

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 27 February 1990

The **SPEAKER (Hon. N.T. Peterson)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: POWER LINES

A petition signed by 1 754 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to require the undergrounding of power lines in the Adelaide Hills was presented by the Hon. D.C. Wotton.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 1, 6, 8, 16, 21, 23, 25, 38, 74, 76, 77 and 85.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

- By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—
Summary Offences Act 1953—Regulations—Traffic Infringement Notices.
- By the Minister of Finance (Hon. Frank Blevins)—
Superannuation Act 1988—Regulations—Commutation.
- By the Minister of Labour (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—
Motor Fuel Licensing Board—Report, 1989.
- By the Minister of Employment and Further Education (Hon. M.D. Rann)—
District Council By-laws—
Loxton—No. 36—Council Land.
Onkaparinga—No. 9—Swimming Centre.
Port Elliot and Goolwa—No. 31—Traffic.

QUESTION TIME

The **SPEAKER**: Before calling on questions, I wish to advise that questions otherwise directed to the Minister of Emergency Services will be taken by the Deputy Premier.

ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

The **Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen)**: My question is directed to the Premier. Will the Premier confirm that Cabinet yesterday rejected a recommendation for a 3.5 per cent reduction in electricity tariffs paid by industrial, general purpose and farm consumers, and explain why?

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: I will confirm nothing. I will simply say that the question of the appropriate tariffs that are set by the Electricity Trust in relation to business, commercial and domestic are always referred to Cabinet for consideration, although the final decision, of course, is one that the Electricity Trust of South Australia Board takes. But quite properly it takes those decisions in consultation with the Government. Members may be aware that we have been working progressively with the trust over the past few years to try to ensure that business tariffs are reduced and that the degree of cross-subsidisation, which is inherent in

the system, can be reduced as well. There has been an ongoing program to that effect.

In consequence, of course, our business and commercial tariffs will become very much more competitive with the eastern States, but we also feel very strongly indeed that this should not be done at the expense of domestic consumers. That must be an overriding consideration. We have consistently ensured, again in conjunction with the trust, that the increases in electricity prices have been kept below the rate of inflation—quite substantially below—over the past few years. It is normal for tariffs to be adjusted in July of each year, and the trust in the normal course of events would announce its policy in relation to tariffs for the year following 1 July. There are a number of proposals in relation to that. The Government still adheres to the policy of progressively reducing cross-subsidisation, but not at the expense of domestic consumers. In consequence, we will be continuing our discussions with the trust.

STANDARD CHARTERED BANK

The **Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh)**: Will the Premier explain to the House the relationship between the Standard Chartered Bank and the South Australian Government? An article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 26 February 1990 refers to Standard Chartered Bank Australia Ltd as having a 'close relationship' with the South Australian Government. The article mentions SGIC's and Sagasco's investment in Standard Chartered and further asserts that the Government gave tax holidays and free accommodation to attract Standard Chartered to Adelaide.

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: Yes, I have seen that article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* and I was as much surprised with the content and inferences drawn by that article as was the Group Managing Director of Standard Chartered, who has written to me on the matter complaining about the way in which the article had been constructed and the inferences that were drawn. He, of course, can speak for himself, and I understand that he will be responding and will also be available for media response as required on that issue. Let me put the position of the South Australian Government quite clearly.

Members will recall our clearly announced intention, as part of our economic strategy for this State, to try to ensure that a major corporate private sector headquarters was established here in South Australia. The loss of the Bank of Adelaide in 1979 cost this city and this State dearly indeed. Very interestingly, and just in parenthesis, in 1979 it was the Standard Chartered Bank that expressed some considerable interest in providing assistance for the saving of the Bank of Adelaide and its retention here in this city. Unfortunately, inflexible policies at the Federal level in particular meant that that did not happen but, in the course of that, some very productive associations with Standard Chartered Bank were developed.

The next stage was for us, in pursuance of our policy, to try to identify an appropriate financial institution which would see its base here in South Australia. It was in that that we took advantage of the announced policies of the Hawke Government to deregulate the financial sector and introduce some more banking licences into Australia and to talk again with Standard Chartered and work with it on two fronts: first, to assist its case for the issue of a banking licence in Australia and, secondly, to ensure that its headquarters would be here in South Australia. It was a major achievement to ensure that that happened and one which has served this city and this State very well indeed.

The article is quite correct in stating that the State Government Insurance Commission, which has a portfolio of investments as part of its overall investment policy and which predominantly invests and supports South Australian based equities, was prepared for both policy and commercial reasons—and I underline commercial reasons—to take a stake in Standard Chartered in order to introduce some domestic South Australian equity into that bank when it received its banking licence.

Incidentally, in that it was joined by Advertiser Newspapers Limited, which at that time also took a holding of some 2.5 per cent in order, again, to provide some South Australian equity focus for the bank. At the moment, SGIC holds 8 per cent of Standard Chartered. Recently, it acquired some further shares—although not a substantial number—I am told on very good commercial terms. I welcome that, and I think that all South Australians should support it, since Standard Chartered is based here. I hope that it will be based here successfully and profitably for a long time to come.

Secondly, in relation to Standard Chartered's establishment here, I believe that it has made a very good contribution as a corporate citizen. It has been a sponsor of a number of State activities, such as the State Opera Company, the State Theatre Company and various other activities. It is a member of the SA Great organisation. I guess the only sponsorship that has caused me a bit of distress is that it is the principal sponsor of the Port Adelaide Football Club—but that was the choice the bank made and, unfortunately, it can demonstrate a very fair degree of success in that particular sponsorship. I mention those sponsorships to indicate that the presence of the headquarters of Standard Chartered in this city adds to the corporate citizenship and, therefore, to the support of a number of things that happen in this State.

That is great, and it is something that we support. There is no question that the bank, as with many financial institutions at the moment, has not performed as well as could be expected and, indeed, is suffering some losses in particular areas. All those are outlined—the extent to which they are accurately outlined in this article. They are part of the bank's commercial charter and, of course, have nothing to do with the South Australian Government.

In fact, Standard Chartered, until this difficult year, has performed well in comparison. I refer members to a table published today in the *Financial Review*. The table looks at the performance of various foreign banks and shows that Standard Chartered is quite respectably ranked in the middle of the field. Standard Chartered's Group Managing Director (Mr Knox) looks forward with optimism to working through this period of difficulty. He advises me that there is no question with respect to its long-term plan to remain active in Australia and to ensure that its headquarters remain in Adelaide. Again, I welcome that, as I am sure do all members and all South Australians.

Finally, let me deal with the article's allegation, if one could call it that, that Standard Chartered was supported with incentives of tax holidays and free accommodation in order to be here. That is nonsense. It is true—and I am very pleased to restate it (I say 'restate it' because it has been on the record since Standard Chartered originally gained its bid and made its decision to headquarter in Adelaide)—that it has been a recipient under what is now our State Development Fund Development Payments Program whereby it received some financial assistance in the form of an establishment loan.

In that, of course, it was treated no differently from a number of other new ventures and companies working within

the guidelines of that scheme. So, no special favours or concessions have been provided to Standard Chartered, apart from the very determined support of the South Australian Government to gain it a foreign banking licence on the basis that it would be headquartered here in Adelaide. I say again that I think that that has been of considerable value for the State and will be of great value into the future.

ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier confirm that Treasury opposed the submission to Cabinet yesterday by the Minister of Mines and Energy for a 3.5 per cent reduction in electricity tariffs for certain categories of consumers on the ground that it would reduce the Government's take from its 5 per cent levy on ETSA by half a million dollars, and will he explain why the needs of small businesses and charities, in particular, are not being given higher priority than the Government's greed for more tax revenue in view of the fact that the levy will earn the Government more than \$37 million this financial year—about \$1 million more than the budget estimate?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This question is almost identical to that asked by the member for Heysen. I am surprised that the Leader did not take the lead question. I am not sure of his purpose in doing this.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader's interjection gives me a clue: he is trying to boost the somewhat flagging reputation of the member for Heysen by giving him the first cab off the rank. I admire the support the Leader is giving to his team.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is Question Time and Standing Orders clearly provide that interruptions are out of order. I draw the attention of the Opposition to that fact.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I can only feel sorry regarding the material that the Leader has to deal with on the front bench. But I need not go into that. The Leader asked the second question, which effectively traverses the same ground as the question asked by his colleague. Therefore, the answer is unchanged. I am not in the business of confirming or denying what is before Cabinet or what has been considered by Cabinet. However, in relation to the question of tariffs, I draw attention to my remarks concerning the balance between business and domestic tariffs, the way in which we are working over a planned period in conjunction with the Electricity Trust to ensure that all consumers of electricity in this State benefit.

I point out again that, in conjunction with ETSA, we have consistently delivered lower than inflation increases in prices over the past few years, and that has been a very tangible benefit. We are not in the business that apparently the Opposition is in; that is, trying to play one sector off against the other. All I can say is that, in the short term, benefits that could be prescribed in a particular tariff adjustment will be there in the longer term. That is what we are looking for. We are not in the business of short, quick fixes in relation to tariffs because of a particular result in any one year. What is important is, first, long-term adjustment and a relationship between business in general and domestic consumers and, secondly, that we keep prices down to the minimum possible. The Government is talking to ETSA about that, and that is what our joint decisions will cover.

TOXIC ALGAE

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I direct my question to the Minister of Water Resources. Because of the toxic algae in Lake Alexandrina, what is being done to ensure that residents in the Strathalbyn-Milang area have drinking water?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: My colleague said 'Cheers!' It is expected that the supply of water in the Strathalbyn reservoir will be exhausted in about a week, and it will then be necessary to return to pumping water from Milang. I make it very clear to local residents that they will be given 48 hours warning and everything possible will be done to ensure that they are made fully aware of the risks, if at that time they still exist. In answer to a question raised in the community as to whether we propose to restrict the availability of water to the Strathalbyn-Milang area, I point out that we do not believe that restrictions are appropriate because, in fact, that would extend the amount of water available by only a few days. In addition, because a lot of that water is used for stock, we do not intend to put restrictions on that community.

