor Government close the Hallett Cove-Willunga railway in 1969? That line went straight through what is now a densely urbanised area. Why is nothing being done to stop the spread of commerce and industry through the western suburbs, and rejuvenate great areas of West Torrens, for instance, for housing? And I need not remind you of how the MATS plan completely stuffed Hindmarsh as a residential area. There is something quite wrong with both urban and transport planning:

O judgement, thou art fled to brutish beasts and men have lost their reason!

I need hardly add that your latest transport proposal, with its conglomeration of grotesque overpasses and the attendant housing demolition and degradation, will stir up a local hornets' nest and I for one, will be happy to add my sting to the virulent horde. I can only conclude by indicating that I will endeavour to oppose and destroy the proposed O-Bahn by any lawful means, to the last drop of ink, the last shred of paper, the last gasp of breath, and the last symbolic drop of blood.

I think that provides the House with a reasonable idea of the attitude of the residents in that area. I have received dozens of other letters, many of them from constituents thanking me for raising the issue and calling a public meeting to bring this proposal of the Government to their attention. The whole purpose of organising a public meeting on this issue was to ascertain from the residents whether or not the attitude I had adopted was correct.

Ever since I have been a member of Parliament representing that area, I have believed that the local residents were strongly opposed to any development along the Holdfast Bay railway reserve and that they supported the suggestion that I put forward years ago that we seek to have that reserve beautified. They supported my suggestions to the council and to the Government to obtain grants to provide a passive recreation area (which was done), and now the residents have confirmed what I have felt all along: they are totally opposed to any arterial road, transport corridor or anything at all in regard to this railway reserve.

It is significant that we have already received 173 signatures to the petitions we have lodged with Parliament, and there are considerably more to come. Approximately 80

petition forms are circulating within the community. This House must bear in mind the comments that have been made by councillors and by the council and the warnings that were given by the Minister. We sympathise with the people living in the southern suburbs because of their transport and traffic difficulties, which sympathy was quite evident throughout the meeting (which was attended by in excess of 400 people). Because of poor planning in the past, we totally supported a move to improve their transport system, but we do not support any development on the Holdfast Bay railway reserve.

On behalf of my constituents, the people in the south-western suburbs, residents of the West Torrens council, I plead with the Minister and the Government that that reserve be handed over to the West Torrens council to be maintained as a linear park for the benefit of the people.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

MURRAY RIVER FISHERY

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I move:

That the regulations under the Fisheries Act 1982 relating to river (Murray) fishery, made on 14 September and laid on the table of the House on 26 September 1989, be disallowed.

I do not take this action lightly. The public of South Australia, particularly those members of the public who live in the vicinity of the Murray River in this State, are absolutely appalled at the sheer arrogance of the department and the Government in the manner in which they have gone about implementing these regulations. The Government has had a Green Paper out for public comment for some 12 or 18 months, and numerous submissions have been made by members of the public in response to that Green Paper. Public meetings have been held. Finally, the Government produced a White Paper, which it has put into effect in the form of the regulations. Those regulations take absolutely no account of the worthwhile submissions made by members of the public.

This situation has overtones of the past, with the Government adopting the attitude, 'We know what is best for you and that is what the Government intends to do.' Any Government that adopts that attitude in Australia today will have a very short life. We are led to believe that we live in a democracy, but when we see the actions that have been taken in certain instances by Governments and by departments, particularly in this State, we start to question whether or not that is correct. From the time these regulations came into being on 14 September, ever-increasing numbers of people have been coming to me, expressing their concerns and wanting the regulations amended.

I have explained to them that parliamentary procedure does not allow for regulations to be amended, that Parliament either accepts or rejects the regulations. It is on that basis that I move the motion for disallowance. I move for the disallowance of these regulations because of the weight of public opinion. To gauge the weight of public opinion a petition was circulated in the community only last week, and next week I will present to this House a petition which contains many thousands of signatures and which, I understand, presently contains some 3 000 signatures. The petition is as follows:

... being the residents of South Australia ... we object in the strongest terms to the excessive restriction being placed on the recreational fishing sector by the River Murray fishery regulations as consented to by Executive Council on 14 September 1989.

The regulations will not achieve the Government's stated objective and we call on the Government for the immediate repeal of these regulations and the implementation of an effective river

fishery management plan for the River Murray in South Australia to improve the ecology and natural habitat of native fish species.

One only has to look at a graph of Murray River flows and fish catches over a number of years to see that it clearly indicates that, although fish catches might have declined to some degree, breeding stocks are not in jeopardy. River conditions and management of the river have the greatest bearing on the level of fish stocks in the river. The graph indicates that there was a strong flow and a corresponding high catch in the river in October-November of 1973-74; and in 1974-75 there was once again a strong flow and an extremely high catch of native fish species. The opposite is clearly indicated: when there is a constant low flow, the catch is of no significance whatsoever.

The fish are there and under certain conditions—when the river is flowing strongly and when breeding time is right—they are readily caught. Native fish species in the Murray River will breed only under certain conditions, principally when the river flows strongly and when the water spreads over the flood plains. Fish will spawn when the temperature is right. That is happening at present, and has been the case for the past month or two with this strong flow. Present catches are the highest for years, because there has not been a significant flow in the river for a number of years. Any suggestion that fish stocks are virtually depleted is not true. There have been catches of 10 and 15 Murray cod in a net at one time. There have been catches of 20 and 30 callop at one time in drum nets. While the appearance may be that the stocks of fish in the Murray have been depleted enormously, the facts are that when the river flows strongly catches equivalent to what they were 20 and 30 years ago are still recorded.

To have some understanding of why the people at large are distressed with the implementation of these regulations, it is necessary to look at the history of the Fisheries Department and the Fisheries Act to see what earlier management was all about. Following the low flows in the Murray during the 1960s the then Director of Fisheries and Fauna, Mr Olsen, implemented the Fisheries Act of 1971 with its regulations. With the Fisheries Act of 1971, regulations required recreational fishermen to register all equipment for the first time, the objectives being:

1. To measure the recreational effort in fisheries management.
2. To set a limit on the number of effort units required for a person to catch fish required for a family unit.
3. To monitor closely the return achieved by effort units.

The registration fees which applied at that time for drum nets were generally accepted by the community. This had the effect of replacing the wire drum nets which caught many of the small fish and also scaled and damaged many of the fish which were in the net to the extent that if the small fish were released the survival rate was low. From a management point of view the use of wire drum nets is a danger to the survival of the species, and every endeavour should be made to ensure that wire drum nets are not used.

At the same time the regulations required that yabbie pots, hoop nets, and cross lines would also be registered on a recreational fishermen's licence, but no charge would be made for that equipment. At about the same time in the commercial sector going back to 1967 there were 188 breaches in South Australia. The objectives of the regulations were:

1. To determine the catch and effort data and record that information.
2. The removal by attrition of reaches in backwaters.
3. The proposal to reduce the commercial sector.

In 1973 following the urging from the recreational and commercial sectors, a research officer, Mr Reynolds, was appointed to study the effects of European carp on native fish. That was one of the best appointments ever made by

the department. In 1973 and 1974, which were high-flowing years (and I have already quoted from the graph which indicated that there were good catches in that time), there was an abundance of yabbies, and certainly callop and other native fish at that time bred in abundance with the high-flow conditions.

In 1975-76 it was proposed to locate fishing areas of substantial size, for recreational drum nets near major towns and minor towns sufficient to cater for increasing recreational drum nets. In other words, they created recreational reaches where amateurs could put in a drum net and a cross line in their recreational pursuits, and it was properly controlled and managed by the department. The proposal for the commercial sector to have a system of appointing fishermen to target European carp and to provide training for new commercial fishermen was good. However, the department has not followed through, in that it seems to have been scared stiff to allocate additional licences for professionals to take European carp, in the belief that any person issued with a permit to take European carp would somehow, along the line, dedicate efforts to taking native species rather than carp. I believe this would not occur. The situation in which professionals were allocated specific licences to take this noxious fish, which was causing absolute havoc to the Murray River fishery, would do a great service to the fishery.

There is the ability to establish a worthwhile industry based on carp. Repeatedly, members of the community have tried to obtain licences to principally harvest European carp. Let me say that there are literally thousands of tonnes of European carp in the Murray River in South Australia. One has only to visit some of the backwaters and paddle around in a dingy to see the large fish in their thousands.

A worthwhile industry could be established in South Australia based on the European carp. However, the department has seen fit not to do that. Meanwhile, the European carp is having a devastating effect on the ecology of the river in South Australia, and probably in Victoria and New South Wales. For many years it was necessary for recreational fishermen to register their equipment, and particularly their drum nets. However, in 1986 the Government, in line with its deregulation program, decided that it was no longer necessary for drum nets and recreational fishing equipment to be registered. We had open slather whereby anyone could have any equipment that they liked. In itself, this was a disaster because it meant that the Government no longer had a tab on the amount of equipment in the river.

This change increased dramatically the amount of interference with gear, because anyone could steal another person's net take it further down river and claim it as their own. That increased problems dramatically. Certainly, if the regulations implemented in the early 70s had been left in place—regulations relating to recreational drum nets—it would have had the effect of phasing them out over a period, as happened with other nets used for recreational purposes since July 1986.

Unfortunately, the Government decided not to continue with the licence structure, and abandoned the whole scheme. In 1989 we have a situation where the Government has gone 100 per cent the other way where no-one can have a licence or a net, but I cannot be convinced that that sort of action is based on any form of scientific approach at all. If the Government is to be successful in any management plan (that applies for most things, but particularly in respect of the environment), it must have the support of the public. If it does not have public support, it will not succeed. It will not succeed in this case because many of the people whose equipment has been recognised by the Government

over the years have had that recognition taken away, and in many instances they will place in the river wire drum nets which cannot be seen but which cause a great deal of damage to species.

If the Government and the department honestly believe that by banning recreational drum nets they have solved this problem, they are poor students of human nature, because that will not occur. It would be far better for the Government to withdraw the regulations, go back to the drawing board and think again. The best way of doing that would be to establish a working party of two experienced recreational fishermen, two experienced commercial fishermen, one environmentalist and one departmental research officer to come up with a proper management plan that would facilitate the optimum use of the Murray River in South Australia by professional and recreational fishermen. If a proper research program and a restocking program are implemented, I have no objection whatsoever to a licence and a fee for recreational drum nets and equipment. However, no way on earth would I ever support the implementation of a licence for hand line fishing in South Australian waters.

The majority of people who are serious about wanting a recreational drum net are not opposed to paying a fee which would provide a source of revenue to the Government for research and which would also provide a fund that would enable the Government to restock the river in South Australia with fingerlings from Narrandera or the like. In so doing, it would be taking positive action. The negative approach of prohibition has never been successful anywhere in the world and it will not be successful in this instance. For the reasons I have given, I have moved my motion, which I commend to the House.

Mr RANN secured the adjournment of the debate.

VOLUNTEER AMBULANCE OFFICERS

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I move:

That this House condemns the Government for its failure to provide sufficient support for St John Brigade volunteer ambulance officers which has led to the decision to phase out their invaluable organisational role in the provision of top class, cost effective and wide ranging ambulance services to South Australia.

In moving this motion I am acutely aware of the wording, which has to be emphasised: 'condemns the Government for its failure to provide sufficient support for St John Brigade volunteer ambulance officers' because, if one goes back over the history of the whole saga from the 1970s into the 1980s, when it gained momentum, the Bannon Government and the Labor Party as a philosophical body have never really come out and supported the volunteers. It has been patently obvious that, back in the mid-1980s when the public was 100 per cent behind the volunteers, the Government of the day went very quietly, paying lip service to supporting the volunteers. In reality, however, the hidden agenda behind the scene throughout the whole of the saga was that it made sure that the unions got their way and that the paid ambulance officers ultimately would reign supreme in St John. I refer to the 1984 report of the Legislative Council select committee on the St John Ambulance Service in South Australia. I wish briefly to canvass the history of the industrial relations which is referred to in that report and which is of interest to all those who tried to follow the events. The report states:

In a letter dated 12 July 1951, the St John Council undertook to organise an efficient ambulance service for South Australia on the basis that, *inter alia*, the service would be provided whenever

possible by voluntary personnel. Paid personnel would be used where absolutely necessary to maintain adequate service.

Until the 1960s appointment of paid staff followed a strict selection procedure . . . In the mid 1960s a paid officer resigned from the brigade, contrary to the requirement that paid officers maintained their voluntary involvement. At the same time, a St John Ambulance Officers Association (AGWA) was formed as a branch of the Australian Government Workers Association (which later merged with the FMWU).

It was not until the late 1970s that significant industrial problems began to occur. In June 1977—

I think that is the significant date in this matter—

the *Advertiser* newspaper carried the front page headline 'Axe St John Volunteers Says Union'.

I stress that it was back in 1977 that the movement commenced. The report continues:

The union proposed that paid ambulance officers progressively take over the afternoon, night and weekend shifts crewed by volunteer ambulance officers. The union claimed that the campaign was directed at the management of the ambulance service not the volunteers . . .

In 1978 the AGWA unsuccessfully sought introduction of a fully paid ambulance service in the metropolitan area through the Industrial Commission. Shortly thereafter a group of paid ambulance officers sought registration of a new organisation, the Ambulance Employees Association (AEA), to represent them in industrial matters.

It is now a matter of history that when the Bannon Government came to office in November 1982 it established, in accordance with a pre-election commitment, an inquiry into ambulance services in South Australia and appointed Professor L.J. Opit to conduct the inquiry. The report of the select committee contains a section on the role of volunteers. Indeed, it endorses the role of volunteers. I think that is quite surprising, because the Labor Party opposed setting up of the select committee. It was all very well to pay lip service, and in the early 1980s it was appropriate for the Labor Party to show interest in the volunteers, but the fact was that it opposed the setting up of the select committee. It did not want to set up an inquiry. However, it was forced into it, because the Opposition and the Democrats were able to force the measure through. When it came time to produce the report the Government paid lip service to the role of volunteers. In relation to volunteers, the report states:

Volunteers play an important role in the provision of community services. It is equally important that the role of volunteers in any given organisation is subject to careful management, and that paid staff, volunteers and management have a clear understanding of where volunteers fit into the present and future planning for the provision of services by that organisation.

Volunteers may be motivated by personal interest in serving a particular client group, by a desire to gain work experience, or by a desire to assist the community.

Further on in the report the following statement is made:

The select committee believes that volunteer ambulance officers should have the opportunity to contribute effectively to the management of ambulance services and recommends that a volunteer ambulance officer, elected by secret ballot, be appointed to the proposed ambulance board.

The committee also commented on the conflict between paid officers and the volunteers, as follows:

The select committee noted, with concern, the conflict that still exists—

and members should bear in mind that this was in 1984—between paid and volunteer ambulance officers. Representatives of each group submitted anecdotal 'evidence' of deficient service and antagonism attributable to the other . . .