The presence of nodularia in Lake Alexandrina continues and, unless there is a change in weather conditions within the next few days, it is expected that the nodularia will continue in Lake Alexandrina. The department is extensively monitoring the level of algae and its toxicity, and that will continue. The monitoring results will be released to the public immediately they become available. In addition, I think it is important to note that we will continue to cart water to the community so that drinking water is available to anyone who needs it. Obviously, people can collect the water from the large tankers at a central point in the community.

The Department has also made arrangements for Professor Falconer to visit Adelaide this Thursday, 1 March, to provide an external review of the actions being taken by the E&WS Department to investigate the problem. In other words, we are very happy to get an overview from a person who is considered, Australia-wide, to be an expert so that we can ensure that everything that can be done is, in fact, being done.

Tests have been carried out to ascertain the algae levels at various points in the lake to determine whether, if we have to return to the lake water and there is a problem with nodularia, we will be able hopefully to pump from the centre of the lake, particularly if the algae levels are much less. Those tests are currently under way. We are also looking at the possibility of being able to use underground water. That is currently being explored.

There is one other thing that I should like to share with the House. The department has taken delivery of a pilot water treatment plant that operates using the dissolved air flotation principle. This plant will be assembled as soon as possible and will be used initially to test the possibility of using such a plant to remove algae from Lake Alexandrina water. Contingency planning has commenced; this is assuming that the problems with Lake Alexandrina water may arise next summer, but we have contingency plans already in hand.

Finally, the department has made contact with the Murray-Darling Basin Commission to ascertain the position interstate, because we understand this problem is being experienced throughout the whole of the Murray-Darling basin. We want to make sure that we have access to every bit of research and information about this problem. I can give the residents of Milang and Strathalbyn a guarantee that the department is doing everything humanly possibly

to ensure that they have access continuously to safe drinking water and that we are doing everything we can to ameliorate this problem.

ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Premier. Does his Scrooge-like approach to this year's budget, reflected in—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member please resume his seat. Standing Orders provide for the dignity of this House to be upheld by the Chair. I feel that the comments made by the honourable member are out of order and I wish that he would withdraw them and not use that sort of language again.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Does the Premier's approach to this year's budget, reflected in Cabinet's refusal to reduce electricity tariffs to more than 90 000 consumers because it would deny the Treasury an extra \$500 000 in revenue, indicate that the State budget is going into deficit as a result of unfunded election promises?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This is again based on the two questions that have already been asked.

An honourable member: You have not given us an answer yet.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not going to canvass matters which are before Cabinet and which are involved in discussions with the trust. In any discussions with the trust about electricity tariffs, our primary concern is, and must always be, the cost of electricity to consumers, whether they be business or domestic, and to protect their rights. They are not related to specific budget considerations of Government. I say again that any changes that are made in tariffs mean that those benefits, if benefits are available, will eventually be received, and that would be our purpose.

If the accusation is that I am extremely careful about Government expenditures and protecting the budget, yes, I would accept that. Whether it is Scrooge-like or not, as the honourable member attempted to say, I leave for people to judge. But, as Treasurer of this State, I do not back away from the fact that I am very careful indeed of the finances of this State and ensure that they are protected, because I will never forget the experience in 1982, and the reports that we got on coming into government, that the State was about to go bankrupt and that we would be making application to the Reserve Bank and the Commonwealth Government for support of our budget unless we did something about it. We did something about it; we corrected that position; we are at the moment the best financed State in the country with one of the lowest tax rates. We intend to keep it that way, but we will keep it that way only if we are very careful in how we manage our expenditure. That is perhaps something that members opposite ought to remember as they urge all sorts of wild extravagant expenditure programs on us, as has been apparent in recent debates in this House.

MURRAY RIVER

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I direct my question to the Minister of Water Resources. Two different strains of algae at two different locations in the Murray River are causing problems with the water supply for a number of townships. Will the Minister tell the house what has caused this outbreak and what is being done to solve the problem?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his interest in this matter. As I specifically answered the previous question relating to the whole area at Strathalbyn, I do not intend to reiterate my answer. It is not the same question, because two strains of algae are involved. Whilst these are related—

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I would have thought that members opposite might be interested in this issue. I know that some are interested and for those people I will continue to brave the rudeness of some of the interjections. There are two strains of algae. One is nodularia, to which I have just referred. It is found in Lake Alexandrina and produces two different types of toxin. The other type is anabaena, which is found at Mannum. So far in Australia it has not been found to cause any particular health problems to the human population. However, following queries that have been raised through the media, my colleague the Minister of Health, through the Health Commission, is conducting broader population studies regarding this matter to verify this point. No information has been provided anywhere in Australia indicating that anabaena causes problems to human health. Those things having been identified, it is important to note that both of these algae are caused by a number of factors that come together to encourage the growth of the blooms. These factors are the presence of phosphorous and nitrogen and, of course, the presence of clear, still water.

It is rather ironic that the turbidity level of the river, which is often the cause of much complaint, is quite low at present and, unfortunately, this situation plays a major role in encouraging growth of the algae. I would like to remind the House that phosphorous is, I understand, the fourth most common non-metal found in the earth's crust. I understand that there is nothing much that anyone can do about it; it is present, it was there before any of us and it remains there.

I also point out to the House that the nodularia is not something new. It was found in Lake Alexandrina as far back as 1878. I understand that there is documentation to indicate that it seriously affected some of the sheep in that period.

It is important to point out the man-made causes of this problem, one being, as my colleague has said, the presence of superphosphates, which are used extensively in horticulture and agriculture. To a lesser extent, human activity does play a part in increasing the phosphorous level in the river. Although it is very small, every step that we as a community can take to reduce the levels must be of some assistance. I am sure that no honourable member on either side would want to stop all the activities along the river, such as irrigation, farming, tourism, recreation and so on. I am sure that many members here have a particular interest and would not want that to happen at all.

There are things that we can do, and there things that the Government and I are doing. I believe that farmers have learnt about the long-term effects of superphosphate going into the groundwater and, eventually, into the river. Of course, this phosphorous will be making its way through the natural system for a long time to come. So, even if we were to stop the use of phosphorous tomorrow, we would still have the problem.

Members interjecting.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am delighted to note that my colleague thinks I have something important to add to this debate. I am almost ready to conclude. I want to touch on three other things the Government is doing. We are working very consistently through the Murray-Darling Min-

isterial Council. Millions of dollars have already been spent trying to rehabilitate the Murray River. I have stuck to the policy, as has the Government, on the removal of environmentally unsound shacks along the river, and we will continue to do so. Finally, I am working constructively with the irrigators in the Riverland to ensure the rehabilitation of their particular use of Murray River water. There are a number of things that we can do. We are doing everything that we can. I do not believe that anyone can hold a Government or a Minister responsible for some 200 years of white civilisation and the consequences of that.

ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Premier say whether he received an application from the Electricity Trust of South Australia for a reduction in tariffs of 3.5 per cent to apply from 1 March for businesses, general consumers and charities?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No, I did not receive an application in the sense that the honourable member is describing. I refer members to my answers to the three previous questions on this matter. The subject of electricity tariffs is a matter of discussion between the Government and the trust. The matters are handled in negotiation normally—and currently—through the Minister of Mines and Energy, who is the Minister responsible for the Electricity Trust of South Australia. From time to time Cabinet considers matters relating to ETSA tariffs and communications flow backwards and forwards. Sometimes official communications or letters are sent formally to me as Premier, but they will always be referred to and dealt with by the Minister of Mines and Energy, who then reports to Cabinet. So, that is the way in which it works.

Obviously, there are all sorts of implications in tariffs, one of which is our policy plank that we will maintain prices in this area at or below the inflation rate. That means working closely with ETSA to do so. As I have already outlined to the House, we have also announced a means whereby we will progressively address the problem of cross-subsidisation in relation to electricity tariffs but, as a Government, we are not prepared to do that at the expense of domestic consumption and I think that that should be made quite clear. If the Opposition is attempting to argue that we should be going down that track, I hope that it says so loudly and clearly in the community generally. I repeat that I cannot confirm, deny or comment on any current negotiations that are going on. At such time as a resolution is reached, obviously a decision will be announced.

HOUSING TRUST

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Can the Minister of Housing and Construction tell the House the Government's policy on the sale of Housing Trust dwellings to people other than tenants? Two residents in Spence have offered to buy Housing Trust dwellings in their locality. One offer was for a disused delicatessen and an attached tenanted dwelling. The second offer was for a tenanted dwelling. The first offer is being considered by the trust and the second has been rejected because, according to the trust, it does not sell dwellings to people other than the tenants.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question. I am sure that many trust tenants and members of the community would be interested in the answer I am about to provide to the House. The trust adopts

a clear policy on the sale of properties. In particular, as I am sure most members know, sitting tenants can purchase the rented dwelling in which they are resident, provided either that there is a separate title or that a separate title can be created for that property. When a property becomes vacant, it is offered to the next applicant in line for rental. That is the position with regard to the majority of properties in a situation where there is a waiting list.

When property is available (and this situation develops particularly in country areas) and where there is no current or expected demand for that property and there is a chance that it would fall into rack and ruin or be vandalised through its real estate agents, the trust would then offer the property on the market for sale at market value. Where there is a demand for a property, it will go to the next person on that rental list. At this stage I do not have specific details about the two properties to which the honourable member has referred, but I have asked the trust for a full report on them and I will provide that information to the honourable member in due course.

YOUTH TRAINING AND ASSESSMENT CENTRES

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Is the Minister of Family and Community Services satisfied with procedures, including those dealing with any association (including family and personal associations) between staff and detainees, followed by the Department for Community Welfare for guaranteeing the security of youth training and assessment centres and, in view of a recent incident, are those procedures to be reviewed? A youth who was being detained at the Youth Training and Assessment Centre at Magill absconded on 29 January. This youth was serving a nine month gaol sentence for causing death by dangerous driving, the crime having involved the death of a 17-year-old girl in a hit and run accident. It was the youth's most recent conviction among numerous recorded in recent years.