Volunteer ambulance officers and paid officers actively involved in the ambulance brigade believe that there is a small group of paid ambulance officers actively seeking to stop volunteer involvement in the ambulance service. The volunteers feel threatened by the appointment of additional paid crews and the introduction of integrated crews comprising paid and volunteer ambulance officers.

AEA membership is restricted to paid ambulance officers up to the level of Centre Officer. This group attributes perceived

deficiencies in the ambulance service to the use of volunteer ambulance officers.

They have been critical of the command structure and differences in training, assessment and work experience between the two groups which, they claim, have disadvantaged them.

It is unlikely that this conflict will disappear completely until there is improved communication between paid officers, volunteer officers, management of the ambulance service, and the ambulance brigade.

This was in 1984. It should be borne in mind that that report was not written by the Government; it is a bipartisan report with sufficient Opposition members and Democrats on that committee to make sure that the report was printed accurately. In hindsight, it is patently obvious to all of us that there was a hidden agenda amongst Government members that some time down the track we would actually see the paid officers get what they wanted. In other words, the unions would win, and we would see the unions take over the ambulance service.

An article appeared in the *Sunday Mail* on 19 March this year written by Randall Ashbourne who has the ear of many Government members. I am sure he would have written this report bearing in mind what he had heard around the corridors of this place. He says:

Off the record, the Bannon Government will admit that within five years the South Australian ambulance service will be completely professional.

That is quite a statement; it is something which we suspected at the time of the select committee might happen. I believe history will prove Mr Ashbourne to be correct in this case. The article continues:

By the turn of the century, the Country Fire Services is likely to go the same way.

I suggest to members that not only is the CFS targeted for takeover and removal of volunteers by the Labor Party and the unions but also the questions are already being asked about the hidden agenda and for Meals on Wheels and other voluntary organisations in the community. As Mr Ashbourne points out in his article:

The signs have been coming for a long time.

These are not my words, but the words of a political reporter who is very close to the Ministers of the Labor Government. He continues:

Take the women's shelter movement as an example. It started as a voluntary movement—a caring act of committed people who saw a need and filled it. Having demonstrated the need, they applied for government funding. Because government money was involved, the bureaucracy insisted on more and more government control. Thus we reached the stage with one particular shelter where, because of apparently unfounded allegations of financial impropriety, the organisers were removed and replaced by public servants. Suddenly, we had a 9-to-5 women's shelter. What good is that to a woman whose husband comes home drunk and violent after the pubs close?

The list of similar, once voluntary movements is endless—child care centres, kindergartens, hospital boards, district sporting clubs. Most have moved from being all voluntary to government-subsidised, to government-controlled.

They are the three steps. Of course, the hidden agenda is there. The article continues:

To some extent, the takeover has been evolutionary—the social need has existed and socially-aware governments have moved to ensure the provision of such services over a wider area. To a large extent however, the takeover has been prompted by Labor ideology—that 'charity' ought not be necessary at all, that the State should provide all the services a society needs or wants.

Further on, he says:

But back to the St John volunteers and the CFS. Both are under threat from their career counterparts. In the case of the ambulance service, it will cost an extra \$3.5 million a year to fully professionalise the metropolitan area, and an extra \$10 million a year to do it Statewide.

We have done some costing, and we believe the figure is nearer to \$30 million. We have seen a State which has pride

in its volunteerism in the ambulance services and the CFS. We have also seen a philosophical argument develop from the 1970s, moving through the 1980s, whereby the Labor Party has been determined to support its political wing on South Terrace and make sure that they do rid themselves of the volunteers and replace them with a paid service.

This Government does not appreciate the value of volunteers in our society—the value of people in our community willing to give themselves to aid others. That is patently obvious. It is a basic part of Liberal philosophy and is anathema to anyone who sits on the Labor benches of this Parliament. Without the unpaid workforce in Australia, we would grind to a halt. The unpaid workforce is there and should be utilised. Volunteers do a tremendous job in their locality and in the wider communities. They provide aid for families, the disabled and older people. I mentioned earlier the valuable work of the CFS and Meals on Wheels. What next is on the Labor Party's hidden agenda?

A survey was conducted last year by the Australian Bureau of Statistics and the Volunteer Centre of South Australia, and it produced some very interesting figures. Three out of every 10 people undertake some form of voluntary work in this country, and five million across Australia are performing voluntary work. In South Australia, 426 000 people were identified as providing voluntary work. The survey was conducted over a three-month period and a staggering 15.6 million hours were being given to the community by volunteers in South Australia alone. A total of 46 per cent of the volunteers were men, and 30 per cent of people aged 15 and over provide their services regularly. On anyone's reckoning, that is a tremendous achievement. It is a commitment to care, a commitment which the Liberal Party recognises and in Government certainly intends to foster. The Bannon Government has its marriage with Trades Hall, and in the last 10 minutes I have explained the hidden agenda involving St John's, the CFS and other areas. Unlike the Labor Government, we believe there is much more at stake in the community in going out and fostering volunteers.

In two very important areas, volunteers are actually fighting for their survival. It is a fight which never should have begun; it is a fight which the Labor Party never should have allowed to develop; it is a fight not only about volunteers fighting for their survival but it is also a basic fight about union dominance. Yesterday the Leader gave reassurances of a Liberal Government's commitment to ensure that volunteers will survive in the South Australian community and, using his words, 'Unions will be forced to retreat and make sure that volunteers are there to do what they want to do to help their community.' To make sure that members understand our policy, I will repeat what the Leader of the Opposition said publicly yesterday:

The volunteers of St John's deserve our support and they are assured of it. The volunteers of the CFS also are under seige. They, too, must be protected and will receive our support. There are 19 500 CFS volunteers who risk their lives in this State every summer. They risked their lives to protect the State through the last two Ash Wednesdays. There is no way that a Government should be allowed to destroy such a commitment for the sake of union power.

Let me specifically take the opportunity to highlight some of our policy commitments of aid and support for volunteers in this State. Again, I will use the Leader's words of yesterday when he said:

We believe that, by complementing the work of professionals, volunteering work expands and enhances the effective delivery of services across the State. As we look to the future, we ought to require all relevant Government departments to develop and implement a policy on volunteering. We need to assess a means to reimburse the out-of-pocket expenses of volunteers recruited by approved non-government organisations.

We must encourage far more students from both primary and secondary schools to participate in voluntary activities. To give credit to the work of volunteers and enhance its standing, we should encourage employers to take volunteer work into account in job applications, for volunteer work experience has a great deal to say about an applicant's personal attributes and commitment to assisting others. In the State's interest, we must seek discussions with the St John Council to formulate a long-term policy which enables volunteers to continue to make a contribution to the provision of ambulance services in both the country and metropolitan area.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN POPULATION

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:

That this House deplores the declining population share in South Australia compared to other Australian States which indicates the stagnation which has occurred during the life of this Government.

(Continued from 12 October. Page 114.)

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I would like to carry on from the remarks I was making last week in relation to the population trends in South Australia, which are a cause for considerable concern. Our population has been increasing slowly—minimally—compared to the rest of Australia. That will lead to some problems for us down the track. The result of South Australia's slower population growth is that our State's population is making up a progressively smaller percentage of the total Australian population. For example, in 1972, South Australia made up 9.1 per cent of the Australian population; by 1982 it was only 8.8 per cent; and in 1988 it had declined to 8.5 per cent. That was the point at which I concluded my remarks last week. So, we are declining.

Any population increase is due to births or inward migration from interstate or overseas and declines due to deaths and outward migration (again, interstate or overseas). On almost all of these counts South Australia has consistently shown lower growth than other States and Territories. In summary, the following are the trends that have emerged:

1. Natural increase: South Australia has the lowest total fertility rate in Australia apart from the ACT, and we have a crude death rate that is higher than the Australian average. The result is that our population is reproducing itself more slowly than any other State or Territory. In 1988 our population increased by about 0.6 per cent through natural increase compared to 0.8 per cent for Australia as a whole.

2. Overseas migration: In terms of overseas migration there is a clear contradistinction to the post-Second World War years when South Australia enjoyed a considerably higher percentage of migration. We attracted a greater percentage of migrants to this State, particularly from overseas, during that period of expansion under successive Liberal Governments than would have been our share. Unfortunately, with the demise of Liberal Governments, that trend has been reversed. Since the 1970s, South Australia has consistently received less than its share of migration from overseas. For example, in 1988 South Australia had about 8.5 per cent of Australia's total population, but attracted only 4 per cent of overseas migrants. This pattern does not seem to depend on periods of high or low migration intake: in the high intake of 1982, South Australia received only 6.7 per cent of the overseas migrant intake. Only Tasmania has a worse record than South Australia.

3. Internal migration: From 1 July 1982 until 30 June 1988 South Australia lost about 7 100 residents to other States and Territories. We are not gaining large numbers as are Western Australia and Queensland: in fact, we are losing them.

4. Population projections: Anyone with a computer can generate population projections, but there are two main sets for South Australia. The first is generated by the Department of Environment and Planning's Development Program Unit, and it gives us projections to 2021 for regions and even local government areas within the State, but it does not provide Australian figures for comparison. The second set is generated by ABS, using several fertility, mortality, and migration assumptions. Of the four ABS series available at the moment, series C is probably the most reliable. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a statistical table that shows projected population estimates for South Australia and Australia, according to series C.

Leave granted.

TABLE 2: ABS SERIES C PROJECTED POPULATION; SA AND AUSTRALIA, 1989-2031

Estimated resident population, June quarter	S.A. ('000)	Aust. ('000)	S.A. as % of Aust.
1989	1423.4	16789.4	8.5
1990	1437.5	17047.7	8.4
1991	1451.6	17309.3	8.4
1996	1514.5	18551.2	8.2
2001	1565.6	19698.6	7.9
2006	1608.0	20780.3	7.7
2011	1644.5	21801.7	7.5
2016	1677.0	22770.0	7.4
2021	1703.8	23669.1	7.2
2026	1722.4	24474.8	7.0
2031	1731.5	25171.0	6.9

Source: ABS 3222.0. Projections of the population of Australia, States and Territories.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It indicates that in South Australia we have, in 1989, 1.423 million people. Australia has 16.789 million people. Our percentage of the population as a whole is 8.5 per cent. By the year 2001 it is estimated that our population in South Australia, according to series C ABS figures, will be 1.565 million, whereas the population for Australia as a whole is estimated to be 19.698 million. Our percentage of the Australian population would have declined to 7.9 per cent. If these projections are followed through to the year 2031, it is estimated that the population of South Australia will be 1.731 million, and the population for Australia will be 25.171 million. Our percentage of that population will have declined even further to 6.9 per cent. The source of these figures is the ABS No. 3222 projections of population of Australian States and Territories.

The result of the series C projections is that South Australia's share of Australia's total population declined from 8.5 per cent in 1988 to only 6.9 per cent for the year 2031. This is all due to the assumptions used to generate the projections, but choosing any of the other series gives a similar result. Series A reduces South Australia's share of the total Australian population to 7.1 per cent by 2031; series B reduces it to 6.9 per cent; and, series D reduces it to 7.3 per cent.

I have some comments on age structure. While the actual size of our population relative to other States and Territories will be important, especially for Grants Commission purposes, the age structure may be equally important. The age structure of the population can be expressed as a dependency ratio. That ratio is made up of adding together the number of persons aged nought to 14 years (who are classed to be dependent) and those aged 65 years and over (who are also classed as dependent) and dividing them between the number of people aged between 15 and 64 years, who are least likely to be dependent. This dependency ratio was 58.8 per cent in 1972, which is a high percentage, declining to a present level of 49.7 per cent, mostly because of a decline in fertility.

The projections show an increase back to about 50 per cent by 1996, and a decline to 45 per cent from 1996 until about 2011, with a rise again to about 60 per cent by 2031. There will be a high dependency ratio then if these projections are correct. The problem with the dependency ratio is that it masks two opposite movements which show up clearly in projections: an increase in the proportion of our population aged 65 years or over and a decline in the number of people aged nought to 14 years.

South Australia now has a higher proportion of people aged over 65 years than any other State or Territory, and projections show that this is likely to continue. In 1972 only 8.5 per cent of South Australia's population were aged 65 years or over, but by 2031 this could be as high as 23.2 per cent. That is a significant increase from 8.5 per cent in 1972 to 23.2 per cent by 2031. The increase is largely due to a decline in fertility and hence in the number of young people in our population and is much less due to declining mortality.

Table three summarises actual and projected percentages of population in this State aged 65 years or over as a percentage of the population between 1972 and 2031. I seek leave to have the table incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Table 3: Persons Aged 65+ as a Percentage of the South Australian Population, 1972-2031

Actual Population Data	Percentage of Population Aged 65+
1972	8.6
1982	10.8
1988	12.2
Projected Using Series C	
2001	13.99
2011	15.12
2021	18.94
2031	23.19

Source: ABS 3201.0 Estimated resident population by sex and age.
ABS 3222.0 Projections of the populations of Australia, States and Territories.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: That table simply summarises what I have been putting before the House. For comparative purposes, the proportion of the total Australian population aged 65 years plus would be only 20.05 per cent by the year 2031 according to series C.

As regards the young, in 1972, 28.4 per cent of South Australia's population was aged nought to 14, but the fertility decline, which started in the early 1970s, reduced this to 23.3 per cent by 1982 and 21 per cent by 1988. The ABS series C projections continue this trend. Table 4 indicates persons aged nought to 14 as a percentage of the South Australian population from 1972 to 2031. I seek leave to include that table in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Table 4: Persons aged 0-14 as a Percentage of the South Australian Population 1972-2031.

Actual Population Data	Percentage of Population Aged 0-14
1972	28.4
1982	23.3
1988	21.0
Projected Using Series C	
2001	18.44
2011	16.13
2021	15.20
2031	14.31

Source: ABS 3201.0 estimated resident population by sex and age.
ABS 3222.0 Projections of the populations of Australia, States and Territories.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: That table is rather worrying, because it indicates that the proportion of population aged nought to 14 in 1972 was 28.4 per cent. Currently it is down to 21 per cent. Using this series C, by 2031 only 14 per cent of South Australia's population will be aged nought to 14. We are failing to reproduce ourselves. Again, this declining trend is more the result of declining fertility than of any other factor.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have done my bit. I hope that the Minister has done his bit. If he has, I am pleased to hear it. There are many less obvious implications of the changing age structure of our population. For a start, a higher proportion of the population would be of voting age, and probably female, unless the male/female differential in age at death closes. We know that the life expectancy for females is still about five years longer than for males, but that gap could close.

The State Government could conceivably find more calls on its resources for services to the aged at the expense of services to the young. I know that in the early 1980s several studies tried to estimate the relative costs of the old and the young. I think that the result was that in Australia about three times more was spent by Federal and State Governments on each person aged 65 and over compared with each child aged nought to 14. Of course, the changes encouraging self-provision through superannuation may change this situation radically.

I put those statistics on the record because they indicate what should be of concern to psephologists and all who are charged with planning for the future of this State. The trends are there for all to see. They indicate that we are stagnating compared with the rest of Australia. I repeat that from the end of the Second World War until 1970, because of the lower cost structure which was encouraged and engendered and because of the stability of our work force (and some of that stability still remains) and the work ethic which historically has been well developed in South Australia, we enjoyed a period of growth which exceeded that of all the other States. Unfortunately, these statistics start in 1972, but since 1970—the change of Government—those trends have been reversed.

We saw some economic news in Saturday's *Advertiser*, which reported that there is a bit of a blip at the moment, but that is all it is. That would tend to give the lie if one took literally what that report from the Centre for Economic Studies was seeking to portray to the population at large. It was claiming that in all these indicators we were doing better than the national average. If one takes a short period—somewhat less than a year—one might be led into believing this was happening; but the underlying trends showing what has occurred over time and what will occur from now on are undeniably in terms of the statistics that I have put before the House. We must radically rethink where we are going in South Australia.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

WELFARE CUTS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Robertson:

That this House calls on the Leader of the Opposition to clarify his attitude to the welfare cuts proposed by his Federal Coalition colleagues.

(Continued from 12 October. Page 1115.)

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): My colleagues on this side of the House and I do not support this motion

and we will oppose it strongly when the opportunity arises. In the meantime, it has provided me with a marvellous opportunity to refer to many of the positive policies of my Federal colleagues.

When I last addressed this matter, I spoke at length on these positive policies, and now I have the opportunity to refer to the economic and tax policy that has just been announced by the Coalition. I am delighted with the way in which the sittings of the House have worked out, because I now have an opportunity to address this plan. There is no doubt that the policy provides the most detailed and comprehensive tax and expenditure program that has ever been proposed by an Opposition Party. It is certainly an action plan for a more productive and a fairer Australia, and that is why it has been so very well received.

The comments I have received from my own constituents and people from outside my electorate have been very positive. Australia is facing a growing economic crisis which threatens the future living standards of all Australians. The Coalition's economic action plan represents an integrated attack on Australia's problems. At the end of the first term of a Peacock Government, tax rates will be cut, interest rates will be lower, Government will be smaller and inflation will be reduced.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Adelaide is completely out of order in interjecting out of his seat.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The fact is that members opposite do not like all these positive statements.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Well, one can see that; they are not the slightest bit interested. They do not want to listen to it and they do not know what to do about this package. They have fumbled around trying to engender some opposition to the package and to get a few people to support that opposition, but they have failed dismally. They will not bring about a situation where people in South Australia will express any opposition to this package—and they do not like that.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I will ignore the rabble on the other side for the rest of my contribution. By the end of the first term of the Peacock Government, we will see inflation reduced, productivity and real wages will be higher, and growth in foreign debt will be brought under control. In this package, tough decisions have not been shirked. The plan calls for an end to the present open-ended unemployment benefit system; and for a far-reaching program of reform to transport, communications and other key areas of the economy. The plan calls for a credible medium-term monetary policy directed at reducing inflation, and for a major program of privatisation to transfer to private enterprise what it could do more effectively at a lower cost.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Desperate measures for desperate men!

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: That is great, coming from the desperate bodies on the other side of the House! The Minister at the bench, who would howl down the idea of any privatisation, has, under some disguise, I might add, been responsible for a considerable amount of privatisation under his own Government. So, let him not get excited over there about what these positive incentives will bring to the people of Australia.

The plan calls for reform of the labour market to boost productivity by encouraging closer and more rewarding working relationships between management and employees, and for an end to compulsory aged retirement. A major

commitment is given to handing back the increase in tax caused by inflation pushing taxpayers up the tax scale. Never again will inflation be permitted to swell Government coffers and rip off taxpayers through bracket creep.

This decision represents a most significant discipline on any Government and is a major initiative in this action plan. Indeed, it is estimated that bracket creep under the Hawke-Keating Government's high inflation could be between \$2 billion and \$2.5 billion this year. The Government members have all gone quiet—they recognise the situation and have no answer for it. They say that they do not support this package, but they have no answer whatsoever to combat bracket creep in Australia under the Hawke-Keating Government. The Coalition's goal is to achieve a flatter two tax rate system, with the top marginal rate equal to the corporate rate by the end of the Coalition's first term. Tax reforms give priority to providing incentives and assisting families—and I welcome that wholeheartedly. If any members of this House do not welcome that, they have rocks in their heads.

Families, particularly those with children, have suffered most under the Hawke-Keating Government. These reforms include the provision of substantial child tax rebates, estimated to cost \$1 000 million. They include an easing of income tax for the dependent spouse rebate, at a cost of \$200 million. The reforms include assistance to working mothers with tax rebates for child care, at a cost of \$820 million—again, members opposite are silent.

As an incentive to save and invest, the Coalition will replace Labor's capital gains tax with a tax on short-term speculative gains. A key policy goal of a Coalition Government is to bring into line our inflation rate and labour cost growth with those of our trading partners. To achieve this goal the Coalition rejects the Government's policy of sole reliance on high interest rates to try to cope with Australia's economic problems. Rather, the Coalition aims to reduce inflation and interest rates and to achieve a major shift of resources into the production of exports and of goods to replace imports by a process of liberalisation encompassing all aspects of Australian economic life, market structures, management, work practices, public sector and other infrastructures, including the waterfront, transportation and communication.

The Australian economy is about to enter its most difficult period since the Second World War. The economic mismanagement of the Hawke-Keating Government has left Australia with a legacy of debt, the servicing of which has already mortgaged the future of the next generation of Australians. As I have said on numerous occasions in this place, as the father of four children that concerns me more than anything else because the present Hawke-Keating Government could not care less about the responsibilities that will be left to future generations to pay back the enormous debt that has been brought about by the mismanagement of the present Federal Government.

Much of the money has not gone into productive investments and exports to service that debt; it has been frittered away to try to artificially prop up living standards. The hard decisions to boost our productivity and competitiveness have been avoided to placate some narrow vested interest groups and to buy industrial peace under the accord. The fact is that the moment of truth has arrived. Urgent action is required—and members opposite can stop anyone in the Mall this afternoon and they will tell them that they recognise that urgent action is required—if the debt mountain accumulated under Labor is to not bury all Australians.

Mr Hamilton: Quick fixes.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: There are no easy, quick fix options. We all have to work harder and smarter and, for a time, we all have to save more and restrain our consumption levels. I do not think that anyone doubts that. All Australians recognise that there are no quick answers to these problems. The Coalition has approached its task with compassion and realism. Those in genuine need must be helped—there is no doubt about that—but there is no place for those who will not help themselves or who have become excessively or unjustifiably reliant on others.

In particular, millions of average Australian families who are struggling to make ends meet and to raise and educate their children are becoming very impatient as they see their hard-earned tax dollars going to others who they believe are not pulling their weight. Again, members opposite should go out and question the people. I can assure members opposite that that is how the majority of them feel, particularly those who are presently finding it extremely difficult to bring up children.

The principal task of a Coalition Government will be to tackle the issues which the accord has swept under the carpet; to bring employers and employees closer together so they can reach sensible wage bargains and boost productivity and competitiveness; to eliminate waste and inefficiency in Government spending programs and in public administration; to revamp our health and welfare system to encourage greater personal and family financial responsibility, except in cases of genuine need; to work towards a simpler, flatter tax system that will restore incentive; to enhance the independence of the Reserve Bank, ensuring that it can pursue a truly independent monetary policy framed against our medium term objectives of reducing inflation and placing Australian industry on a competitive basis; to eliminate inefficient work and management practices on the waterfront and throughout the transport system generally; and to free up restrictions flowing from excessive regulation, protection and public sector control of enterprises which would be better run in the private sector.

These basic changes of policy must be designed to engender a new attitude towards work and self-reliance. Again, would anybody object to that? Incentive to work, save and invest must be coupled with strong medicine for those who will not pull their weight in society and for those who will not seek to help themselves. A fair go for all Australians requires us to recognise that the efforts of each individual affect others. The Coalition is committed to liberating Australia's economy so that all Australians can be free to play their role. I support that very strongly indeed.

I now refer to the family tax package that has been introduced under this program. The Coalition has decided that the main focus of the tax package should be to provide relief to families who have been hardest hit by Labor. Over \$2 000 million will be returned to families through the Coalition tax package which comprises a new program of child tax rebates, an increase in the eligibility threshold for the dependent spouse rebate and a reduction in the rate at which it is withdrawn. By introducing the child tax rebate the Coalition recognises the increased cost to families of bringing up children. The rebate will be paid at varying rates for the first child and subsequent children at a total cost of \$1 000 million. For the first child under 13 years the rebate will be \$250; for the second child and subsequent children under 13 years, \$200; for the first child between 13 and 15 years the rebate will be \$350; and for the second and subsequent children from 13 to 15 years, \$300.

The people with whom I have discussed that package, the parents of young children, have welcomed that with open arms, because most people realise that it is about time that

people who were doing the right thing in struggling to bring up children in this country were given a fair go. People have been talking about the need for that to happen for a long time. It is only now that we are starting to see incentives being provided for those people under this package. The Coalition will introduce a child-care tax rebate to help those families where both parents are at work and to help sole parent families.

We recognise that under present economic conditions in the majority of families both the husband and wife work. The Coalition also realises that there are a large number of sole parent families who have tremendous responsibilities in the caring of children. The Coalition will introduce a child-care tax rebate to help those families in which both parents work and to help sole parent families.

This will be at the rate of \$20 a week for the first child under five years and \$10 a week for other children under five and for children between five and 12 years. Finally, the dependent spouse rebate will be improved by increasing to \$1 000 the income a dependent spouse may earn while still being eligible for the full rebate, and by easing the rate at which it is withdrawn. I support strongly, and I believe the majority of people in Australia support strongly, that family tax package.

I commend the Coalition and members of the Coalition who have been involved in putting that package together. It is an excellent program and one that I support strongly. There are other matters to which I want to refer concerning other tax changes, the economic policy, for example, and the Coalition's tax and expenditure policy, which has been developed within the framework of our overall economic policy, and that was designed to tackle Australia's growing economic crisis.

The policy is an integrated package designed to do so many things that Australians have been looking for over a period of time, some of which I referred to earlier, for example, the raising of productivity. How can this country go forward if we do not recognise the need to raise productivity? We have the Minister smiling like a Cheshire cat, laughing away; he obviously sees no need whatsoever to raise productivity in this country. That explains why we are in such a mess in South Australia and Australia—because the mob on that side is not the slightest bit interested in the need to raise productivity. Anyone with any nous will realise that Australia will continue to go backwards unless we understand and appreciate that fundamental point: we need to raise productivity.

That policy, which is an integrated package, is also designed to increase competition in the economy, to increase exports and tackle foreign debt, and to raise incentive, to work and invest. We could spend the rest of the day talking about that need. Not long ago I took the opportunity of talking to small business people in my district about the impact on them of interest rates.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: There were a hell of a lot of them. I interviewed about 45 small business people and I was staggered at what they told me, at the concern that they expressed. I also asked them about other concerns. A major concern expressed was that there was no incentive at all to employ. In fact, it was a situation where people in small businesses that could have employed two or three people—they certainly had enough work to employ one or two more—refused to do it because of the associated hassle. There is no incentive in this State. There is no incentive whatsoever for people in small business to go out and employ, yet we wonder why we have an unemployment problem in South Australia, particularly with young people.

Surely it would make sense for us to be able to provide incentives for people who want to employ and who see the need to employ to be able to employ, instead of having this situation where so many of them do not employ because of the hassle. It causes me incredible concern, and that is why I believe it is so essential that the integrated package that has been brought down by the Coalition is aimed at raising incentives and working in this country.

As I said earlier, there is so much that we could say about the package and there is so much that is positive about it. Again, I commend the Coalition for the work that it has put into the formulation of the package, which has been supported and well received by the majority of Australians. So, I close my remarks by urging members to oppose the motion before the House. In particular, I urge the Minister for Housing and Construction to take half an hour to go down to his room or somewhere quiet and have a decent look at that package, instead of thinking that he knows what it is about and rubbishing it when he has no idea about it at all. He should read the package carefully because, in doing so, he will recognise that it is a positive and worthwhile policy, which will be received by the majority of people in Australia at the next election, when we will see a Peacock Government come to power. I urge members of the House to oppose the motion.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): That would be the worst diatribe and parrot-like contribution that I have heard in this place for a long time. It was clear that the member for Heysen was reading from the Liberal Party policy speech made by his Federal Leader—no words of his own—just like a parrot. The most damning thing that lays to rest the contribution of the member opposite appears in a letter in this morning's *Advertiser* written, I am advised, by a disillusioned member of the Liberal Party, Mrs M.A. Starr of Queenstown, a past secretary of the Woodville sub-branch of the Liberal Party. It reads:

In political history, 12 October will long be remembered as the date the Federal Coalition of Liberal and National Parties lost an election it had every reason to win.

This is a disillusioned member of the Liberal Party writing.

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: That does not surprise me: the honourable member does not get around much. He should go down to his electorate office and start talking to people. The letter goes on to say:

With what have we been presented? A cheap and nasty exercise in political cynicism; the casting of this country as a sinking life boat, where the sick, the weak and the disadvantaged must be thrown overboard to ensure the survival of the strong. The Peacock package is, in simple terms—

An honourable member: Starve the Aboriginals!

Mr HAMILTON: Take it easy. The report continues:

The Peacock package in simple terms: less for those who, in the main, would normally vote against the Liberal Government; benefits for the undecided middle-class section of our community, the people who will decide the result of the next election.

In other words, it involves a raw and crude grab for power. I enjoin members opposite—

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: I am not surprised. The member opposite is not very bright, as we all know. He was hopeless as a Minister, and he is even worse now that he does not have his public servants to hold his hand, as he did when he was a Minister. The reality is the parrot-like contribution that we had here this morning and the obfuscation of members opposite. Members on this side remember clearly what happened under the Fraser Liberal Party. We remember that fistful of fivers that they bandied around; giving it in one

hand and taking it from the other. Let us address the real issues such as unemployed, the Aborigines and the disadvantaged people in the community. Where are they? Those silver tails opposite are not worried about the disadvantaged people who have had to struggle. They want to see this perpetuation of the disadvantaged in the community. They are not particularly worried. A blatant display of a greedy grab for power amongst the middle class in Australia is the only contribution we have seen from members opposite. Where is their concern for the education of our students at schools and universities? They have demonstrated clearly their concern by their attacks on those people.

What about their training programs? What have they done there? Suddenly, it is very quiet from members opposite. They obviously do not want to talk about it. They are like petulant children. They want to walk away from the issue. They yell loudly: they are all huff and puff, but when it comes to the real issues such as going out into the community and finding out what people really want, and not to grab for power—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! In view of the amount of interjection on the honourable member for Albert Park and on the honourable member for Heysen when he was speaking, I ask the honourable member not to encourage members to interject.