After a previous conviction relating to a break and entering offence involving a sum of \$10 000, the youth was detained at the Enfield Youth Remand and Assessment Centre. On his release, he was put into the charge of his stepmother, an employee of the department in the youth remand area. The subsequent hit and run accident occurred while he was in her charge and outside the hours of a strict curfew imposed on the youth. However, the Department for Community Welfare found that there were no grounds for her to be disciplined on that occasion, as the breach of curfew was not part of her duties as an employee of the department. I have been informed that the stepmother has now been reported for harbouring the youth's escape on 29 January and that, notwithstanding the matters to which I have just referred, the youth's release from the Magill centre is imminent.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I can confirm that most of what the honourable member has said is correct but either the matter of the youth having been actually in the charge of his stepmother whilst in the institution is one involving incorrect information or I have not been told the whole story. I can certainly confirm that the stepmother has been reported by the police for harbouring, under section 77 of the Community Welfare Act. I can confirm that the chief executive officer has issued a notice of inquiry to the officer. The Public Service Association has been advised of the intention to suspend this officer without pay, and Work-Cover has also been advised.

However, unless I have the information wrong, the confusion may arise from the fact that about 12 months ago

the department became aware that the stepmother, who was a residential care worker at SAYRAC, not SAYTC, was seeking to contact the stepson in SAYTC on a large number of occasions. She was cautioned by the chief executive officer regarding separating her parental responsibilities towards the boy from her employment responsibilities. That caution was taken at that particular time. I can find no evidence to suggest that the stepmother was in any way implicated in the circumstances which led to the boy's escaping from custody, again, from the fact that the stepmother was working at a different institution. The circumstances of the escape have been reasonably well canvassed publicly, and that matter is being attended to.

A number of matters require a good deal of examination by departmental officers in this most unfortunate case, very distressing, as it clearly is, to a family. At this stage the boy has been apprehended and is back in the custody of the department; a charge is pending from the Police Department; and, of course, an inquiry will be conducted under the normal auspices of the Public Service. I do not know that I should canvass the matter any further than that because I do not want to ascribe guilt or anything like that until such time as these matters have been thoroughly investigated.

Mr Oswald: Could I have access to the inquiry?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I would be only too happy to give the honourable member access to all those details.

FEDERAL ROAD FUNDING

Mr HERON (Peake): Will the Minister of Transport please explain to the House the ramifications for South Australia of the Prime Minister's announcement of additional road funds of \$300 million over three years?

Mr S.J. Baker: You've got one minute.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Deputy Leader of the Opposition please come to order and watch what he is doing.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I was particularly pleased to hear the Prime Minister this morning and read his statement about additional road funding. Our share of it will assist quite considerably here in South Australia. The most important thing is to put it into context. It is a top-up of a very large amount of funds that the Federal Government has made available for road building over the past seven years. I will spell out in dollar terms what that has meant to Australia. In the past seven years it has meant an additional 18 per cent increase in real terms over the previous seven years—and that is a fact. A very simple calculation shows that, over the past seven years, there has been an 18 per cent increase in road funding over the previous seven years. That is fact, and the very simple calculation to prove it is available for everyone.

In dollar terms, it means \$235 million on average each year for seven years, compared with the previous seven years. Any fair-minded person would have to say that that is a magnificent effort on behalf of the Federal Government. If the previous Federal Coalition Government thought so much of road funding, why did it not do something similar? I am sure that the Federal Opposition will announce that, if it wins Government, it will make some real increases in this area. All I can say is that we go by the record, and the record of the past seven years of the last Liberal-National Party Government was absolutely abysmal compared with what the present Federal Government has done. This is on top of the offer that has already been made to the State of a further \$110 million to solve some black spot problems—

real road safety measures. I believe that this is something for which the Federal Government ought to be complimented.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I just want to finish on this point. I think it was in his Address in Reply contribution that the member for Bragg suggested that all major cities in this State ought to be connected by dual highways. If the honourable member's proposal includes Port Lincoln on the West Coast and Mount Gambier in the South-East, does he have any idea at all of just what it would cost to have dual highways between those cities alone? Untold hundreds of millions of dollars—

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Sir, the Minister did say he was winding up, and in fact he was responding to an interjection. Interjections are illegal—

The SPEAKER: Order! The interjection, of course, was from the Opposition side. Interjections are out of order. Will the Minister please draw to a close?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will, Sir. I just wanted to point out that this Opposition has some pretensions to fiscal responsibility and suggests the absolutely nonsensical proposition that all roads between the major cities in this State ought to be connected by dual highways. I am in the process of having that costed, but one thing I am sure about is that it would send this State broke, even if it were desirable to have dual highways. I think it is the most nonsensical thing I have heard in the 15 years during which I have been in Parliament.

STATE BANK

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): In view of the fact that the State Bank's provision for bad debts in the first half of this financial year increased from \$17 million to \$48.5 million—an increase of \$31.5 million or almost 200 per cent compared with the same period last year—and that in a press statement last Friday the bank's Group Managing Director (Mr Tim Marcus Clark) stated that 'bad debt provisions are expected to rise' during the remainder of 1990 and 1991, will the Premier tell the House the latest estimate of the bank's total provision for bad debts to the end of this financial year and for 1990-91, in view of the impact this will have on the State budget?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member, of course, is consistent in her line of questioning. Even on the backbench she has the State Bank in her gun, and I am delighted that she is maintaining that interest. It is a welcome change from her new-found green and environmental crusade which, probably, gives her colleagues a fair bit of discomfort. I am delighted, since it tends to support most of the issues this Government has been promoting. I should have thought that the most important thing in the State Bank statement—and the honourable member would have referred to it if she had some kind of balance in her approach to this—is the fact that last week the State Bank of South Australia declared a \$40.7 million interim profit for the six months to 31 December 1989.

That, of course, has great relevance to us as a State Government since, as a shareholder, we are a recipient of those profits just as we are the recipient of the equivalent State Bank's tax payments. So, I should have thought that, rather than this carping, negative question about the increase in the size of provisions, the honourable member would have concentrated on congratulating the State Bank which,

along with only a few banks in this current climate, has been able to announce a good interim profit and, indeed, is working to ensure that it will have a good profit at the end of this financial year. That is the bottom line.

In relation to provisions, I should have thought that the honourable member would have been the first person to complain—indeed, I seem to remember her doing so in her previous capacity on the Opposition front bench—about underprovisions made by the State Bank in relation to possible debts. When I put on the record at that time the sorts of provision that were made, it could be seen that the State Bank was extremely prudent and proper in relation to the provisions it makes.

The provisional situation and the profit position are set out in the statement. I am satisfied, in the current climate, with the performance of the State Bank, as should be all South Australians. Indeed, it is up to us to start defending our financial institutions, because we are being tarred with the brush of others who have not been successful. I should hope that the Opposition understands that in this climate it is in South Australia's interests to get behind and support our financial institutions.

EAST END CYCLE EVENTS

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport explain to the House what opportunity will be available for members of the public to compete in the second East End cycle event to be held on 18 March this year?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question. His interest in cycling is well-known, as are his successes in that area. They tell me he is on the comeback trail! Last year on 15 March the South Australian Recreation Institute and the South Australian Sports Institute conducted a cycling event in the East End of Adelaide called 'Cycling With the Stars', which was a great success. A number of members participated in that.

The day consisted of three main events: Cycling With the Stars, a five kilometre family cycling event with many leading international riders; a second event, which involved an Adelaide street race, a criterium event which was around the East End of Adelaide; and a third event, a 'Life. Be In It' day in the park which featured cycling organised by 'Life. Be In It'. The day was a great success.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Yes, I will be there, but not in the 'criterium'. On Sunday 18 March there will be another day of cycling action in the East End of Adelaide. The first major event will be the East End Cycling with the Stars, and I am inviting members and the public at large to participate through the South Australian Recreation Institute and the South Australian Sports Institute in that ride. Two courses can be followed, either a 7 kilometre course or a 16 kilometre circuit around the East End. The South Australian Touring Cyclists Association will organise this event, entry to which is free, and registration can be made on the day. I invite people to line up in front of Alfresco in Rundle Street at 10 a.m. for registration and the start will be at 10.30 a.m.

The public will be able to participate with leading Australian and overseas cyclists. The East End women's street race will also be held. It is for women only and will be conducted around a 700 metre circuit of Rundle Street, Union Street, Grenfell Street and East Terrace. The race will be 15 minutes plus five laps and will feature some of Australia's top female athletes.

Event three on 18 March will be the 1990 East End Adelaide street race, with an open criterion and using the same circuit as the East End women's street race. That will also involve about 100 of the top riders from Australia and overseas. I invite the public and members to participate in the open event, East End Cycling with the Stars, and also to be spectators. It was a great success last year and I am sure that it encourages people to take up cycling as a form of recreation.

MARINELAND

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I address a question to the Premier. Will someone in Government please accept approximately 4 000 letters addressed to the Premier expressing concern about the welfare of the dolphins at Marineland and, if not, why not? These letters are addressed to the Premier, and many seek a reply. Attempts have been made to deliver them to his office. However, the reply was that they should be given to the Minister for Environment and Planning. But the Minister's office has said that the letters were addressed to the Premier and therefore should be given to him. Apparently, no Minister in this Government is interested in the views of a wide cross-section of South Australian's about the welfare of these dolphins.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am happy to receive the letters. Regarding any argument about the location of the letters, I guess that the suggestion that they be directed to the Minister for Environment and Planning was made simply to expedite the process of reply, because that Minister is in the best position to reply. Indeed, any reply I would give would obviously be made in consultation with the Minister. There is certainly no problem in my receiving them. I thank the honourable member and perhaps, if he feels strong enough, he can carry them to my office.