Mr HAMILTON: Far be it from me to encourage members opposite. I understand the Standing Orders. The rabble opposite try to shout me down. It is unfortunate that they do not possess the necessary skills. The member opposite has made his contribution—as poor as it was in the House—but he still wants to go on. He ignores the Standing Orders. One can only wonder what spectators of his contribution must think. One has only to go back to the members opposite when they were in Government to see the poor display of how they supposedly looked after people in South Australia. I remember between 1979 and 1982 when we had disadvantaged groups, and in this respect I speak of my electorate. What support did they get from members opposite? Zilch: that is what they got.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: The only time that the member for Coles ever came down to my patch, as we all know, was at election time. And what happened then? The honourable member got done over like a dinner. Support went from 4 per cent to 15.2 per cent in 3½ years. The honourable member would not know what it was like to go out door-knocking, except at election time because that is when they believe it counts. That is absolute nonsense, and they know it damn well.

I speak with a great deal of authority and knowledge, about the people in my electorate, because at least I get out and knock on doors and talk to people—not just at election time. I do not hand out glossy leaflets or have glossy advertising on television, radio and the like, to try to convince people. Members opposite should go out and talk to real people, for example, the ethnic and Aboriginal communities in South Australia, and see what they think of this greedy grab for power. The Minister who is responsible in this area and people like my colleagues behind me, the member for Price and many others know damn well and are very much concerned about the Aborigines in the community. We do not jump up and down and say, 'What will we do?' We get out there and try to help these people.

They need that assistance, as we all know. The silver tails opposite do not want to talk about these people but would kick them in the guts—that is the best way—and not worry about them. Let them fend for themselves. I know that

because I come from that disadvantaged background, not like some members opposite. Let them get out and start talking to these people and find out their real needs, such as better training, better opportunities, better housing—all those issues are very important to the unemployed. However, we have this greedy grab for power.

Members opposite talk about looking after working women. What did they do in terms of child care? The Federal Labor Government provided so many places, far in excess—

Ms Gayler: And subsidies.

Mr HAMILTON: As my colleague reminds me, there were subsidies for these working parents in Australia. This foolish contribution by members opposite—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: At least Hawke had the guts to address the issue: that is more than the member opposite. I never heard him talk about it until it was popular to do so.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: He was given a speech.

Mr HAMILTON: Indeed, as my colleague reminds me, he was given a speech. Members opposite never address these issues, but when something is popular, if it concerns the environment, child poverty, child bashing or abuse, when they read something in the paper, suddenly they want to talk about it and get on the band wagon. But what have they done in terms of homework? Very little! I would like to go on longer but I know others want to participate in the debate, so I will wind up my remarks by quoting a letter from this morning's *Advertiser* by Mr Ian Hunter of Kurralta Park. He states:

Congratulations to the Liberals for their economic policy and their political honesty. It's time people recognised that Aborigines and the unemployed don't matter. They don't vote Liberal.

And, of course, those in developing countries who benefit from our overseas aid don't get to vote at all, so they are, by definition, not important to the Liberals. At least the Liberals are honest enough to admit on whose behalf they will govern—the well-off in society. They are not a party for all Australia. They are a party of privilege.

That is a fantastic contribution, and I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Becker:

That this House recommends that the Government advise the Federal Minister for Transport and Communications that the curfew hours of 11 p.m. to 6 a.m. at Adelaide Airport be retained indefinitely and that jet aircraft movements be permitted during those hours only in cases of emergency.

(Continued from 28 September. Page 1001.)

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Spence): In moving his motion, the member for Hanson is obviously aware that discretion in the matter of curfew hours at airports rests with the Federal Government. He should also be aware that the Federal Government has no inclination to change the present hours of 11 p.m. to 6 a.m. at the Adelaide airport. I believe that the honourable member's motion is just an attempt to be seen as the leader in maintaining the existing curfew, and yet it is simply repeating Government policy. The State Government supports the Federal Government's stance in this matter and, at present, it does not believe that South Australia is missing out on any potential overseas flights to Adelaide as a result of the curfew. Unlike Sydney, which also has a curfew and is saturated with flights at certain times, Adelaide has considerable spare capacity during normal operating hours.

In future, however, the circumstances may change; for instance, there is a tendency for morning departures to Europe instead of evening departures, as they are coupled with fewer stops *en route*. This means that aircraft are scheduled to arrive in Adelaide in the evening instead of the next morning. There has been a recent example of this, namely, in relation to British Airways, which had flights due at 10.30 p.m. instead of the former arrival time of about 6 a.m. It could well be that that arrangement may better suit residents on the flight path. However, there is also a danger that aircraft running late due to unforeseen circumstances may not arrive before 11 p.m. It is this circumstance for which the Minister of Tourism was seeking some tolerance. It should also be noted that certain new types of aircraft are being developed that will be quieter than the present generation of aircraft. So, in future, we may need to be a little more flexible in our curfew hours.

At present, and in the foreseeable future, I do not anticipate this Government asking Commonwealth authorities to vary the policy, although this year there could be a complication arising from the prolonged pilots' strike and, as Grand Prix time approaches, there could be difficulties getting enough planes into Adelaide to cater for the necessary influx of visitors unless some exceptions are granted. To date, no specific requests have been made by the Grand Prix office to the airlines. But one could imagine a situation where, say, a flight from overseas that normally remained on the ground in Sydney or Melbourne overnight, could possibly be extended to Adelaide to provide additional capacity. This kind of situation may never arise again and, apart from such exceptional circumstances, it is anticipated that any breaches of the curfew in future will be confined to emergencies as is the case at present. I oppose the honourable member's motion and the recommendations contained therein.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I find it difficult to accept the reason for the Government's opposition to this motion when, in fact, earlier in his speech, the honourable member stated that it was Government policy, that there was no intention to vary—

Members interjecting:

Mr BECKER: There is nothing wrong with the way it is worded; he could have moved an amendment if he had wanted to. This motion simply states:

That this House recommends that the Government advise the Federal Minister for Transport and Communications that the curfew hours of 11 p.m. and 6 a.m. at Adelaide Airport be retained indefinitely and that jet aircraft movements be permitted during those hours only in cases of emergency—

I find it very hard to understand how anyone could object to that. However, British Airways is breaking the curfew hours. On the past two Tuesday mornings British Airways flights have arrived well after 11 p.m. If my memory serves me correctly, a flight arrived at about 11.20 p.m. two weeks ago, and last Tuesday a flight arrived at 12.30 a.m. I was still attending to correspondence and I saw the plane come in. One can imagine the noise created by the flights when they go out about an hour later over the suburbs of Brooklyn Park, Mile End and North Adelaide. If we allow the continual breaking of curfew hours, it will become a permanent arrangement.

Ansett Transport Industries wants to operate its aircraft 24 hours a day. Sir Peter Abels does not give a damn about anyone: he has shown that during the pilots' strike and with his antagonism towards the pilots. He wants to reduce the number of pilots he employs, to put them on contracts, and to carry on in the way in which that he has run his road transport system. He will not do that at the expense of the

residents of Adelaide. As I said earlier, this involves about 120 000 people, who are affected by some type of aircraft noise in the Adelaide metropolitan area, and about 16 000 people are directly affected by loud noise from the airport. We need that curfew period; we must tell British Airways that it must maintain the schedules within Australia, and that the British can no longer go on raping the colonies as they did for decades, as the Minister at the bench would know, because his forefathers treated the colonies like dirt. It is about time we stood up for our own rights and insisted that those curfew hours be maintained:

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (12)—Messrs Allison, Arnold, Becker (teller), Blacker, Cashmore, Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Oswald and Wotton.

Noes (24)—Mr Abbott (teller), Mrs Appleby, Messrs Bannon, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, Duigan, M.J. Evans and Ferguson, Ms Gayler, Messrs Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Klunder, Lewis, McRae, Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Rann, Robertson and Tyler.

Majority of 12 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

[*Sitting suspended from 1.05 to 2 p.m.*]

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Superannuation Act Amendment (No. 2).

QUESTION

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

COUNCIL RATES

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park)** 12 October.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: My colleague the Minister of Local Government has advised that the matter of supplementary council rates notices issued as result of amended property valuations was referred to the Crown Solicitor for consideration. I am advised that in the event that a valuation of land is superseded by a supplementary valuation under the Valuation of Land Act and, where the supplementary valuation was not available to the council at the time it adopted its estimates of income and expenditure for the ensuing year, the supplementary valuation cannot be used by the council for rating purposes pursuant to section 171 of the Local Government Act, unless it resulted from a formal objection, review or appeal against the original valuation. All councils have been advised of this requirement.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Before calling on questions, I advise that questions that would otherwise be directed to the Minister for Environment and Planning will be taken by the Deputy Premier.

ETSA

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister of Mines and Energy confirm that he has received a Green Paper on deregulating some of the operations of the Electricity Trust and that he has refused to act on this paper even though, in a speech yesterday to the National Press Club, the Federal Resources Minister, Senator Cook, said that the States should allow private companies to compete to supply power to their grids?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am a trifle confused by this question. I looked at the speech that was made by Senator Cook yesterday, as I understand it, to a National Press Club luncheon. He referred to inefficiencies in electricity generation based on several things: first, that there is a major industry overcapacity; and, secondly, that there are consequent high debt levels and both these factors cause inefficiencies. Neither of those two factors apply to South Australia. We do not have an overcapacity in reserve. Our capacity—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: If the honourable member wishes to interject rather than listen, I suppose that we will have to put up with that, but I am trying to provide an answer. One measures overcapacity by the amount of generating capacity minus the highest peak. From memory, the highest peak was 1 880 megawatts last summer and the plate capacity of ETSA is about 2 380 megawatts. If that is true, the difference is about 26 per cent and I am told that between 20 and 25 per cent is acknowledged internationally as a reasonable ratio.

I am relying on memory, but I think that the 2 380 megawatts is a plate capacity, which is not the capacity that one has during hot weather when the actual production capacity of those units decreases by some percentage. However, ETSA's reserve capacity is at about the level it should be and no higher. In terms of the monetary aspect, ETSA would have one of the lowest, if not the lowest, debt ratios in the country and I think that that has been generally acknowledged. As far as I can tell, that is not what we are on about. As to deregulation, I am not entirely sure to what Green Paper the honourable member is referring.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I would have to check that, because I am not aware of having knocked back a Green Paper on deregulation. This is something quite strange. In fact, if the honourable member wishes to get to the point of whether or not South Australia should ever allow private power generation, I have made it perfectly clear on a number of occasions that I do not care where we get the electricity from, as long as it is the cheapest and environmentally the least problematic energy we can obtain.

Under those circumstances, I am not entirely sure what the honourable member is on about. We are concerned that the coal or gas is as environmentally sound a proposition as possible—and Lochiel is environmentally sound. The Opposition continues to scream about the cost of electricity and I continually have to remind members opposite that it was during the Opposition's term of office that electricity costs rose. I have provided those figures on the previous two days. Does the Opposition wish me to repeat them for a third time? I do not hear any denials, so I will repeat them for a third time in the hope that eventually, slowly but surely, we will get the information through some of the thick skulls opposite. Let me make those points again. In 1980 the electricity cost—

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, Standing Orders prevent repetition in this Parliament. The Minister has just clearly—

The SPEAKER: Order! The point of order by the honourable member for Alexandra is quite valid. I am sure that the Minister can wind up his remarks without having to resort to repetition of a point which apparently he has previously made.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Mr Speaker, if I keep on being asked the same question, I will have to keep on giving the same answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Leader to not disrupt proceedings. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I will wind up without using those exact figures again, because clearly members of the Opposition now believe that they have them straight. It is true to say that during the three years of the Liberal Government the real cost of electricity rose by 30 per cent, whereas over the past four years of this Government it has decreased in real terms by 15 per cent. That is the contrast that the people of this State should bear very clearly in mind.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Leader to come to order. The honourable member for Newland.

FEDERAL OPPOSITION'S ECONOMIC PLAN

Ms GAYLER (Newland): Is the Premier able to inform the House of the implications for South Australia of the recently announced economic action plan of the Federal Liberal Party?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I must say that I have been expecting members opposite to raise questions relating to this particular major initiative of the Federal Opposition, but apparently they are a bit too ashamed to raise the issue. What I would like to tackle—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the question asked by the member for Newland, which was probably her last question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre knows that he should be raising only a point of order, not trying to make political points.

Mr GUNN: The point of order is that the Premier has no authority or knowledge of the matter referred to in the question of the member for Newland. The matter is outside the jurisdiction of the Premier of this State and is, therefore, out of order.

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable member for Newland repeat the question for the benefit of the Chair?

Ms GAYLER: I asked about the implications for South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair does not require the assistance of whichever Opposition member it was who was rudely interjecting at that point. The honourable member for Newland.

Ms GAYLER: Is the Premier able to inform the House of the implications for South Australia of the recently announced economic action plan of the Federal Liberal Party?

The SPEAKER: The Chair does not uphold the point of order of the honourable member for Eyre, because the

Premier clearly has responsibility for the economic implications of things that affect the State. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, Mr Speaker. The point I was making is that, as they do affect the State, I would have hoped that the colleagues of Mr Peacock federally in this State would be raising with him their concern about some of those implications. It is very interesting that there has been silence not only about the package but also about the implications of that package. If one looks at the document—and it has been widely publicised and touted around; anyone who can read can look through the detail of it, because that is what we have been asked to do—one will find some very clear negative implications for South Australia. Let us just take it in terms of the attack that this particular proposal makes on funding to the States. It is absolutely outrageous, when the Federal Opposition has been attacking the Federal Government—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Federal Opposition has been attacking—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition for his repeated interjections. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —the Federal Government over the past few years for consistently reducing payments to the States, and we have been complaining about it. We have been told by members opposite that this would not happen under a Liberal Government. Well, here in this document there is clearly a further cut—up to something like \$30 million as far as South Australia is concerned. I make the point that, in terms of services to the community, every \$10 million reduction in funding means approximately 100 fewer teachers, 100 fewer police and 100 fewer nurses. So, the impact of that on the providers of essential services would be very profound.

But, we have absolute silence from the State's Opposition—no criticism of the Federal Leader about this package. I guess it is pretty much in line with the response in relation to the mortgage relief scheme. Members may remember that the Leader of the Opposition proposed this scheme in July as a major or massive initiative and claimed that it had the support of his Federal colleagues, because it would need their support if the Opposition were ever to get into government, to be implemented. In fact, it was discovered that the Federal Leader of the Opposition rejected the claim that was made by the State Leader of the Opposition.