'BUY AUSTRALIAN' CAMPAIGN

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education tell the House what response he has had to his call last month for South Australian retailers to support a 'Buy Australian' campaign? Last month I noticed newspaper reports attributed to the Minister urging retail chains to promote Australian products for a month after Australia Day.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: That is right. Last month I called on the major retail chains to promote Australian-made products from a launch date around Australia Day. I think that no-one in this Chamber would need to be reminded of the importance of our promoting and buying Australian-made products. Every time someone buys an Australian-made product of quality, that person is actually supporting an Australian job. Beyond that, it is also having an effect in terms of our balance of payments. I recall reading recently that every time an Australian spends \$2 per week on Australian-made products, switching from imported products, that takes \$1 000 million off our balance of payments problem. So obviously we are all keen to promote Australian-made goods.

I am surprised at the mirth of some members opposite. The member from the Riverland would know that we are currently encouraging South Australians to buy oranges from the Riverland rather than imported navel oranges from California. It is very important for our economy. We are also encouraging people, as the members for Mount Gambier and for Victoria would know, to buy Australian-made

cheeses from the South-East rather than imported cheeses. For too long Australians have been in a feeding frenzy over imported goods and we have to try to change that through an educational process, and the Australia-made Council is doing excellent work.

However, on the issue of the call to retail groups in South Australia, the response was tremendous. K-Mart, Westfield Marion, Parabanks and John Martin all responded to the call and launched 'Buy Australia' promotions during February. I visited both John Martin and K-Mart, and the managing director of K-Mart told me that 75 per cent of K-Mart's products on sale and 90 per cent of its women's wear were Australian sourced. This is very important for employment. I hope that the Opposition will join me and this Government in supporting these retailers who are taking up the challenge for a campaign.

TOXIC ALGAE

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): My question is to the Minister of Water Resources. In view of the fact that algal blooms are presenting noxious and toxic problems associated with Adelaide, Strathalbyn and Milang water supplies, as has been acknowledged by her colleagues, can the Minister advise the House, first, what steps she has taken to ensure that long-term strategic research is conducted by bodies such as the CSIRO and the E&WS Department, the State laboratories, into identifying the trigger mechanism that renders toxic what are otherwise apparently non-toxic algae? I am advised by the CSIRO, as the Minister was, that the phosphorus and nitrates (phosphorus which is diffuse across the land, and nitrates which are man-induced pollutants) may be responsible, but that specific proof is not available.

Secondly, what short-term research is under way to ensure that adequate safe water supplies are available on demand whenever these algal blooms occur, bearing in mind that the CSIRO scientists, I was advised last week, predicted such occurrences six years ago and that they are now complaining that Federal funds have been reduced from \$7 million to \$5 million this year?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I have already answered some of that particular question—in fact, in response to the other two questions that I answered—but I am happy to reiterate.

I think from memory the first part of the question related to the long-term strategy. I should like to spell out clearly that research is going on. The South Australian Water Laboratory is considered to be one of the best not only in Australia but in the world. I think that has been acknowledged by my predecessor and, indeed, by other Ministers of Water Resources.

The department is working very closely with Professor Falconer, who is coming over. It is interesting that the honourable member asks a question and then does not have the manners to listen to the answer, but that is fine, because I shall answer anyway. Professor Falconer—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Professor Falconer is coming to Adelaide on Thursday to have an overview of the procedures that we have adopted in South Australia. I think that even members of the Opposition would acknowledge that he is considered to be an Australia-wide expert. As well as this, the department has worked for some time in a cooperative way with the CSIRO. In fact, a number of

experiments have been worked conjointly with the CSIRO and, indeed, with Professor Falconer.

It seems to me that the question relates to what further research we should be undertaking to find the trigger mechanism. It is quite clear that the research which has already been done indicates the problem: that if we have large amounts of phosphorus and nitrogen, we have calm water that is clear, and if we have bright sunlight, that would seem to be the ideal situation for these particular types of algae to bloom, and to bloom in such a way that they cause problems, but not to the Adelaide water supply at this stage. I should like to correct the honourable member, because he has talked about the Adelaide supply.

I would like to clarify that, at this stage and for the foreseeable future, the Adelaide water supply is not under any threat. Just so that is not another hare that is set running by the Opposition, I want to make sure that that is clearly on the record. The two areas I have previously outlined—I thought in a detailed way—indicate what the Government is doing but, if the honourable member wishes me to repeat that all again, I shall be pleased to do so. As the honourable member knows, the solutions will probably be fairly long-term because we have to ensure the removal of phosphorus and nitrogen from the Murray River.

We have to ensure that we do nothing by way of human activity to exacerbate the problem, and that is through human waste and a range of other practices such as using dish-washing liquids and a whole range of other substances. We have to ensure that our farmers use less superphosphate, which finds its way into the river, and one could go on. However, as I have indicated in my previous answer, one of the things we are considering is trialing a new type of agitating facility, to ensure that we can remove the particular type of algae from Lake Alexandrina.

The honourable member apparently now finds the whole thing amusing; having talked all the way through my answer, he is now laughing. I can assure the House that I do not take this matter lightly: it is a serious matter. I reminded the House earlier that it has been around since 1878; it is not something that has just happened in the past year. To answer the last part of the honourable member's question, I point out that we are considering a range of contingency plans to ensure that the Adelaide water supply is safe for the future and for those areas which do not have filtered water and which are prone to the types of algae that can cause particular types of toxin.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mount Gambier has asked his question and is out of order.

OVERSEAS QUALIFICATIONS

Mr GROOM (Hartley): My question is directed to the Minister of Ethnic Affairs. Will the Minister report to the House on the current state of implementation of assistance and courses to facilitate entry into the Australian work force for both skilled persons and those with overseas qualifications? In the past considerable difficulties have been encountered by people having overseas qualifications who cannot practise their professions or trades in Australia. South Australia is unique, I understand, in establishing what has been termed a 'network' to provide support and assistance in the area of overseas qualifications. Bridging courses are one of the means of enabling such people to contribute their skills to the Australian work force, and I understand that considerable progress is being made in this area.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question. I will obtain some more exact

advice on those areas that come more directly under the ambit of the Minister of Employment and Further Education with respect to actual courses on offer in tertiary education institutions. However, as to the general principles—as members will recall—in the budget for this financial year the Government promised that resources would be available for overseas qualifications to upgrade the work in the Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission in this regard. In 1987 South Australia was first to establish a unit for this purpose, and the second unit was established last year.

That unit has been doing significant work in helping direct people to the right place where they might get some further advice and have access to courses that would enable them to use the qualifications they gained overseas. However, it was quite clear that some problems were still left unaddressed and I refer to the questions of the actual provision of courses and, also, of trying to remove any unfair elements, built into our system, of discrimination against people. In that regard, the decision to upgrade the overseas qualification unit was made and I expect to be in a position to announce in the next few weeks the composition of a board that will handle this matter in the Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission.

I also draw members' attention to the legislation—introduced before the last election which Parliament was unable to proceed with at that time but which will be proceeded with this year—which specifically proposes to write into law that it shall be an offence for any body that has the capacity to accredit qualifications to take into account anything other than educational issues; for example, they may not take into account the fact that, because people were born overseas, that therefore means that they should suffer some extra impediment, even though they can prove that they have achieved a certain level of educational competence. I will keep all members in this place further advised on this topic, because it is a very important area not only for the victims of discrimination but also for society at large, which is not getting the opportunity to take complete advantage of the full human resource potential in our community. If we tell people that they cannot use their talents, all of us suffer.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MINISTER'S REPLY

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr GUNN: During Question Time on Wednesday 21 February, during a response by the Minister of Housing and Construction to a question asked by the member for Walsh, I sought, in conformity with Standing Orders 127, 128 and 131, to take a point of order. I took the point of order because that is the only course of action open to any member of this House who believes a Minister is overstepping the bounds in answering a question by either being unduly critical of the Opposition or taking an inordinate amount of time to answer a question—

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Or being repetitive.

Mr GUNN: —or being repetitive—and on that occasion the Minister was doing all three of those things while reading from a prepared answer. I sought to draw that matter to the attention of the House so that Question Time would not be wasted with the Minister's carrying on in this fashion.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr GUNN: Yes, by way of a point of order. I believe I was completely misrepresented by the response I received on that occasion, because I am confident that if you, Mr Speaker, had properly understood the point of order, I would not have received that response.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has now turned his personal explanation into a debate and, therefore, he is out of order.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the time allotted for all stages of the following Bills:

Supply (No. 1),
Stamp Duties Act Amendment,
Real Property Act Amendment,
Magistrates Act Amendment,
Aboriginal Lands Trust Act Amendment—

be until 6 p.m. on Thursday.

Motion carried.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 February. Page 218.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I am not the lead speaker on this Bill. I wish to make some brief comments and observations on the Supply Bill (No. 1). This document is actually another example of the Bannon Government's dishonesty with respect to not only the way it operates its finances and fails to keep its promises but also the way it informs the House and the people of South Australia about exactly what is happening with the State's finances. Nothing could be more dishonest than this document because it says nothing at all. At least in previous years we have been given some indication of where the budget estimates lie.

I point to the classic paragraph in Supply Bill (No. 1), which states quite blandly:

In the area of State's 'own source' receipts revenue from payroll tax is expected to exceed the budget estimate due to higher than anticipated employment growth. Interest received on investments is also showing a small increase over budgeted levels. Offsetting this, however, it is now expected that revenue from stamp duties on conveyances and mortgages is likely to be lower than estimated in the budget. This reflects mainly a flattening out in the property market. Overall, the expectation is that recurrent receipts will be reasonably close to the budget estimate.

That says absolutely nothing. The document says, 'Parliament of South Australia, approve the \$800 million. There is no accountability whatsoever but we think you should go through the processes to approve what the Government believes to be a rubber stamp.'

The Bill is not a rubber stamp, and it was never meant to be a rubber stamp. Detailed information should be quite clearly shown in this Supply Bill because it takes the Government's expenditure items—the supply of money—through until the August budget. It is an important Bill because it really provides Parliament with the opportunity to give the people of South Australia an interim report on the budget.

I mentioned the dishonesty in this document because it really does confirm that the Government had no intention whatsoever of keeping its election promises. One will note that in the estimates of expenditure there is no line for State Transport Authority student concessions—none whatsoever. We do not see in the estimates of expenditure a line for Homesure concessions. These were promises by the Government which, at election time, Mr Bannon said he

could accomplish within this budget. Everybody in this House knew about the promises. Everybody knew that the Premier had made these promises and, in fact, he explained to journalists at the time that he had accommodated for them in the budget. There was no room in the budget but they were going to be accommodated.

What we have now is an explanation that says, 'Our revenue pluses are offset by our revenue negatives and, generally, the budget is on target.' What does that really mean? My interpretation of that is that the Premier had no intention whatsoever of meeting the costs of the promises. If one believes the Minister of Transport—and nobody ever believes him, anyway—one would think that the cost of the State Transport Authority concession to students is \$7.5 million. If one takes a more global view and looks at the total cost of that scheme, it is approaching \$25 million. That was not provided for in the budget. Other areas of expenditure had to be pruned or more revenue had to be generated to accommodate it.

On the matter of Homesure, we know that the Premier said, 'We will spend \$36 million on Homesure and we will provide benefits to over 30 000 new home buyers.' In fact, he went further: it was not just new home buyers but those persons who purchased houses since the interest rates increased three years ago. That was his promise and he said, after being questioned, that he could accommodate that within the budget. He had no intention of doing that. We can see from the bland explanation provided with the Supply Bill that revenue is approximately on target, so no extra revenue is coming through. Expenditure is approximately on target and no area of saving has been identified which would allow the Premier to accommodate the extra cost.

I estimate that the promises the Premier is keeping probably add up to at least \$10 million. I suppose the document takes this overview and says, 'We all have a little bit more money from payroll tax and a little bit more money from land tax but because of the economic downturn we will collect a little bit less from stamp duty on transactions, particularly housing transactions.'

I wish the Premier had been at a meeting last night, and at other meetings of small business people who are protesting—as the Premier is aware—about the high impost of land tax. It is absolutely critical for many small business people out there today that the Government does not overload them with taxation. They are already paying record interest rates on moneys borrowed. They are paying real interest rates of 15 per cent out there in the marketplace, yet all members would know that their revenue take has not increased 15 per cent. How many people are on the land tax roll that Mr Bannon has hit them with this year, remembering that 30 per cent of people paying land tax have to pay more than would be encompassed within the inflation rate? Further, it is not just those who are above the 7.4 per cent; some of them are paying 200 per cent, 300 per cent and 400 per cent. I will make only a brief remark about that because the Opposition will follow up this matter in further debates in Parliament.

The payroll tax take has improved—of course it has improved. That must be seen as a positive but also as a negative because we know it takes from the employing populace and they are an essential part of our community. The Premier has said that if he could get rid of payroll tax he would. The interesting aspect of course, is that he has said that he expects stamp duty to run far short of the estimate. He knows, as everybody in this House knows, that we are not due for a soft landing; we are due for a fairly solid bump this year.

The Federal Treasurer would have us believe that the economy is slowing down and we will not have too many casualties. I can assure members that there are casualties out in the marketplace, and the number will grow quite rapidly because people are now spending less and people are tightening their belts, yet there are no signs of interest rates coming down. So 50 per cent or 60 per cent of businesses have increased taxation at the same time as their revenue base is rapidly disappearing.

I return to the point about dishonesty. We did not have an explanation as to what the Premier was doing about electricity tariffs. In his budget predictions in the Supply Bill, the Premier does not say, 'We are getting an extra \$1 million out of the electricity tariffs.' We know that suddenly he said, 'I want all that revenue. I don't want it to go to the people that it should go back to, so I will stop these concessions being given.' Returning to the point I started with, this amounts to absolute dishonesty. The Premier of this State has not come clean. He never comes clean. Everything is either commercially confidential or it is too hard to answer.

We had another example today. Not only did we have reference to the Electricity Trust but also a question relating to the State Bank. Previously he has been asked a question on the performance of the State Bank. He said, 'I will bring you down a report.' He did not bring down a report. That is dishonest. When he was asked the question today, 'What are the forward estimates of bad debts for the total 1989-90 and 1990-91?' he said that he had great confidence in the State Bank. That was not the question. The Premier was asked a direct question and again he failed to answer it, just as this document fails to answer any questions that the Opposition believes should be satisfied. It is not the intention of the Opposition to oppose this Bill, but certainly we must question both the content of the document that we have before us and the conduct of the Premier.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): During this debate. I will refer to the problems associated with seaside councils and their ability or otherwise to maintain beachfronts. The budget line I refer to in this instance is the money provided out of the Environment and Planning budget for the Coast Protection Board. It seems most likely that an increase in the Coast Protection Board allocation would be of assistance to seaside councils, and that would assist my constituents.

The Coast Protection Board was originally set up by the former member for Henley Beach, Mr Glen Broomhill, when he was Minister for Environment and Planning. This matter was brought to my attention again by a headline that appeared in the *Advertiser* of Saturday 17 February. Under 'Seaside council funds dilemma', the Local Government Association President, Mr Malcolm Germein, stated:

Local seaside councils have attempted within their limited revenue base to give much needed attention to our coasts. But it is well outside the resources of councils to do all that is needed.

I have been a resident of Henley and Grange for 30 years and enjoy being in close proximity to one of the best beaches in the world. Not only that, the Henley and Grange beaches are the closest beaches to Victoria Square, which is generally regarded as being the centre of the city. My resentment comes about by the fact that, over that time, I have continuously paid higher council rates than residents of councils in the immediate vicinity, namely Woodville and West Torrens. My rates are approximately \$20 per year higher on average but, of course, other residents whose houses have higher valuations pay higher rates. The reason for this is the maintenance of the beach front along the coastline of the City of Henley and Grange. There is a resentment that, for example, on a hot day in Adelaide the beach fronts are

crowded with people not only from Henley and Grange but from the surrounding districts. It is ironic that people coming from other areas can enjoy the facilities of the beach yet they do not have an obligation to pay anything towards the upkeep of the beach. In fact, some of these people have the temerity to be critical of the beach facilities when they are not prepared to make one iota of payment towards their upkeep.

The past several budgets have increased the total amount of money spent by the Coast Protection Board on local beaches, but this increase relates to the carting of sand which has become more and more expensive while providing no extra facilities for the people using the beach. Local councils are responsible for the maintenance of the beach facilities and the cleaning of the beach, and that is now running into a considerable amount of money. Council also provides for part payment of sand drift control fencing; construction and maintenance of erosion protection such as walkways; the infrastructure for visitors such as roads, toilets, car parks, boat ramps, change rooms and shelters; rubbish collection, as I mentioned; sand clearing; the wages of beach inspectors; and the restoration and repair of storm damage.

Beachside councils have been subject to large scale criticism about the clearing of large expanses of dry sand. Most councils have cleanup sessions. The Henley and Grange council has a system of beach cleaning by volunteers, and I attend at least one of these voluntary sessions each year. However, other States have been prepared to subsidise the cleaning of beaches. For example, the Victorian Government has been prepared to subsidise the cleaning of beaches in the first instance by providing the necessary capital to buy beach cleaning machinery and then subsidising, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, the actual cleaning of the beaches. I believe that it is completely unfair for residents of beachside suburbs to be subjected to the total payment for many of the things that I have already mentioned while the remainder of the people in the metropolitan area come down from time to time to enjoy those facilities yet pay no money towards them.

I am in total agreement with Mr Germein when he states: Obviously beach and foreshore facilities and maintenance demand a contribution from the wider community if the costs are to be born equitably by our community.

I have a copy of correspondence that was sent to the Minister for Environment and Planning by Mr Fred Angus, the Mayor of Henley and Grange. In a sense, it sums up the dilemma that seaside councils face at the present time. The correspondence states:

Dear Sir,

Metropolitan Seaside Councils Committee.

The State Government action of eroding the funding of the Coast Protection Board over recent years has been a source of concern to our organisations which traditionally have worked in financial partnership with the State Government on coastal issues. The drastic action of providing the board with the lowest level of funding since establishment in 1972 has inspired the resurrection of the Metropolitan Seaside Councils Committee. The committee constituents and objects are listed in the attachments.

Recent statements and actions by the State Government indicate a desire for long-term planning and this involves adequate consultation and financial arrangements between interested parties. Long-term identification and scheduling of coastal works have been attempted but the necessary ingredient of financial agreement has been missing. The committee would appreciate the opportunity of discussing the mechanism for long-term partnership with the State Government to enable protection and preservation of our State beaches. As our beaches are a major tourist attraction, the committee is desirous of a joint meeting with you and the Minister of Tourism to discuss their future. Would you please indicate a time that such a meeting could occur with this committee?

I am not suggesting at all that the State Government has ignored the plea from Mr Fred Angus or from anyone else

to try to come to a solution to the problem, but the problem certainly has not been fixed. It is appropriate in my view to regard our beaches as national parks, and the responsibility for them should be covered by all people who use them.

In other cities alternative arrangements have been made for metropolitan beach councils to gain revenue. The beachside suburb of Fremantle does not allow free parking in its streets, and off street parking is provided, for which visiting motorists must pay. This provides revenue for Fremantle and the money is then spent on seaside improvements where and when necessary. Whether this is an action that can or should be taken by councils in order to gain the appropriate revenue is a moot point. It is, however, my contention that the seaside councils are in need of more help so far as their revenue base is concerned for looking after the metropolitan beaches. It is completely unfair that the residents of the beachside suburbs should bear the full cost for what is, in fact, a playground for the whole metropolitan area.

Argument has been put to me that people living in the seaside suburbs should be content because the fact that they live in a seaside area puts up the valuations of their properties and this should be a source of satisfaction to them. I fail to see how this can be a convincing argument. The fact that valuations go up means that people are immediately involved in increased expenses for such things as council rates, water rates, and so on. The advantage of increased valuations is realised only if, and when, the owner sells the property. By and large, my area has a stable population and it is not unusual for people to be in residence for 20, 30 or more years, so there is absolutely no advantage of rising property valuations because of the location in a seaside suburb.