It was a scheme hastily borrowed from Victoria and thrown together. Then the Leader of the Opposition discovered that he was caught out, that it had been announced two days earlier by Mr Brown, the Victorian Leader of the Opposition. Mr Peacock had rejected it and he also rejected the Leader of the Opposition's scheme, yet we were told that this had his approval. Certainly, that indicates the impact that the Leader of the Opposition is having at a Federal level. In addition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —I was looking for these things that the Opposition has made particularly its own. Very interesting! What happened to the fringe benefits tax? One remembers the virulent opposition by the State Liberal Party in South Australia. There were reservations about FBT, certainly, and we were told that the Leader of the Opposition in South Australia had led the charge and had even moved a special motion at the Liberal Conference against FBT. He said, 'A Liberal Government will take up

this challenge and resist payment.' We can remember the big and upbeat statements made. When I saw Mr Peacock's document, one thing that I thought was that certainly there would be the motion passed by the State Leader of the Opposition at the Federal conference—the charge and attack that he led. I looked in vain: FBT is to be retained under this document.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If that was not enough—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would like to remind members of the situation on Eyre Peninsula and the severe problems experienced there. This has been a matter of debate and concern in this House over a considerable period. In that context the Leader of the Opposition has called for things like the appointment of extension officers, the upgrading of financial help and rural counselling, and so on. These things have been done—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am glad that they are bipartisan in their support. That is obviously welcome to people on Eyre Peninsula. My Minister of Agriculture just last week was on the Peninsula looking at the implications of the good season which has been enjoyed so far determining what further measures are necessary. I am going to Eyre Peninsula today to follow up the visit that I made some time ago at the height of the drought and to look at the change in circumstances.

Why am I talking about Eyre Peninsula and its problems? It is because, in the context of the Peacock statement, one finds hidden away so that, presumably, it is hoped it will not be noticed, at page 14 of the supplementary notes, a proposal suggesting that a range of rural counselling programs is to be abolished as part of this program. In fact, let me quote—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Very interesting! The Leader of the Opposition claims to be a champion of these people, but we had heard not a peep, not a word, out of him on this particular matter. One could say that perhaps the policy was made in ignorance, for instance, of the situation on Eyre Peninsula, but in fact specific reference is made to it. Let me quote the document, as follows:

This program—

the program of rural counselling assistance from the Commonwealth Government—

began during the wheat down-turns and continuing droughts in Eyre Peninsula and the Mallee in Victoria. While the program has been successful there is more room for some full-time services to be reduced to part time and others to be amalgamated.

There is to be a major reduction because, according to the Federal colleagues of the Leader of the Opposition, everything is all right and we can reduce that support. Yet there is not a word, not a peep, from the Leader of the Opposition. Certainly, I shall be happy to draw this to the attention of rural supporters of the Liberal Party when I go over there. No doubt in doing that I will be joined by the member for Flinders, who would be equally appalled at the supplementary note on page 14, which says that there shall be a reduction or abolition of rural counselling programs. What does the Leader of the Opposition interject? 'It's a State responsibility': what a cop-out! Yes, the State does take some responsibility and we are providing funds in that area, but we believe also that the Federal Government should be supporting this program as well, not like Mr Peacock and his colleagues.

DEREGULATION REPORT

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Is the Government trying to delay the tabling of the 1989 report by the Government adviser on deregulation because it is strongly critical of Government inaction? The 1989 Report on Deregulation has not yet been tabled, even though it has been in the hands of the Attorney-General since 22 August—for two months. However, I have a copy, and it is critical of the Government's deregulation program. The report states:

The time taken to carry out major regulation review is disturbing. Either the task is being given low priority or the review process is extremely inefficient.

Further:

Because the more significant reviews of Government regulations are taking several years to complete, there are very few cost savings which can be identified from deregulation at this time.

The report refers to 10 reviews which were under way at the time of the 1988 Report of the Government Adviser on Deregulation and states that 'none of these reviews have been completed, so that the benefits of deregulation have still to be achieved'.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am amazed at the audacity of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in asking a question about deregulation when one looks at the record of his Party on this question over the years and contrasts it with ours. It is quite outrageous. In fact, to the best of my knowledge, any of the major deregulation programs brought into this House have been opposed by members opposite. What about the Egg Board? It is apparently deemed absolutely necessary for the Egg Board to have these massive regulations, and measures aimed at reforming that situation brought in by the Minister of Agriculture were in fact resisted to the end by members opposite. What about the Potato Board? We had regulations prescribing the size of bags in which potatoes could be brought into this State. When we tried to change that, it was opposed by members opposite. That was very interesting indeed.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, the honourable member would know a lot about potatoes.

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

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The issue of wheat marketing has been raised only in the past couple of days, and the deregulation of bulk handling is not supported by members opposite; on the contrary, we are told that there should be more regulation and a monopolistic situation freed up. When shopping hours were in question, where was the Opposition? Opposing it, making sure that those deregulations did not happen.

When we freed up the service stations—a very successful initiative taken on deregulation—where was the Opposition? It was taking up a cause that said, 'This would be disastrous as far as we are concerned.' When bread baking hours were deregulated, where was the Opposition? What are members opposite saying about a report issued yesterday? They oppose it. So, do not talk to us about deregulation. I could go on with a list a mile long. We know where members opposite stand.

Secondly, what has this Government done? We have introduced sunset measures. We have an ongoing and continuous review of regulations which are automatically expiring unless specifically considered to be renewed. We have eliminated many Acts, and many sets of regulations in the course of that, and it is an ongoing and rolling program. We have achieved more in deregulation in the past few years than any Government previously in this State. Then

the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asks me about the report.

An honourable member: Where is it?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The report will be tabled as soon as appropriate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! Order! The Premier will resume his seat. I name the Leader of the Opposition for persistent and repeated interjections in defiance of the Chair. Does the honourable Leader wish to give an explanation?

Mr OLSEN: Mr Speaker, repeatedly the Premier in his answer to that question referred to a subject that was the basis of a question. During the course of the Premier's response, he taunted the Opposition repeatedly—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN:—all but inviting comments from this side of the House. It is true, Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN:—that I responded to what one could describe only as repeated taunts and challenges from the Premier in relation to the report, which was the basis of the question that the Premier repeatedly refused to answer—a specific question in the House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: During the proceedings of this Parliament, more particularly during Question Time, questions have been asked by members on this side of the House and the Government has refused to answer the specific nature of those questions. While Standing Orders do not require the Government to answer those questions specifically, today there were repeated taunts and challenges from the Premier. I acknowledge, Mr Speaker, that I erred in terms of responding to the challenges, despite your warnings, and I apologise to the House for so doing.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I move:

That the honourable Leader's explanation be accepted.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I have to oppose the motion moved by the member for Light. I find it extraordinary that the Leader of the Opposition is complaining about the Premier not answering the question. In fact, when the Leader of the Opposition went over the top was precisely the point at which the Premier had got to the central core of that question. As soon as the report was mentioned, there was an extraordinary outburst from the Leader of the Opposition. I put it to the House that you, Mr Speaker, have been extraordinarily tolerant of honourable members.

Mr GUNN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, two Ministers have interjected during the Deputy Premier's remarks and you have not called them to order or named them. The Minister of Education—

The SPEAKER: Order! Is this point of order something to do with a proceeding that is actually taking place at this moment?

Mr GUNN: The point of order is that you have not applied Standing Orders in the way in which you applied them to the Leader of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order. The honourable member for Eyre seems to be trying to make a debating point, which he is entitled to do at a

later stage, but it is not a point of order. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I do not wish to unduly detain the House. This matter has been long since coming. The behaviour of honourable members during Question Time is at extraordinary odds with what happens outside of Question Time. We well know why that is the case: because Question Time tends to be a cockpit for the Parliament.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: If, in fact, Question Time is a farce, it is a farce because members such as he who is interjecting now attempt to make it such. The Standing Orders of this place have not been concocted in five minutes; they have been laid down over many years; indeed they are the accretion of centuries. They provide for strong exchange of opinions, but in circumstances whereby the situation does not roll over into some sort of rabble. A number of people have observed what has been happening in this place for some time and have felt that we have come very close to getting to that particular point.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I notice one or two points being made by members opposite about interjections and that sort of thing. One cannot justify continued ignoring of directions of the Chair on the grounds that occasionally someone from the other side of the Chamber is pulled up for an interjection. I think that anyone who is a fair observer of these proceedings would have to conclude that that is what has been happening. Senior members of this place have a responsibility to show some sort of lead in these particular matters. I believe that the lead shown by the Leader in recent times has been deplorable.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion that the Leader's explanation be accepted. We, too, in the Opposition have been disturbed for some time now—years, in fact—about the operation of Question Time—indeed, of other times during the sittings of Parliament—but particularly Question Time, when we are subjected to a tirade of abuse and misinformation from the Government, and are expected to sit here mute and not respond. We have been subjected to the same again today.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: It is a set up.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course it is a set up. We are also disturbed, with any respect I can muster, about the rulings from the Chair. The Leader was not called to order today. It is very difficult to interpret just what is happening from the Chair during Question Time. On some occasions a member will be called to order and called to order again, and I can well recall members being called to order three times before they are warned. The ground rules in this place change daily. The Leader was not called to order. The Leader was warned early during Question Time. How on earth are we to have some consistency in the operation of this place if we are to be subjected to a continual tirade of abuse, misinformation and prevarication from Government Ministers in answer to Dorothy Dix questions and not have any sort of protection or consistency from the Chair as to what we can or cannot do?

Early in Question Time the Leader was warned. Members opposite are cautioned. If we are looking for any consistency, over the years one could reasonably expect that a member would be called to order a couple of times at least before he or she was warned. That did not happen today.

No wonder we do not know where we are. I repeat that it is absolutely intolerable to expect us to sit here dumbly and take misinformation and abuse from Government members. If you think, Mr Speaker, that you can conduct the operations of this House as though it is a Sunday school class, when this is going on, I am afraid that it is time you visited a few other Parliaments.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask members, notwithstanding their feelings on a particular motion before the Chair, to avoid reflections on the Chair. The member for Eyre.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): What is taking place this afternoon in Question Time is another reflection of this Government, and other Governments of similar persuasion in this country, who have armed themselves with mass media organisations with the sole intent of smashing Oppositions. They do not want Oppositions to have the opportunity—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GUNN: There is another interjection from the Minister of Recreation and Sport, with no regard for rulings from the Chair; nothing has been done to stop him. That is the sort of behaviour which we have had to accept in this Parliament. On a regular basis we have minders racing around the press galleries trying to influence the journalists and stop them. We then have Dorothy Dix questions served up by members in marginal seats; all designed to whop into the Opposition, to mislead, to misinform and to stop facts getting before the public. This campaign has been highlighted again today with an outrageous Dorothy Dix question designed to misinform the public, yet we on this side of the House are supposed to sit here and cop it like lambs. We have a responsibility in this Parliament. The Opposition has a proper role to play.

It is bad enough that we are starved of resources to enable us to carry out our proper constitutional function. The Leader of the Opposition is within his rights and is fulfilling the proper role as Leader of the Opposition to question, probe and oppose. That is the role of Opposition. When the sort of treatment we have been receiving brings people into conflict with the Chair, of course Governments want to nip them in the bud. One has only to consider what has taken place in this Chamber over the past few weeks in relation to the deliberately orchestrated campaign to thump the Opposition unfairly and unreasonably and to deny us an opportunity to carry out the role we are supposed to play. The Government will not answer questions on notice. It has a huge army of minders. They will all be with the Premier today on their way to Eyre Peninsula. The question today was designed for a headline for the papers on Eyre Peninsula tomorrow. I have a few questions to ask the Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask members on both sides to conduct themselves with appropriate decorum.

Mr GUNN: I have questions that I want to ask, but there will not be an opportunity, because Question Time has become a farce. The motion by the Deputy Premier to get rid of the Leader of the Opposition today shows the sort of arrogance which, unfortunately, Governments across this country are adopting to try to stifle the effective role of Parliament.

Governments are supposed to answer to Parliament. This great media machine should not trot around the country misinforming the people and misquoting the Opposition in an attempt to thwart the democratic role of the Opposition. Therefore, this attempt to suspend the Leader is a political

stunt which is contrary to the best interests of all citizens of this State.

It is about time that this Government recognised there is a proper role for the Opposition. When in Opposition, members opposite were not treated in this manner. They were not subjected to the same sort of disgraceful tactics. I could detail chapter and verse to this Parliament some of the conduct of honourable members who were affected in a most unparliamentary manner during the term of the previous Government. I will not bore the House with those details but, if provoked, it would be very easy to name certain members whose conduct was far from acceptable. I hope that this Parliament will have enough decency and commonsense to reject this political move by the Government.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I support the motion of the member for Light and certainly oppose the remarks made by the Deputy Premier. The member for Light moved that the Leader's explanation be accepted. If ever I have heard a sudden death naming, this was it: no warning was given to the Leader. I use my words carefully, but one can assume that no honourable member other than you, Mr Speaker, knew what was to happen, so I would imagine that every honourable member would have been surprised that the Leader was named in the circumstances in which he was named. The naming having occurred, the Leader gave an explanation as to his conduct. His explanation was convincing.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: And he apologised.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: And he apologised. I believe that many members will admit it is unusual for someone in that circumstance to apologise to the House, as the Leader sincerely did. It was a gracious apology and a convincing explanation. Any fair-minded person would surely regard the Deputy Premier's refusal to accept that explanation as being petty in the extreme. We are in the last days before an election. These Question Times are extremely precious for the Opposition, because it can scrutinise the administration by the Government of this State and expose its failures.

In ruling as you did, Mr Speaker, you have effectively prevented the Opposition from scrutinising the Government for the remainder of this Question Time and, in doing so, the Leader, who is here to represent the Opposition's views as the Leader of this Party, has effectively been ruled out from the operation of this House for the remainder of the day. That in itself is a very severe thing to inflict on a Leader of the Opposition in the days leading up to an election.

I point out that, in opposing the motion, the Deputy Premier said that it was not only at Question Time that the Opposition's conduct was to be regretted. Barely two hours ago, during private members' time, the Minister of Recreation and Sport constantly interjected, out of his seat, on the member for Heysen. He did that at least six times and not once was he called to order. Not even the fact that he was out of his seat brought a reprimand from the Speaker, but the Leader, in fulfilling his obligations and in responding (albeit somewhat vigorously) to extreme provocation from the Premier, has had imposed on him the most severe punishment that can be inflicted by this House. It is unjust and untimely. I do not believe that it was necessary and I believe that, in all the circumstances, the Leader's explanation should be accepted and the naming should lapse.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I support the motion of the member for Light and I wish to canvass the points

raised by the Deputy Premier who said that practices have been built up over 100 years. The Deputy Premier knows that Standing Orders were changed in the early 1970s. He was here then, and he made promises about answers being short and that they would not be used for political purposes. At that time, Opposition members lost their right to explain a question and then ask it, as part of the deal that Ministers would give short answers.

Today, the Premier, when he knew that time was critical, took 10 minutes to reply to a question about a Commonwealth matter that he said in his opinion might relate to the States. It was a deliberate Dorothy Dix question. The Deputy Premier, since he has held that portfolio, has promised that he will see that answers to questions are short, but that has not happened. He knows that that was part of the deal. However, when this House is manipulated for political purposes by the ALP when in Government, in a forked tongue manner, he says that the Leader of the Opposition's explanation and apology cannot be accepted.