The question has been a serious one in the past. I believe that the formation of the Coast Protection Board in the first instance was an answer, an attempt to answer this problem. Stringencies of budgetary control have now reduced the effectiveness of the Coast Protection Board in what it can and cannot do for seaside councils, and I believe that this is an area that should be well and truly looked at.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): The Premier and Treasurer should be embarrassed by the lack of detail in the second reading explanation. In contrast to last year, there is complete silence about large areas of Government revenue collection such as royalties, registration fees and licences and about receipts of Government utilities such as the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Unlike last year, there is no detail on charges and revised forecasting for cost items such as the public health system.

Reading between the lines, it appears there has possibly been significant deterioration in the budget position. Last year, the Premier was prepared to offer the House a forecast that the budget outcome at the end of the financial year might show some improvement on the budget estimate. This year, he has said it is difficult to estimate the outcome with any certainty, whether it is better or worse than the budget forecast.

However, what he has said is that interest and wage costs are much higher than anticipated. I read into this the likelihood that the further impact of misguided Labor Party policies will push the budget further into deficit. Given Labor's failure to provide significant reductions in interest rates and inflation in this financial year, it is possible that the impacts on the State budget could be very severe. This is fairly obvious, because a 1 per cent change in average

interest rates increases recurrent payments by about \$35 million in a full financial year.

A 1 per cent rise in wages costs an extra \$25 million in a full financial year, while a 1 per cent rise in the CPI means an additional full year cost to the budget of some \$7 million. This budget was based on assumptions of falling interest rates and inflation, and of continued wage constraint. As members will realise, none of those factors has been achieved. Because Labor has failed to deliver, I believe we now face a budget deficit.

It is likely that this position will be compounded by the cost of Labor's election promises. The Premier was challenged on this issue during the election campaign. He was asked how he would fund his bribes, particularly Homesure and the free student public travel system, which was introduced quite recently. I use the word 'bribes' because, unlike the detail and the identification in the Liberal Party's policies, the Premier was unwilling to nominate the cost savings he would implement to pay for his election promises, so that taxes and charges would not be increased and so that the budget would be kept on line. The Premier gave the following answer to the challenge:

Funding of the new initiatives, including Homesafe (as it was then called) is readily available within the context of the 1989-90 budget and the budget plan for 1990-91. The 1989-90 budget is based on a surplus of recurrent receipts . . . after allowing for the new initiatives and tax cuts announced at the time of the budget.

This explanation, I believe, was typical of Labor's spend now, pay later performance, which we have seen in the past few years of its managing the State budget. While the budget for this financial year is based on an estimated recurrent surplus of about \$35 million, there is a deficit on the capital side of almost \$250 million. After taking into account a SAFA surplus which has been brought forward, the true estimated budget deficit for this financial year is more like \$154 million.

This amount, of course, will be covered by additional borrowings. It would appear that the true budget deficit now will be well over \$160 million for this financial year. This is not something that the Premier would like widely debated, particularly at this time. However, we will keep bringing forward our views as to where the State's deficit is heading. The Opposition remains concerned by the long-standing and apparently increasing tendency of this Government to conceal important details of financial administration, particularly, as we have noted, when an election is being contested. That happened before the last State election, of course, and it is now happening with a Federal election in the wind.

Among the few useful statements of fact in the Treasurer's second reading explanation is that while there is 'considerable uncertainty' about the total of recurrent receipts this year, 'revenue from payroll tax is expected to exceed the budget estimate'. Payroll tax, as I do not have to remind the House, is a tax on employment which is helping to keep unemployment in South Australia at the highest level of that of any mainland State. Yet we are faced with the appalling fact that revenue from this tax on jobs is growing faster than even last year's increased budget estimate.

The Treasurer, who now sits back and accepts this situation, is the same Treasurer who has previously called for national action to get rid of this obnoxious tax. An unstated fact in the second reading explanation is that revenue from land tax will be several million dollars above the budget estimate of \$70 million. So, in the past six years, land tax collections will have increased at a compound rate of about 17 per cent per year. This financial year alone, more than one-third of all land tax accounts have increased by more than the 7.4 per cent CPI movement. The landholding of 5 030 of those taxpayers has not changed in that time, and

749 land taxpayers have been asked for increases greater than 200 per cent. Land tax is passed on to tenants who cannot afford to relocate their businesses to avoid the increase. It is an inequitable tax that bears no relation to capacity to pay.

There are also now many anomalies which have made the tax even less fair. For example, if the landlord happens to be a Commonwealth, State or local government agency exempt from land tax, that tenant's leased premises are exempt. There are currently more than 280 Government agencies with land tax exemptions. However, if the landlord is in the non-government sector, land tax is charged and the tenant pays more. And if a private sector landlord happens to buy other properties during the year, land tax is levied on the new aggregated holding and is applied progressively. The tenant pays even more now because of circumstances totally beyond his or her control.

I do not believe it is fair that, where Government agencies are in competition with the private sector, they should be exempt from land tax. In addressing this anomaly, the State Government should not seek to exploit it so that land tax revenue increases even more: rather it should be used to slightly broaden the base so that it is fairer and so that Government agencies do not have this cost advantage in competing with the private sector.

The rising impact of land tax is combining with the Federal Labor Government's legacy of high interest rates to send an increasing number of South Australian businesses to the wall. It has been quoted fairly extensively in this House that the level of bankruptcies in this State is now the highest it has ever been. Is it any wonder that the major study by Professors Blandy and Walsh released late last year concluded that 'a major review of State taxes is warranted'? The study argues:

What the Government can do to influence the rate of economic development, and hence its long run ability to deliver adequate levels of public services, is to help minimise costs to business and consumers by minimising its taxes and charges and reducing the impact of other direct regulations and controls.

But has the Premier done anything or taken their advice? He has done absolutely nothing. He has responded to current controversy over land tax by saying that the Government must maintain its revenue base.

This Government is not prepared to look at opportunities for cost savings. It looks only at further expenditures funded by increased taxes that hurt the unemployed and the struggling small businesses that are least able to afford them. The Blandy and Walsh study notes, first, 'the large economic role of the public sector in South Australia compared with other States' and secondly, 'the fall in capital spending relative to recurrent spending'. Further, it states 'the share of capital spending has fallen more than in any other State' and they term this 'a high risk response' to the problem. The report also states:

State Government outlays in real terms per head of population in South Australia have increased substantially since 1981-82 and have amounted to about 20 per cent of gross State product throughout this period—a relatively high share among the States.

It is not good enough for the Premier to talk about flair and light, which he talked about previously. What is needed is a radical rethink of the need for the Government to be involved in the great range of functions in which it is currently involved. If it can shed functions or contract out to the private sector, the savings made can be used to reduce taxes and charges. There is now a great deal of evidence to suggest that this is possible and, as we have stated quite categorically, a 20 per cent saving may result. According to the Blandy and Walsh study:

There is no objective 'public good' justification for the range of activities currently undertaken by the South Australian public sector.

On coming to office in New South Wales, my Liberal colleague, Premier Griener, instituted a comprehensive audit of the State's finances and produced a regular series of three year forward estimates of Government expenditure that are available to the public. If South Australia is to grow and to prosper, we need similar openness in government. It is absurd that forward estimates are currently prepared by the State Treasury but are kept confidential. Increased transparency will help the Government to govern for all South Australians and not just for a few favoured interest groups.

In framing future budgets and Supply Bills, the Premier should tell South Australians whether they are to be kept in the dark about his Government's spending and taxing intentions or whether the Government will come clean and publish forward estimates. In addition to proper forward estimates, there should be more contracting out and devolution of appropriate functions to the private sector. Much more needs to be done to ensure that public sector spending is efficient and effective, and is minimised where possible.

While the State Auditor-General performs a splendid job, there is room for an expansion of efficiency auditing to increase the value of the money that we receive and, of course, we should ensure that we cut waste. The Blandy and Walsh study also recommends that 'formal cost-benefit analyses for major new spending proposals . . . should also be made for public scrutiny'. I believe that implementation of this recommendation is long overdue. There are many other areas in which the Liberal Party is examining the potential for improved efficiency in the running of the State. I have already mentioned a number of areas referred to in the study *Budgetary Stress* by Blandy and Walsh, which was published last year. Yet, apart from selective quotations used for electioneering, we have heard nothing from the Premier since that report was released.

What is the Government's response to all specific recommendations in *Budgetary Stress*? Will the Premier consider separating the roles of Premier and Treasurer as Blandy and Walsh recommended and as the Liberal Party has already accepted? And, more fundamentally, will the Premier urgently move to change the current incentive structures faced by the South Australian public sector that are 'protecting non-performers' and 'rewarding political astuteness and empire building' rather than allowing for reduced expenditure and staffing for the same result? While we have a Government that is unwilling to give leadership on these key issues, South Australia will continue to suffer.

Last week, the Minister of Small Business, Ms Wiese, was, for this Government, unusually frank in her response to further gloomy retail sales figures. She said a key reason was that 'South Australians have less discretionary income to spend in this area than have people in the other Australian States'. To elaborate on the Minister's comment, I point out that after South Australians have paid their mortgage, their power bills, their water bills, and the range of other Government imposts, they have less available to spend at the supermarket or the deli than people in other States. Average mortgage repayments now consume 32 per cent of the median family income in South Australia. Only people living in New South Wales and Victoria pay a greater share of their weekly income to keep a roof over their head. And, as all members would be aware, property values in those two States are much higher.

In South Australia, the impact of Labor's record interest rates is compounded by the highest electricity tariffs in Australia, steeply rising public transport fares and a level of State taxation which has risen at 2½ times the CPI rise

under this Government. Under the accord, mark 6, South Australians would be facing more of the same: a loss of purchasing power for almost all families; rising inflation; and interest rates remaining at record levels.