I do not know whether this is the last sitting day of Parliament before the election is announced, or whether the election will be announced next week or the week after. If this is a set-up only you, Sir, would know. If it is, let it be judged in the future whether this is not a way to deliberately reflect on a Leader just before an election. If it is that is a disgrace, because there have been worse examples of interjections and interference with the operations of this Parliament and members have not been named. The Leader was not even cautioned. He was warned. There was no pulling him up earlier, as is always the case. I suspect, after being here for 21 years, that something smells in regard to what has happened.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Davenport to make it clear to the Chair that he did not intend to reflect on the Chair with his last remark.

Mr S.G. EVANS: Sir, I have not reflected on the Chair, but if there is something that smells about it only those involved know.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): As a new member of this place, having been here, like some Government backbenchers, for a very short time, I can say that I came in here with some ideals of what the Westminster system means—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr D.S. BAKER: It is the very cornerstone of the democratic system that we know. I came in here with an ideal to uphold the Westminster system of Government and to try to contribute something to this State on the political scene. When I came into this place I expected—as do all members—to be treated with some fairness. That is all we ask for: to be treated equally. The highest office in this Parliament is that of Speaker, and I would never criticise that office. However, the person holding that office has not treated me or other members on this side of the Chamber with the fairness that I believe we deserve. Only yesterday—

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow the member for Victoria to continue in that vein. If members are aggrieved with the Chair, they are entitled to move dissent from the Speaker's ruling or to move a motion of no confidence in the Chair. The matter of debate at the moment simply refers to the conduct of the Leader of the Opposition, its effect on the proceedings of the Chamber, and whether or not his explanation, after having been named by the Speaker, should be accepted. I cannot allow the member for Victoria at this point to reflect on the Chair or the incumbent of the Chair in the way he is doing.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The point I was coming to was that yesterday in this House I think both the Deputy Leader and I were warned. In my case I was warned three times by the Speaker and then I was told that if I transgressed further I would be named. That occurred after three warnings. Yesterday they were the rules. Today the Leader of the Opposition was warned once, and then named. All I ask is that we have fairness in this House and that we are all treated equally.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): When I rose I did not proceed to debate the issue because I believed that the sincerity and purpose of the answer given by the Leader was adequate to your question, Mr Speaker, 'Does the Leader have an explanation to be considered?' I believe his reply did that. He was not asked to apologise for a perceived transgression, but he did that. To my way of thinking, that gave a clear indication of the way in which he approached the severity of the circumstances that had unfolded.

I did not seek to debate the issue, because I did not believe that I would see such hypocrisy from the Deputy Premier, the Leader of the Government in this House, in making the statements that he did. We clearly have the position where the only occasions this afternoon on which action has been taken against Government members is by members of the Opposition rising on points of order. We cannot have a situation where the whole of Question Time or the whole of debate is interrupted by points of order. The points taken against the Minister of Mines and Energy relative to repetition were upheld by you, Mr Speaker. There were more than a dozen opportunities throughout both of the answers that the Premier was giving for him to desist from baiting or goading members of the Opposition to respond to the statements he was making.

Opposition members did not take that action and were willing to cop it sweet. If the Premier wanted to politicise the whole circumstance and make a farce of Question Time—as he had—so be it. However, to then call upon the Leader of the Opposition and name him after having failed to take any action whatsoever against the consistent transgressions of the Premier is something that needs to be taken in balance when the motion is put. I ask members on both sides to think of the circumstances for the future of this Parliament and accept the motion.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (16)—Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, Becker and Blacker, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick (teller), S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Inger-son, Meier, Olsen, Oswald and Wotton.

Noes (25)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, Duigan, M.J. Evans and Ferguson, Ms Gayler, Messrs Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood (teller), Klunder, McRae, Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Rann, Robertson, Slater and Tyler.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs S.J. Baker and Lewis. Noes—Ms Lenehan and Mr Plunkett.

Majority of 9 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The Leader of the Opposition having withdrawn:

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

That the Leader of the Opposition be suspended from the sitting of the House.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (25)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, Duigan, M.J. Evans and Ferguson, Ms Gayler, Messrs Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood (teller), Klunder, McRae,

Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Rann, Robertson, Slater and Tyler.

Noes (15)—Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, Becker and Blacker, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Inger-son, Lewis, Oswald and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Ms Lenehan and Mr Plunkett. Noes—Messrs S.J. Baker and Meier.

Majority of 10 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

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

That, in furtherance of the Government's desire that Question Time should be interfered with as little as possible, in view of the events we have just witnessed, the time for asking questions be extended to 3.30 p.m.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: It is my recollection that the Premier was replying to a question earlier. Does he wish to continue?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, Mr Speaker, because, at the very point the proceedings were interrupted in that appalling manner, I had said that I had not seen the De-regulation Adviser's report and I did not know when it would be tabled. Presumably that would be the responsibility of my colleague the Attorney-General. However, if the Deregulation Adviser is critical of some aspects of the program, that is fine. The Government welcomes that criticism: we do not attempt to paper up or in any way override the responsibility of someone in such a position. The Deregulation Adviser has been very diligent and intent on performing his task, and I congratulate him on it.

Of course, the progress of change in some areas probably has not satisfied him; that is fine and, if he chooses to note that in his report, again, that is fine. However, I come back to the essential point I was making and the point that members opposite tried to shout down as loud as they could—that this Government has done more for deregulation than any other Government. We appointed the Deregulation Adviser, and it was the first time that such an appointment had been made. We are pleased to see him reporting to the Parliament, because previously no such procedure was available. Finally, on those occasions where deregulation has been attempted, members of the Opposition have, by and large, opposed it to the end.

YOUTH AFFAIRS INITIATIVE

Mr DUGAN (Adelaide): Will the Minister of Youth Affairs say what action he has initiated to bring together the various youth agencies in the city to ensure that Rundle Mall and Hindley Street can continue to be enjoyed by all South Australians? There has been considerable interest in recent media reports about harassment of young people in Rundle Street by gangs of other young people. This has raised the question of the effectiveness of programs being run by various youth and other agencies who work on Adelaide streets. The idea of a mini-summit has been raised, as well as the idea of greater coordination, to determine whether or not the problems can be overcome. The other issue that has been raised in the debate following these media reports is whether or not the issue ought to be dealt with as a social and youth problem or simply one of policing.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Adelaide for his question and for his interest and concern in this area. As members on this side of the House know, the honourable member's tireless efforts in this respect in his electorate and for young people, not only in his own electorate but generally, are well known.

Rundle Mall has received considerable attention from the media and the public, especially in relation to a couple of incidents that occurred a few weeks ago. It is important that we look at this matter as involving all levels of Government. My colleague the Minister of Emergency Services has obviously acted very quickly to bring the matter to his department's attention, and the police have increased their surveillance of the Mall to ensure safety for all who use it, particularly young people. I know from my own experience in attending recent functions in the Mall that police patrols are there on a regular and frequent basis. Policing has been very thorough. The city council has been involved in this area, the Lord Mayor having indicated his concerns in dealing with the problems calmly and sensibly.

We have initiated what we call our Inner City Youth Problems Working Party, consisting of representatives of the Division of Youth Affairs, the Police Department, Adelaide City Council administration, The Second Story, Hindley Street Youth Project, Service to Youth Council, Hindley Street Traders Association, Victims of Crime, DCW and the Coordinating Italian Committee. We therefore have a broad cross-section of people represented on the committee, the Acting Chairperson of which is a former Hindley Street trader, Mr Len Fancourt, who is also Honorary Secretary of the Hindley Street Traders Association.

It is important to note that we are attempting to address this problem not in a sensational or cavalier way that will merely produce a solution in the short term. My officers in the Division of Youth Affairs are very concerned that to some degree the matter has been sensationalised—understandably, given the incident that occurred. Indeed, such matters can be subjected to exaggeration. When I strolled along the Mall after midnight last week and also the week before, many people were congregating and enjoying the Mall's environs, on their way to or from functions, and the area appeared safe and was quite enjoyable. Obviously at times incidents occur off the Mall which are of concern, and my colleague the Minister of Emergency Services has addressed that issue by reacting positively through his officers and suggesting the installation of a surveillance camera in the vicinity.

Some members of the working party are concerned about the way in which the cameras are being portrayed as spy cameras. Obviously, those cameras are not such a device, but they are discreetly placed, although not hidden so that nobody knows they are there. They are intended to provide a service to the community and to protect rather than to be used to spy. It is a security measure for the community and should not in any way be seen as insidious or something deliberately hidden from the public's view.

It is important to note that, although my people have received reports from the police on incidents that have occurred in the Mall, there have been no reports of any recent major increase in crime in that area. The member for Adelaide would appreciate that, given that this area, which is in his electorate, is a centre for a large number of young people from throughout the metropolitan area.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is about to conclude his remarks. I ask the member for Alexandra to cease interjecting.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The sooner interjections cease, the sooner I can wind up. In December there were two bashings in Rundle Mall compared with 15 bashings within the square mile of Adelaide. The police will take the running on these issues and will address them. A working paper is being prepared to identify problems of behaviour and other contributing factors. We will develop strategies to address

such problems, and I hope that we can have the information available shortly so that the Government and local government can act accordingly. It is a very important issue and one of concern not only to the residents of the electorate of Adelaide but in fact to the whole of the metropolitan area. We will certainly deal with the matter in a sensible and sensitive way.

BUSINESS REGULATION

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): Will the Premier advise why the Government has not established a 'one stop shop' for business regulation as promised by him four years ago before the last State election? In a press statement dated 22 November 1985, relating to the release of the Government's small business policy, the Premier said:

The Government will also consider adopting other recommendations of the deregulation task force. These include the establishment of a shopfront 'one stop shop' to provide all forms and applications required by the public, together with information about necessary regulations and the purpose of each form and application.

Four years later, in releasing an economic plan for the 1990s last week, the Premier again made the promise that a 'one stop shop would be established' when small business in particular, suffering from record interest rates, is looking for much more than recycled election promises.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is reminded that comment is out of order. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, that was our policy and indeed remains our policy and something we have been working towards systematically for the past few years. It involves a very complex exercise of which the honourable member obviously would not be aware, because it means, for instance, ensuring that a whole series of forms and regulatory requirements are standardised in such a way that they can be completed in a much smaller number of documents. A number of other major implications are involved in attempting to consolidate regulations. It has required legislation, and in some areas we have achieved legislation in this time. It requires new regulations to be drawn to reduce the amount of red tape, paperwork, and so forth. The project is well in hand and we are certainly working towards its achievement, and in that we are getting active support and assistance from business.

DISABLED PERSONS EQUIPMENT SCHEME

Mr TYLER (Fisher): Will the Minister of Health investigate the possibility of extending the disabled persons equipment scheme to include people on fixed incomes? Currently this scheme gives financial assistance to pensioners with disabilities who need to purchase equipment such as wheelchairs in order to get about. I have been approached by a constituent seeking financial assistance to obtain a replacement electric wheelchair.

My constituent was provided with an electric wheelchair some time ago. However, it appears that this chair is no longer adequate to provide sufficient and safe support. I understand from my constituent that he is not now eligible for assistance under this scheme as he is not in receipt of a full pension. Previously he had received assistance under Federal Government schemes. However, the responsibility for providing this assistance passed to the State Government in June 1987.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am happy to have the matter further examined. It is worthwhile noting that in 1987-88 the disabled persons' scheme stood at \$1 million. During the past financial year the State Government increased the budget by \$98 000 to provide more aids and, to enable the scheme to run more smoothly, it allocated an extra \$24 000.

A further one-off advance for the aged of \$200 000 was made in 1988-89 to enable the Domiciliary Care and Rehabilitation Services to ensure prompt consideration of requests. So, the State Government's contribution increased by 32 per cent in real terms in the financial year 1988-89, and an increase in funding of \$350 000 has been available in 1989-90 so that additional aids and appliances can be made available to disabled people. However, I am aware that the scheme still does not cover many people who are only marginally, if any, better off than those who are now eligible for the scheme. We will continue to examine this possibility.

ST JOHN AMBULANCE

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): Has the Minister of Health been made aware of continuing and constant harassment of St John Ambulance volunteers by some career officers, especially since we now have evidence that the intimidation has reached a level which puts the lives of the public at risk? If not, why not and, if so, why has no action been taken to stop the harassment? Volunteers have given us leaflets that they are confronted with every time they arrive for duty. These leaflets proclaim the volunteers to be scabs 'affecting other workers fighting to maintain their living standards'. Posters, which are displayed daily, show the volunteers as 'Mickey Mouse'.

Volunteers have also sent us signed statements claiming that they are continually called 'bloody scabs'. They believe that lives are at risk from the latest harassment where rosters of volunteer staff are ripped from noticeboards and destroyed as soon as they are displayed. Volunteers have stated that a career officer at Modbury (Mr Geoffrey Roberts) is the ringleader in this intimidation. Volunteers at Elizabeth have confirmed that he was the main harasser while stationed there. They feel that they have no choice but to ask that he be named, because destroying rosters is a dangerous action that could leave ambulances without crews and, consequently, lives of the public at risk.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I would be concerned if anybody attempted to destroy rosters. I will certainly draw the concerns of the honourable member, the House, and me to the Ambulance Board so that the whole matter can be properly processed. I have received allegations from volunteers about harassment from career officers, and I have also received allegations from career officers about harassment from volunteers. Few, if any, are prepared to go on the record in relation to this matter.

I have no doubt that some of these incidents have occurred from time to time. However, when people are not prepared to go on the record, it makes it difficult to take the matter any further. I know that the board would be concerned about thoroughly investigating any allegations when there is some evidence of such incidents. I hope for the honourable member's sake that he is on very sure ground when going as far as naming somebody, but obviously the matter will be investigated.

BLUE-RINGED OCTOPUS

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Will the Minister of Fisheries indicate the potential danger for people who use

our local beaches and the West Lakes waterway during this summer? I have been approached by a number of local constituents who are concerned about the presence of the blue-ringed octopus in West Lakes. They are concerned also that the public be made aware of the potential danger of this creature. Further, a number of parents have expressed their concern about the danger that the blue-ringed octopus poses to their children, should they decide to handle this sea creature.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I note that the honourable member has been concerned for many years about the hazards posed by blue-ringed octopodes in the West Lakes area, and has drawn this matter to the attention of my predecessors and also other relevant Ministers, such as the Minister of Marine. Indeed, he was therefore instrumental in the Minister of Marine's acceding to a request for hydrological survey work to be undertaken in West Lakes, which was effected at a cost of about \$100 000. It must be reiterated each year that there is a hazard posed to many who use the West Lakes area, and they should understand that that hazard is a real one. The threat of the blue-ringed octopus is one that has potentially serious consequences indeed.