The Bill proposes an appropriation of \$800 million public expenditure for the 1990-91 financial year. It is totally inadequate that the appropriations keep rising automatically each year without a proper review of the rationale for the outlays. It is just not fair for the struggling small businesses paying land tax or the other battlers facing higher charges and other Government imposts. I believe that it is becoming very clear that people in South Australia are suffering more than people in other States.

I have outlined a number of areas which I believe should be reviewed urgently. I challenge the Premier and Treasurer to respond to these and other recommendations in recent economic reports for the benefit of all South Australians.

Bill read a second time.

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

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

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I wish to express some disappointment at the response which was forwarded to me earlier today during Question Time by the Minister. I had hoped—

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Which Minister?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The Minister of Water Resources. I thank the member for Alexandra for his interjection, but it is appropriate in this case, because it was the member for Alexandra who first raised this issue with me: the very important question of water pollution affecting his electorate where the more toxic varieties of algae have been located in Lake Alexandrina, and in particular affecting the water supplies at Strathalbyn and Milang. It was at the request of the honourable member two weeks ago, when he was first alerted to the possibility of this algae proving toxic, that I raised the matter with members of the E&WS Department in Adelaide—the Director-General, in fact—and with the CSIRO research department in Adelaide, which also sought advice from its research department based at Griffith, which deals essentially with the Murray River, Darling, Murrumbidgee water pollution and other problems.

As I said, in response to the member for Alexandra's request, I raised these matters on his behalf, seeking reassurance that the water supply for his electorate would be safe. In the interim, further problems arose at Ansteys Hill where water from Mannum was causing problems with the smell. I will outline the various types of algae in a few moments.

First, let me advert to the question that I raised with the Minister. I asked her for some reassurance, or at least for some statement, that long-term strategic research was under way in South Australia either by the E&WS Department, which has reputable water research laboratories, or by the CSIRO, and also what short-term tactical research was under way. It was pointed out to me by the CSIRO spokesman—a very reputable scientist—that funding of \$7.07 million allocated to his department for this specific area of research had this year been reduced by \$2 million, at a time when the problem was at its most acute for several years, and it was now only at \$5 million. That, of course, means that the essential short-term and long-term research which has to be conducted was substantially curtailed.

The member for Alexandra pointed out to me that not only were problems arising in connection with drinking water at Strathalbyn and Milang, but also that stock could possibly be endangered. I raised this matter with the Direc-

tor-General of the E&WS Department, who gave me a reassurance that, although an alternative source of water had been found to be reticulated through the water pipes to Strathalbyn and Milang, he would, nevertheless, in the three days during which the stale and possibly toxic water would be leaving the pipes to be replaced by fresher water from Strathalbyn, make tankers available to deliver fresh water from Adelaide and that he would put standing tanks at strategic points within the electorate of Alexandra so that people requiring drinking water would have access to those tanks quite readily.

Of course, there was the broader issue that even a reticulated reservoir supply would last for only a few days and, therefore, it may be necessary in the shorter term again to withdraw water from Lake Alexandrina where the toxic algae—I believe the CSIRO scientists referred to it as semi-toxic nodularia algae—were present. The Minister said that that problem was still being addressed.

The Minister simply did not seem to comprehend the nature of the question. Instead, she regurgitated answers which she had given to previously prepared questions by members on her side. She completely ignored the fact that I was asking for the department's, the Minister's, the Government's, long-term strategic approach and the allocation of State and Federal funds to the research so that one thing could be identified. Here, again, the Minister showed what I took to be abysmal ignorance. The Minister said that we should not really worry because this problem has been around for 200 years. She referred to the fact that phosphorus was one of the more common elements on the surface of the land and that man-made pollutants, such as nitrates, had been administered for a considerable time. We are all aware of that. We are aware of the fact, as is CSIRO, that phosphorus is a diffuse pollutant. It is present in the land and can be washed or leached out from the land into our surface and underground water supplies.

The Minister, of course, had missed the salient point of my question: that, although phosphorus and nitrates had been around for such a long while, CSIRO had alerted Governments across Australia to the fact that in recent years there was the distinct possibility that previously omnipresent non-toxic algae could, under a trigger mechanism, suddenly become semi-toxic or toxic. Of course, it is the trigger mechanism, which seems to be present more today than it was over the preceding 200 years, which has to be identified. All I asked the Minister was: what steps are we taking to find that trigger mechanism; are you asking the Federal Government, at this time, when there is an election, to reinstate the research funds which have been withdrawn—that very precious \$2 million, because it is, after all, two-sevenths of this year's research funds for the CSIRO?

The issue is very important to South Australia, which is at the wrong end of that huge 1 800 mile multiple river system, the Murray-Murrumbidgee-Darling system, because we receive all the pollutant, and, therefore, if there is to be a problem, we shall experience it at its worst. The Minister, as has been her wont over the past few weeks since Parliament resumed, resorted to sarcasm, brow-beating and bombastic behaviour, which will do nothing to reassure the people of South Australia that she is in charge of her portfolio. She may be good at that sort of tactic, but all I want is answers on behalf of the people of South Australia. As I said to the Minister, I will not stand for that sort of treatment, nor will the people of South Australia.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: As the member for Chaffey says, the Minister works on the basis that the best form of defence is attack. I would have to put it more simply than

that. I am told that the Minister is capable of talking underwater, although she cannot communicate with young dolphins, so I would lay that theory to rest. The Minister seems to believe that if she talks for 10 minutes without drawing breath no-one will notice that the question has not been answered. The question was not answered, and we want the Minister to answer questions.

The microcystis algae in Lake Victoria has already been completely isolated from the River Murray because it is toxic. So, Lake Victoria has been cut off completely from the River Murray: nothing enters from that source. However, the Anstey's Hill/Mannum source, anabaena, which is blue-green in colour, while it may be noxious by way of smell and taste, is nevertheless non-toxic. The Millbrook reservoir, with ceratium—again, a non-toxic algae—has been treated with copper sulphate. I understand that it did not do some of the small fish much good—in fact, they are very dead—but at least it has purified the water. I understand that in limited quantities copper sulphate is not unduly toxic to humans, although in excessive quantities it is used for drains and killing tree roots.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Henley Beach.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): During this debate I want to refer to the Tobacco Products Control Act Amendment Bill. Many members will recall that this Bill was first introduced on 3 March 1988, with the objective of taking over tobacco sponsorship of various sporting and cultural events in South Australia. I have recently received a copy of the annual report from Foundation South Australia, which was formed following acceptance of that Bill by both Houses of Parliament. The Bill's passage through the House was not an easy one, and marginal members on this side of the House were subjected to quite a degree of pressure from the tobacco companies. Members in marginal electorates were receiving correspondence, both from local sporting clubs and from the headquarters of sporting clubs, urging them to vote against the proposed legislation. As an example I would like to read into *Hansard* one of the letters that I received from a sporting organisation. This one came from the Royal South Australian Bowling Club Association Inc., 310 South Terrace, Adelaide:

Dear Sir,

We refer to the proposal to ban sports sponsorship by tobacco companies. You are advised that our association opposes the proposition on the following grounds:

- (1) It is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain the current level of sponsorship and there is very little hope of finding replacements for tobacco sponsorship;
- (2) there is no indication that alternative Government financial assistance either at State or Federal level would be forthcoming;
- (3) while such sponsorship may influence some smokers to change their brand, there is no evidence of it causing an increase in the number of smokers;
- (4) we consider that any sponsorship accepted is a matter of conscience for the administrators of the sport; and
- (5) those sports which are mainly participant rather than spectator would suffer the most.

We trust that this clearly indicates our feeling on this matter.

Yours faithfully, Hugh McLellan, Secretary.

I received, I suppose, 50 or 60 letters of that nature both from local sporting clubs and from the associations of those clubs. It has always been stated that there is no connection, or there ought to be no connection between sport and politics. Although this has been stated many times, we all know in this House that there is a very strong relationship between sport and politics. It was with some courage that members on this side of the House, particularly the marginal members (and many of those marginal members are not with us now), took the stance that they were going to support

the legislation which eventually finished up in producing Foundation South Australia, which has been formed for sports promotion, cultural and health advancement.

I am one of the first people to congratulate the foundation on what it has done for the sponsorship of sport in eliminating, to a large degree, the sporting sponsorship which was having such a large effect on our younger generation. I support what it has done, and I believe to date it has done some wonderful things.

It is interesting to note that not one member of the Opposition supported this particular legislation and the debate itself lasted the unusually long time of 11 hours. I often wonder at the moral judgments I have heard recently, particularly in the maiden speeches of members opposite, where and when their morality starts, because we had strong evidence that sports tobacco sponsorship was having a heavy influence on a number of children who were starting up as smokers and yet we could not get one member of the Opposition to vote for this particular legislation.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I do extend an apology to the member for Coles, because she tells me that she voted for the legislation, and I believe her. I believe that Foundation South Australia is now here for good and that it has a continuing influence on restricting smoking particularly among the young. Everybody knows that more than 60 000 young South Australians will die prematurely of preventable disease and it was our responsibility as a Government not simply to stand on the sidelines but to take the opportunity to do something that would save our children's lives. Having said that, I believe that it is time to take a second look at the legislation itself.

I was, in a sense, pleased to see on page 9 of the 1988-89 annual report a statement that Foundation South Australia completed that year with a surplus of \$3.43 million. There were factors that contributed to the surplus, and one of them related to the time lag in using money that had accumulated from the time the additional amount of money in licensing fees commenced and when the foundation itself got under way. There is no doubt about it: there have been some magnificent sponsorships so far as Foundation South Australia is concerned. Unfortunately, though, one of the impressions being created out in the electorate is that Foundation South Australia provides sponsorship for big ticket operations. In other words, it is the larger sports; it is the sportsmen who are already in the high earning fields; it is the codes of sport that already receive large sums of money that are receiving the most benefit from Foundation South Australia.

I believe it is time to return some of this taxation money to the sporting clubs at the local level. Sporting clubs at the local level are now finding it extremely difficult to operate under the inflationary spiral and the high taxation that they have had to contend with. I believe it is time to look at the direction that the foundation is taking, so that those clubs providing a service for juniors and junior sport coaching may be assisted, particularly in relation to capital works. I believe that with the amount of money they have to find for capital works, it is time for relief in this area. I further believe that that could come within the original objectives of the foundation, which is to provide for cultural and health advancement.