The blue-ringed octopus, which has a tentacle spread of up to 8 cm, can inject a venom that is lethal. It must be noted that the bite is almost painless, so it is possible that the victim may not realise they have been bitten by a blue-ringed octopus. However, if enough venom has been released, it can cause complete and rapid cessation of all muscle activity and death can occur through respiratory failure. It must also be noted that the Australian Resuscitation Council recommends that, if someone is bitten, a person should stay with the victim to watch for signs of breathing difficulty. If breathing fails, air resuscitation is necessary and may have to be continued for up to six hours, or even longer. It is also important to apply pressure immobilisation and to keep the victim still, preferably in the prone position.

The blue-ringed octopus is a timid creature by nature, and it is often the case that no contact would be made with it. However, it hides in a number of places with which people may come into contact, such as small rock pools, empty razor fish shells, scallop shells, and even discarded drink cans. As such, the blue-ringed octopus can pose a danger to people fossicking on the beach or at places like West Lakes.

The best way to avoid a bite is to leave the octopus undisturbed but, if it is disturbed, then there is the real danger of a potentially lethal venomous bite. These statements are not meant to alarm people, and I do not suggest that they should stay away from the coastal waters where they are likely to come into contact with it. Rather, I suggest that sensible caution be shown with respect to the threat posed by blue-ringed octopodes.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL NURSES' HOME

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): Will the Minister of Health review security and general living conditions for staff housed in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital's nurses' home? Six months ago use of the nurses' home at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was extended to general accommodation, besides housing up to 50 nurses, chiefly from the country. As a result of that decision, the general public, and sporting groups visiting Adelaide, have had access to the building. Staff have heard that the home is fully booked for the Grand Prix, and as many as 900 people could be accommodated during the race period.

Due to recent changes in security procedures, security staff no longer have immediate access to the nurses' quarters should there be trouble. I understand that recently a party of 150 interstate hand-ballers was accommodated in the nurses' home over a weekend. Nurses at the QEH say there was considerable disruption to staff during the sportsmen's stay, with alcohol being smuggled in, a bottle being thrown through the window of a flat, which terrified the nurse occupant, and nurses on shift work were generally subjected to increased noise.

Nurses also advise that there has been a rise in vandalism, intimidation and assaults on nursing staff around the hospital grounds in recent months. I am advised that nurses have been attacked on several occasions—and on Monday night six cars were broken into and vandalised.

The nurses living in the home say that there is little privacy or security in their quarters. At the same time they say there are severe limitations on the use of electrical items in their quarters due to the frequent overloading of the home's electrical system. Blackouts are not uncommon, and the home's heating system was turned off for a fortnight during winter.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Yes, Sir.

STUDENT ENROLMENTS

Mr DUGAN (Adelaide): Will the Minister of Education inform the House what effect changes in student enrolment may have on the number of teachers required in schools over the next four years, and will the Minister indicate what effect an extra 200 teachers might have on any changes in student enrolments?

I am aware that the number of students in South Australian schools has declined markedly in recent years. This is due to demographic factors such as the fact that people are having fewer children later in life. However, I understand that school enrolment trends are beginning to change, particularly in primary schools. A letter from the Opposition has been distributed to constituents in the Adelaide electorate that promises to increase teacher numbers by 200 in its first term in office, that is, over a full four years.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The point that the honourable member raises is valid. There has been circulated in his electorate a document, which I have seen, entitled 'Major Liberal Policy Commitments'. Under the heading 'Education' the letter states:

A future Liberal Government would employ an extra 200 teachers in our first term of office.

That contradicts a press release that was issued on 8 February under the name of the Leader of the Opposition which, under the heading 'Education Policy Release', states:

Two hundred extra teachers in our schools and kindergartens in our first budget—

Presumably that prediction is being made for the year 1991. So, there is then every reason to ask the question, 'Who is to be believed in this matter?' Before drawing a conclusion on who is to be believed about these promises, I refer members and the public to the fine print of the Leader of the Opposition's press release of 8 February, in which he said:

While priorities can be reorganised within the education budget—and goes on in another section of the press release to say that the Liberal Party, if in Government, would—

... begin a concerted campaign to reduce waste in the education budget.

Almost all the education budget is comprised of salaries, so clearly there is a belief amongst Opposition members that

there can be a reduction in salaries in the Education Department, some that they believe are unnecessary. So, there is an inherent contradiction in what the Leader of the Opposition is saying and the stated policy.

The facts are there for all to judge. In the period 1979 to 1982, when the Liberal Party was in Government, it reduced teaching positions by 500, and left the Bannon Government, when it came to office, with 231 unfunded positions which it, of course, funded. The Bannon Government has continued to retain teaching positions in our system, despite a fall of 22 000 students. In fact, 860 teaching positions have been retained in our education system during the period of the Bannon Government. That has brought great benefits to our schools, and has given the South Australian education system the reputation of being the best education system in Australia. Clearly the Opposition in this area are confused, and I would suggest cannot be trusted.

Mr BILL TURNER

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I direct my question to the Premier. I refer to a report in this morning's *Financial Review* that receivers investigating the affairs of the former proponent of the Marino Rocks marina project are working their way through a tangled web of millions of dollars of inter-company loans, and that Crestwin owes more than \$13.5 million to associated companies in addition to external debts. How many of Mr Turner's 62 companies did the Government investigate before deciding that he had the financial ability to undertake the Marino Rocks project?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The only company that was involved was the company that was intent on carrying out the development, and any change in Mr Turner's circumstances, which have occurred recently and which I have explained to this House, were certainly subsequent, in terms of action taken and these public disclosures, to the Government dealing with the Marino Rocks project. Let me go back to the core of the matter. The project itself is extremely exciting and sound; it is well based; it is feasible and financeable. The fact that a number of people wish to undertake that development clearly demonstrates that.

I hope that the honourable member, along with others, would support us getting a viable environmentally sound development of that kind in South Australia. It is no easy task but it is worth attempting, and the Government is certainly attempting to do so. As I have said time and time again, we will ensure that anyone seeking to undertake that development, first, conforms to all the environmental and other requirements; secondly, can demonstrate their rights to undertake such development in relation to the areas that they bring to the project; thirdly, that they have the appropriate finance in place; and, fourthly, that they guarantee to ensure the project will finish. Those conditions need to be met if we are to have a successful marina.

LYELL McEWIN HEALTH SERVICE

Mr RANN (Briggs): Will the Deputy Premier provide the House with a progress report on the \$28 million redevelopment of the Lyell McEwin Health Service?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member was good enough to indicate to me last week that he wished some information on this matter, so I have it available. It is important to indicate that the hospital bed establishment will be increased from its present level of 174 to 187 beds. Perhaps more important is the refurbishment that will occur,

as follows: 10 beds in the adult special care unit; 10 cots in the neonatal unit; two 25 bed maternity wards; 20 beds in the paediatric ward; three 28 bed surgery wards; the nurse management unit; the patient education suite; the dental surgery; and infrastructural and site works.

The stage 2 work is, in effect, physically complete, and I understand the Premier will open it shortly. Work has finished in advance of the project time because of the efficient way in which it was conducted which, of course, is a tribute to the contractors and the South Australian Health Commission. This has resulted in a considerable saving in the funds that were put into this project. I think that the honourable member and his colleagues in the north can look forward to a continuation of the excellent services they have always received from the Lyell McEwin.

GAWLER BY-PASS

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Minister of Transport confirm that the bitumen on the recently completed stage 2 of the Gawler By-pass is now lifting and cracking and may have to be dug up and relaid at a possible cost of several million dollars? The two kilometre second stage of the Gawler By-pass, between the trotting track and Chamberlain Road, was recently completed at a cost of \$10.5 million. However, I have been informed that sections of the road are now lifting and cracking, and that the deterioration is quite noticeable. I have also been told that the fault is believed to involve the original design specifications for the road, and that the result could be that it will have to be dug up and relaid.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: This is indeed a momentous day.

Mr Ingerson: You've got an answer!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will certainly give you an answer. A calculation was done by members on this side that I have been the Minister of Transport for five months and 26 days, and in the last minute of what may be the last Question Time of this Parliament the member for Bragg obviously has said to the member for Light, 'Please let me have this question, please let me break my 'duck', because—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —I have not been able to think of a question for six months.' He pleaded with the member for Light, 'Please let me have a question from your electorate.'

Mr INGERSON: I rise on a point of order. Mr Speaker, I ask that the Minister refrain from this dialogue and answer the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Because the prearranged time of 3.30 p.m. has been reached, Question Time is now concluded.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask members to hold their place while the Chair takes a point of order.

Mr GUNN: My point of order is that there has been blatant disregard by the Minister of Transport for the Standing Orders. If this course of action had been even partially carried out by a member on this side of the House—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will be silent for a moment. I ask members, Ministers and the member for Hayward not to move around the Chamber while we are taking a point of order. The member for Eyre.

Mr GUNN: The Minister of Transport acted in a manner quite contrary to the Standing Order—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Hartley and all members not to move around the Chamber while we are listening to a point of order about our deliberations. The member for Eyre.

Mr GUNN: The Minister of Transport displayed complete arrogance towards the Chair, expressing a view contrary to what is permitted under Standing Orders. If members on this side acted in a similar manner, we would be named. Therefore, I draw to your attention—

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order until I am able to elicit from the member for Eyre what behaviour the Minister displayed that the Chair should have taken offence to, because I was not paying attention to the Minister at that point.

Mr GUNN: Mr Speaker, it is particularly difficult for the Opposition when, on a regular basis, we have to—

The SPEAKER: Order! All I require from the honourable member is the information that I have requested.

Mr GUNN: The Minister was making gestures with his hands and was refraining to resume his seat when you, Mr Speaker, called that Question Time had ceased, as well as indulging in other actions contrary to Standing Orders. I drew that to your attention as soon as I could. I would say to you, Mr Speaker, that it is peculiar that members on this side have to be more explicit in explaining points of order, particularly when they relate to Ministers—

The SPEAKER: Order! At the moment it is the honourable member himself who is choosing to go into a great deal of detail. I have obtained from the honourable member the information requested. If the behaviour described was carried out by the Minister, he is clearly out of order, and I give the House my word that, had I been aware of it at that time, I would have called the Minister to order, the same as I would have called to order any other member of this Chamber. However, my attention at that time was preoccupied with studying Standing Orders in order to be sure what would happen when we reached 3.30 p.m., whether or not Question Time would be curtailed—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! —and whether the Minister would have the opportunity to continue answering the question put by the member for Bragg. I apologise to the House in general for the amount of time we have just taken up with that matter and I call on the business of the day.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

REFERENDUM (ELECTORAL REDISTRIBUTION) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

SOIL CONSERVATION AND LAND CARE BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 27 September. Page 961.)

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): The Opposition opposes the Bill, which is consequential on the Motor Vehicles Act Amendment Bill (No. 5) which was debated yesterday. The Opposition opposed that Bill and the arguments in support of that opposition are clearly set out in the speech by the member for Bragg.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Transport): I thank the member for Coles for her contribution. It is a great disappointment to the Government that the Opposition opposes the Bill, which is of course its right. The arguments, as the honourable lady has said, were canvassed yesterday and it seems pointless repeating them again. I commend the Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

**JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION (AUXILIARY
APPOINTMENTS AND POWERS)
ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 18 October. Page 1267.)

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): The Opposition supports the Bill. As with the previous Bill that went before the House, the issues have been canvassed at great length in another place and I do not think it is necessary to re-canvass all the points raised there. Basically, the principal Act, as I understand it, allows the temporary appointment of retired judges to assist in clearing the backlog of cases in courts. There are several problems with the principal Act, and this Bill addresses those problems.

My advice is that the Bill allows auxiliary appointments to more than one judicial office, with one designated as the primary office, for example, an appointment to the District Court and the Industrial Court in order to provide greater flexibility. If this could be carried across into permanent appointments in the District Court and the Industrial Court, the Opposition would be even more pleased. I am also advised that one of the criticisms made in the context of delays in both courts relates to the limited flexibility for judges in the District Court to sit in the Industrial Court, particularly in the workers compensation jurisdiction, and for judges in the Industrial Court to sit in the District Court.

We support this interchange, albeit in the area of auxiliary appointments. Permanent appointments would be even more beneficial. The Bill ensures that temporary appointees exercise power only when sitting, and the Opposition is happy with that. Finally, the Bill ensures that temporary employees are not entitled to a pension. That clause was well canvassed in another place. I do not intend to canvass it here, other than to say that the Opposition is happy with the Bill as it came from another place and intends to support it in this Chamber.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I thank the Opposition for its indication of support for this brief, albeit important, measure, which will, as the honourable member has indicated, improve the administration of justice and the more appropriate and more efficient deployment of judicial personnel in a number of jurisdictions in

our courts. It also clarifies, as the honourable member has said, the Judicial Administration (Auxiliary Appointments and Powers) Act 1988.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Mr Acting Chairman, I draw your attention to the state of the Committee.

A quorum having been formed:

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

[Sitting suspended from 3.47 to 4.55 p.m.]

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of State Development and Technology): I move.

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I understand that congratulations are in order for the Minister: he is a new parent as a dolphin has arrived. Perhaps that will ease some of his burdens. However, my charity stops there, because I want to talk about the Government's new education curriculum guarantee package and how it affects people in country areas. The current budget provides \$796 million in recurrent funding for the Education Department; \$14.79 million in capital funding: Minister of Education (Miscellaneous), \$58 million; and Children's Services, \$45 million. Yet there will be a drastic reduction in the number of teachers to be placed in area schools next year.

I have been advised that it is anticipated that there will be a net loss in the area schools system in South Australia of fewer than 20 students next year, but in that same system there will be a loss of 50 teachers. If one agrees that most of the teachers who will be moved are first and second year teachers, one can estimate that on average they receive a salary of about \$25 000, so there will be a saving to the Education Department of \$1.25 million.

Obviously those people living in rural South Australia are out of sight and out of mind with this Government because, once the number of teachers is reduced, the range of subjects available to the students will also be reduced. Those people facing difficult economic circumstances, or who are in the middle income bracket, have no alternative but to use the State education system, so the range of education facilities will be reduced for their children.

Upper Eyre Peninsula and other parts of the peninsula have already experienced a curtailment of the music program, which was a rather unfortunate decision on behalf of the Government, because it was an excellent program. A number of school councils have complained to me about that decision. The matter was highlighted recently in an editorial in the West Coast *Sentinel* under the heading 'Education, a hot potato'. That same publication under the heading 'Teacher cuts imminent', states:

Four local schools have confirmed they could face drastic staff cuts next year under the State Government's new teacher formula. Miltaburra, Karcultaby, Streaky Bay and Kimba . . .

I understand that Wudinna will also be involved. I know for a fact that the Quorn Area School will be affected. I received a letter this week from the Quorn Area School Council and it States:

We, the Quorn Area School Council, are disturbed by the staffing allocation to our school under the Education Department's curriculum guarantee document. On present indication, in 1990 we will suffer a loss of 3.8 teaching staff. The curriculum

guarantee states that, 'The Education Department will staff area schools and small rural secondary schools to ensure that they have a capacity to maintain at least their current curriculum range.' It also states there will be a working party to investigate anomalies. We understand submissions are required by the end of this week, which has left any affected school very little time to prepare a detailed submission, or to consult with staff members affected by the formula . . .

In the primary section, we will, on present projections, have 148 students to begin term 1 in 1990. There will be 53 (R-2) and 95 (3-7), which will swell to at least 65 (R-2) and 95 (3-7) by the end of the year. With an allocation of six classes it will then become difficult to maintain the curriculum guarantee of a maximum of 25 in each R-2 class and 27 in each 3-7 class. Are we then expected to refuse enrolments when classes reach their maximum size?

As a number of our staff are part-time employees, one junior primary and one primary class will be shared by two teachers. The reality is that, for the loss of less than 10 students, we will lose 1.9 teachers in the primary section. There is no allowance in our staffing allocation for children with physical, emotional or learning problems.

That clearly indicates what is happening in rural South Australia. I have also received calls from other parents who are most concerned about this matter.

I was interested to read the Institute of Teachers journal which was circulated today. An article written by Mr Endersby and Clare McCarty under the heading 'What we have achieved' states:

Now that we have reached a formal agreement for the Education Department on a package of improvements for education, it is timely to describe some point of process.

They have not achieved much for my constituents and for other South Australian rural areas. If that is the agreement achieved, as it has been explained to me, South Australian rural education will suffer. The Premier is now on his way to Eyre Peninsula. When he gets over there, I call on him to explain to all those area schools why they will lose staff numbers and the ability to maintain their standards of education. It is no good his racing over there with his media machine—and that is all it is: it is a window dressing exercise.

We want to know what will happen to those classrooms. Will the teachers be removed from them? The Premier and the Minister of Education have a clear responsibility to maintain education standards. I want a guarantee from the Premier and the Minister of Education that the Quorn school and all the other schools will not lose staff and that the range of subjects taught in those schools will be maintained. I refer particularly to the music program, which has been very successful, so I want some guarantee that that will be maintained. If not, we will know that this curriculum guarantee is only a sleight of hand trick to bolster numbers in the metropolitan area and, as a result, country areas will be forgotten.

I now want to refer to a problem raised by one of my constituents. The Woods and Forests Department is sending out agreements to small private contractors who operate in the Wirrabara forest. One of the conditions applying in that agreement is quite perturbing. The letter which my constituent received some time ago states:

The main features of the agreement are—

- The volume of softwood log available annually will be the same as your recent allocation, that is, 5 000 cubic metres.
- The agreement will cover a period of four years .
- The agreement is not renewable under any circumstances at the expiry of the four year period.
- The remaining entitlement of log under the agreement can be transferred during the period of the agreement with approval from the Minister.

I want to know whether the Woods and Forests Department has decided to get rid of private contractors and, if so, is it because of blunders it made with Satco and the New Zealand investment? Will it now selectively remove people who

have been in the industry for over 40 years, such as my constituent and his family? I want an undertaking from the Minister of Forests that in future these people will have their contracts renewed and that they will not be subjected to these unreasonable agreements.

Government members have talked about harsh and unreasonable contracts. I suggest that this is a harsh and unreasonable contract because if my constituents did not sign it they would have been out of business; they had no alternative if they wanted to maintain their operation and get some use out of the capital they had invested. I want to know where the Minister stands in this matter. In my view it is unfair and unreasonable and is the sort of action that Governments should not take.

I now refer to a decision of the Government, through the Engineering and Water Supply Department, to provide \$250 000 for a trial low-cost water scheme for Penong. That is well and good, and I suppose it is better than nothing. However, to solve the problem of the lack of water west of Ceduna a pipeline should immediately be constructed. I call on the Minister of Water Resources and the Premier to immediately construct that pipeline to serve Denial Bay, the Aboriginal community at Koonibba, all the farmers *en route* and the township of Penong. That would solve the problem once and for all and would greatly secure the incomes of those people, because they would not have to be involved in the time consuming and expensive exercise of carting water. It will allow them to stabilise their incomes in difficult years.

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

Mr De LAINE (Price): I join with the member for Eyre in expressing my pleasure at the birth of a young daughter to the dolphin Buttons. I am sure that I speak for every member of this Parliament in saying I hope that all the dolphins are successfully transferred to Queensland and that they live long and happy lives in their new environment. They are wonderful creatures.

Yesterday I spoke about the setting up of a maritime park and recreation area on Cruickshank's Corner, Port Adelaide. Because I ran out of time, I intend to continue my remarks now. I understand that the park was intended for family use and to boost tourism attractions in the Port Adelaide area. Yesterday I mentioned the inaugural speedboat grand prix which was held at this venue in April this year. Cruickshank's Corner, with its river turning basin, is the ideal position to hold any water activity. I understand there is every possibility of the speedboat grand prix becoming an annual international event and that it will, hopefully, rival the Formula 1 Grand Prix. There is the possibility of attracting an air show or spectacular, which will also be performed over the same turning basin. The potential of the area is enormous as far as spectator facilities are concerned.

I understand that about 40 000 spectators attended the first speedboat grand prix, and I was very surprised to hear that because on the day there did not seem to be that many people there. Because of the wide area for viewing along the wharves, from Cruickshank's Corner and from many other areas, it has been estimated that there would be comfortable room for more than 100 000 spectators to view events in this area. When Cruickshank's Corner is developed it will be a focus for the whole Port waterfront area. It goes without saying that great care must be taken to ensure that its development is undertaken in the correct manner.

Obviously, the land will have to be levelled, landscaped and planted. The main building, which I mentioned yester-

day, will be donated by Keith Le Leu and will house all the artefacts, museum pieces, books, photographs, records, and so on. It will be a research and learning area for people learning maritime arts and crafts. It will also be used as an office and meeting room for local community groups, including the local maritime and shipping unions. It must be carefully planned and designed so that it blends in with the surrounding natural and man-made features. Many of the man-made features have quite a historic significance, and it is important that the whole area be developed sympathetically with that.

As I mentioned yesterday, the tug *Fearless* is set up in this area on dry land as not only an exhibit but also a working-training vessel, especially for young people doing courses in seamanship, engineering and so on. The 60-tonne floating steam crane, which has considerable historic significance, is the only one of its kind left in Australia. Some people view this crane's preservation as being very important, and it will be set up on Cruickshank's Corner—I think its jib is something like 150 ft high—as a working exhibit, using air pressure rather than steam. It will give an ideal balance to the Port's historical lighthouse and Custom's House, which are on the other side of the river.

There are a couple of 100-year old Moreton Bay fig trees on the property which have historic significance and which will be preserved. There are plans to build a jetty shed using the old Largs Bay jetty structure, which has been carefully preserved. A boating pond along similar lines but not as big as the one at Bonython Park is envisaged not only for enthusiasts and children to sail their model boats but also for the sailing of remote control yachts, steamboats or whatever. That will be a wonderful facility.

Some large exhibits from ancient ships have already been acquired, such as anchors, propellers, wheelhouses and so on. It is planned to build barbecues and viewing spaces to enable people to view activities on the river, and this will incorporate the Birkenhead Tavern, which is adjacent to Cruickshank's Corner. Considerable work has been done to get the area ready for this year's speedboat grand prix. A lot of earthwork and levelling was done not only to Cruickshank's Corner but also to an area of about 400 metres to the north in front of the Birkenhead Tavern. A double rock retaining wall was erected to ensure that everything stayed in place. It is envisaged that in this area, which really is a small bay, a marina to house all sorts of privately owned vessels be built.

It is also envisaged that a jetty be built. The existing tug mooring facility is very good and, when the tugs move further up the river to Outer Harbor in the not too distant future, it is envisaged that this facility will be ideal for vessels such as the *One and All*, the *Falie*, the *Nelcebee*, the *Yelta* and so on. The ancient clinker-built vessel, the *Karlo*, which is our current firefighting floating facility in Port Adelaide, is very much outdated, and the Minister has told me that next year that will be replaced.

I hope that that vessel can be kept in Port Adelaide either as a museum piece or, even better still, used to ferry people across from the main tourist area of Port Adelaide to Cruickshank's Corner. The vessel would be ideal for that. Incidentally, Captain Murch, the last skipper of the old ferry which operated between Cruickshank's Corner and Port Adelaide and which became obsolete when the Birkenhead bridge was completed in 1941 told me of its history a few months before he passed away at the ripe old age of 90 years; he was a remarkable person.

If we could obtain that vessel, it would fit in well with the other historic vessels as a Port Adelaide attraction. Other development required on the site includes parking spaces

and the undergrounding of power lines, and we need information about the status of negotiations with the Navy and the Submarine Corporation so that we can try to get a submarine or naval vessel of some size tied up there, mainly as a museum piece and attraction. I have visited the wharves at times of visits by tourists who have come to look at vessels, but they have been disappointed when the *One and All* and the *Falie* are out in the gulf or making voyages around South Australia.

There is no doubt that people are disappointed, and we need to have vessels in Port Adelaide to make the whole area worthy of visiting as a tourist attraction. There will be some publicity and we will seek public comment on other aspects of the area, but it is an exciting concept, and I hope that the task force can get the area leased and raise the finance one way or another to develop further this marvellous family and tourist attraction.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Almost every week I am asked by visitors to my electorate office to raise issues and subjects in Parliament. I am always happy to do that for constituents. Tonight, in the 10 minutes available to me, I would like to raise several issues that are of vital concern to constituents and members who are present this evening.

The first issue comes in the form of a letter from a constituent in Douglas Grove, Glenelg North. The letter expresses her concern about the environment. She has asked me to bring this matter to public attention and, although I will not read all the letter (because of time constraints), I will pick out some of the more important points. The letter states:

Dear Sir, . . .

I know I'm speaking for a lot of people when I voice my concern about the future. I'm talking about our environment; for example, the Government wants us to recycle paper and plastic. Now, people are quite happy to do this but the paper and plastic mills cannot cope with the demand and are turning people away with paper and plastic. We spend a lot of money on lots of things. Why can we not have another paper mill or plastic factory? People are disheartened easily these days, let's not dampen the enthusiasm to do something positive about correcting this. Also, there should be heavier penalties for those who don't adhere to the 'rules' as regards dumping rubbish, solid or liquid, into rivers, ditches, the sea and whatever.

We are going to have big problems with river and sea pollution, with soil erosion and the destruction of trees which, in turn, bring about the destruction of bird life, etc. We have one earth; let's look after it. We have raped it of everything that it has to offer, without replacing those things at the same rate that we take them. We have beautiful conservation areas, and let's keep it that way and not be greedy in wanting more land and money and so destroy our future livelihood with greed.

She concludes her letter:

The damage we have already done may never be repairable, but we can slow the process down. We can do something positive toward correcting this so, please, before it is too late, say something in defence of the environment for your children and their children.

This constituent asked me to say something public, but there is no better avenue in South Australia than to raise this matter before members of the South Australian Parliament.

The second issue that I have been asked to raise tonight relates to the use of parking spaces in shopping centres set aside for disabled persons. Members will be aware of the signs displayed in these private car parks, and they will be aware of everyone's responsibility to ensure that only people with appropriate stickers displayed on their cars—people who have sought permission—should use such car parks. We all know that such car spaces are used by people who are not entitled to park in them because of how the legislation is written. Shopping centre management is authorised to do something about this problem, but the dilemma is

that on many occasions shopping centre management is not present. It is possible that Westfield's has management present to initiate prosecutions, but often there are shopping centres where the management is either interstate or not *in situ* and there is no one around to see that a prosecution occurs.

I do not suggest that the police should come onto private property. That is perhaps taking the matter to an extreme, but I believe that the Government should look at perhaps providing an amendment to the legislation if necessary to allow local council inspectors operating in the vicinity to come into those car parks and act on behalf of the management. This area is being abused and, if it continues to be abused, more and more unauthorised people will occupy those spaces to the detriment of the people for whom they are set aside, that is, disabled people who come to shopping centres hoping to obtain a parking space conveniently located near entrance doors. I hope that the Government will take this matter on board and have a close look at it and introduce appropriate legislation at the earliest opportunity.

The third issue that was brought to my attention came specifically from a Glenelg constituent who asked me to bring to the attention of the House the report that appeared in the *Advertiser* on 17 October headed 'Press "to lift morals"'. This report, which had a London byline, states:

Mr Rupert Murdoch, chief executive of the News Corporation, has told British television viewers he foresees a major religious revival in which his newspapers will play their part by maintaining "high moral values".

He says:

I see newspapers as instruments for good, not as instruments to make money.

The article was reported in Australia, and I hope that it has received wide coverage. Certainly, it is heartening to see a newspaper baron laying down policy in that area, and we certainly applaud him and hope that the Australian press will take up this matter urgently and implement that policy in Australia as soon as possible.

The final point that I would like to pick up this afternoon relates to a matter on the Notice Paper under the name of the member for Albert Park, that is, Notice of Motion: Other Business No. 14. It would be contrary to Standing Orders to refer to this matter in any depth, but this motion raises the question of members referring to people outside this place. It was all very well for the member for Albert Park to raise this subject and ask the Leader of the Opposition to dissociate himself from alleged statements made by the member for Victoria. However, on 14 March 1989 the member for Bright also embarked on this exercise. I well recall his most scurrilous and vindictive attack on Jessie Taylor.

Mr D.S. Baker: She's a nice lady.

Mr OSWALD: As the member for Victoria says, she is a nice lady, a well-principled lady who is dedicated to—

Members interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: Members opposite are laughing, and I think that is appalling. She is dedicated to doing something about the aged and senior citizens in this State. Yet all the member for Bright could say was that this honourable lady

was peddling snake oil. Far be it for anyone to suggest that she got—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Rann): Order! The member for Fisher will come to order.

Mr OSWALD: I would hope the member for Fisher will come to order and so should other members opposite. This lady has made a particular effort on behalf of the seniors in this community to do something about income security for the aged and the medical and pharmaceutical services that are available to the aged. She is concerned about their personal safety, which is something that members should take on board. She is concerned about the penalties that are being handed down. She is concerned about the administration of justice and the level of penalties, and members should keep that in mind.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Fisher will come to order.

Mr OSWALD: For the member for Bright to come into this House and say that this woman is peddling snake oil, when all she is doing is trying to speak on behalf of the seniors of this State, is an absolute unmitigated disgrace.

Mr D.S. Baker: It's absolutely disgraceful!

Mr OSWALD: It is. As the member for Victoria says, it is absolutely disgraceful.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections.

Mr OSWALD: An apology would be in order. The member for Bright should come into this House at the first opportunity and apologise to the President of the Senior Citizens of Australia in South Australia and retract every statement that he has made, because it does not do the Labor Party any good for him to come into this House and criticise. It makes a mockery of the motion that has been moved by the member for Albert Park in relation to the member for Victoria, and I am sure when we go through *Hansard* prior to this motion of the member for Albert Park being debated, we will find a plethora of examples where members of the Government have ridiculed and criticised members of the public.

Motion carried.

[Sitting suspended from 5.28 to 6.21 p.m.]

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

At 6.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 24 October at 2 p.m.