The sporting clubs, at least in my area but I am sure in other areas, have provided an outlet for the youth of the district to increase their self-esteem, which keeps them out of other mischievous activities and strengthens character by asking them to play to the best of their ability within a set of rules, so much like society expects them to live in. There

is no doubt that in an area where there is little organised sport there is an increase in the incidence of vandalism, larrikinism, standoff tactics, housebreaking, drug taking and other misdemeanours. This is also true in areas where there is an absence of other organisations which are not particularly concerned with sport. Other organisations assist, be they chess clubs through to boy scouts, girl guides, church youth organisations, and so on.

I want to make it perfectly clear that I am in no way critical of the way in which Foundation South Australia has worked thus far. I believe that it has got off to a magnificent start and that it is doing the job well. Its sponsorship, having taken the place of tobacco sponsorship, is something that is very worthwhile, but I believe that it is now time for it to expand in other directions.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): It is perhaps convenient that I rise immediately after the member for Henley Beach and can echo some of his sentiments about the worthy nature of Foundation South Australia. As one who supported the Bill, as did the honourable member, and one who went to extraordinary, shall we say, efforts to do so, I have watched the progress of Foundation South Australia with interest. I agree that the legislation should be reviewed. A review of the expansion of Foundation South Australia's role, as foreshadowed by the member for Henley Beach, is of less concern to me than the need to review its accountability to Parliament. I am sure that I was one of many members on both sides of the House who, in the budget estimates debate last year, was astounded to learn that the Minister of Health was unable to respond to our queries about the accounts of Foundation South Australia because the Act did not permit him to be answerable directly to Parliament.

I believe we all found that situation unsatisfactory. I think that the framing of the original Act was done with the best intentions in order to ensure that no political influence was brought to bear on the allocation of funds available to Foundation South Australia. However, I think that, after a couple of years of operation, we are now in a better position to ensure that the foundation is more accountable. Last year I was struck by the strength of feeling within the arts community about the need for greater accountability and I believe that that feeling is shared in the sporting community.

I turn now to the impact of the 3 per cent employer superannuation contribution on school canteens. I have been approached by Magill Primary School, because the school council fears that the canteen may have to close as a result of the council's liability for the 3 per cent employer superannuation contribution. The background to this topic would be familiar to members. The superannuation employer contribution originated from the ACTU 1988 case before the Full Bench of the Federal Arbitration Commission. At that time, instead of pursuing the 5 per cent wage increase that the ACTU sought, the ACTU agreed to settle for a 3 per cent occupational employer superannuation contribution. This was really an agreement, one might say, reached with the Federal Government in order to reduce the inflationary effect of a substantial wage increase.

During the intervening period the decision has flowed through to various awards and the major shop award was effective from 1 March last year. The delicatessen award, which covers employees in school canteens, was effective from 1 December 1989, but apparently no-one from the Department of Labour bothered to tell the schools of their impending liability. If they did, they certainly did not tell

Magill Primary School, which received no advice from the Department of Labour.

When staff members heard, entirely by chance, that the council may be liable for this, they tried to contact the Department of Labour. This particular section of my contribution is separate from the main point, but important nevertheless. I am told that school staff members tried, at least 15 times a week for four weeks, to ring the Department of Labour's wage inquiries line. On each of those 15 occasions per week for four weeks their call was met with a woman's soothing voice saying, 'Welcome to the Department of Labour. Your call has been placed in a queue.' The caller was then required to wait and, after 15 or 20 minutes in some cases, the caller simply gave up.

I suggest to the Minister that he does something very promptly to amend that situation, which obviously is causing immense difficulty and distress in the community and which is a very sad indication of this Government's lack of efficiency. In any event, in desperation, before the school council meeting last night, the staff member rang me to see what information I could provide and she, in turn, provided me with information. The school employs a paid manager and volunteers attend on a monthly roster. The paid manager, who earns \$10.31 per hour, works a 25-hour week. Obviously, it is a job which suits mothers of school-age children, because it is part time and it is confined to school hours and terms.

As every honourable member would recognise, the canteen is a very important provider of nutritious food in a secure environment at a reasonable price, especially for primary school children. Magill Primary School is one of the many that refuses to serve junk food and it has a very nutritionally based range of foods available to the students.

Six years ago, when the canteen manager was first employed, the school contributed \$83 per annum for long service leave. This year the school council's contribution for long service leave is \$1 800. Last year the school council was in deficit by about \$100, after setting aside over \$800 for long service leave, which is separate from the food that it purchased and—the biggest liability—salaries. The canteen's profit has hovered between \$35 and \$50 annually. The council now discovers that it is up for \$300 superannuation and it fears that the school canteen will have to close. The takings in the primary and junior primary schools are about \$1 000 per week from 385 children of whom about half would have daily use of the canteen.

I understand that, as a result of representations made by the member for Mitcham when he was shadow Minister of Industrial Relations, the Department of Education pays the WorkCover levy for school canteens. That is a clear indication to me that there is a precedent for the department's accepting some responsibility for the industrial obligations placed upon school canteens as a result of industrial awards.

If the department has been willing to do that for WorkCover I believe that, rather than let school canteens close as a result of this substantial new impost, the department should undertake to meet the superannuation liability of employers. In many schools canteen managers have been employed for only one or two years and the liability for superannuation and long service leave will not be heavy but, in school canteens where the manager has been employed for about 10 years or longer, the liability is extremely heavy and can impose an impossible burden. I hate to think of these little children being forced to cross a busy road to buy school lunches or any other kind of food they need during the day. It is important to maintain school canteens and I urge the Minister of Education to give careful consideration to paying the employer superannuation contribution.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Ever since I came into this place in 1979 it is fair to say that I have spoken a great deal about the complex and difficult problems that my constituents and I have been confronted with in relation to the West Lakes development. To say that it has been easy would be to understate the obvious. Since 1980 I have constantly, to both political Parties, addressed the very many complex and difficult areas pertaining to that development. It is one of the best developments in Australia, but, having said that, it does have problems. One problem which I have raised over the years with many of my parliamentary colleagues, and particularly ministerial colleagues, has been the retaining wall or revetment work around the West Lakes waterway. This afternoon is no exception: I again raise a very difficult situation that I have been confronted with.

I understand that thus far in excess of 7 500 concrete blocks have been replaced around that waterway. Many more have yet to be repaired, which leads me to correspondence I have received from Mr and Mrs Symons of West Lakes. Yesterday I went to see them and had a lengthy discussion with them concerning problems associated with the revetment work and its deterioration. Quite clearly, this is a very complex matter and one on which I understand the Government has, in the past, sought Crown Law opinion, and I understand that another one is pending. I could go on at great length about who may or may not be responsible for the quality of this revetment work but it is not for me to apportion blame and I will await a response from the Minister.

The Minister has been very attentive to this issue, which I have raised with him on a number of occasions and will continue to raise because I understand that, whilst it is a difficult problem, the Government would be aware that it needs to be addressed. Whilst speaking to Mr and Mrs Symons yesterday at their property at West Lakes, they pointed out some of the problems associated with the revetment work outside their property which abuts the waterway. As their local member, I am very much concerned—as I believe the Government is—about the amount of fretting that is occurring with the concrete blocks around this waterway. I am fearful, as I have said in the past, that some member of the public could walk along this revetment work—and in some places the revetment work has fretted to such an extent that it could break away—and end up in the lake.

I hope that the Government will again provide sufficient moneys in the next budget to address this problem which needs immediate attention. I believe in the long term the Government, be it this or any other Government, has to come to grips with this and look at all the revetment work around this waterway. It seems to me that there have been problems with this for some time and in that regard I draw members' attention to page 1444 of *Hansard* of 21 October 1980 when the Hon. Peter Duncan in this place raised a series of questions about the West Lakes waterway. Because of the time constraint, it is not my intention to go through those questions but I suggest that members for their edification look at that page reference. It is a matter which I would hope the Government can address. As I have said many times in this contribution, it is a complex problem but one that has to be addressed.

I commend the Government for the provision of \$100 000 for a study to look at ways of improving the water quality of West Lakes and the upper reaches of the Port River. Whilst I have listened in this House during the past 12 months or so to people talking about the environment, I am quite happy to go on record and ask people to peruse my statements in this place since 1980 in relation to envi-

ronmental problems that I have raised in terms of my electorate.

The question of West Lakes water quality is one that I have raised in this place on occasions too numerous to mention. I will continue to do so despite threats—implied or direct—for me to belt up and mind my own business. I will not be intimidated by anyone in terms of my right, as the elected member of that area, to address these very important issues in my electorate. I believe that the Minister and this Government have acted properly in providing \$100 000 to look at improving the water quality of West Lakes. It is one area for which the Minister of Marine should be commended and I look forward to the results of the study. I will certainly raise questions with the Minister after the winter recess which, I believe, will give the Minister sufficient time to look at this problem. If there is not sufficient time to raise questions in the House, I will certainly do so by way of correspondence or through the Estimates Committee.

I would also like to raise again the question of third party rights of appeal provisions for West Lakes residents. As I understand it, West Lakes and Adelaide City Council residents are the only people in South Australia who are denied third party rights of appeal provisions. I understand the West Lakes Indenture Act provisions but, given that the West Lakes development, for all intents and purposes has been completed, I believe it is about time that either the council or the Minister of Marine and the Minister for Environment and Planning—and I note that the Minister for Environment and Planning is on the front bench—consider giving these residents third party rights of appeal provisions. They have a right to complain and lodge objections. Currently, they are frustrated. Many people, including the Hon. Clyde Cameron and the West Lakes group, have raised questions with me on many occasions on third party rights of appeal. How can they lodge objections to planning provisions in this development without a right of appeal? I believe very strongly in this and I will continue to pursue this matter until the people of this area are given what they deserve.

Finally, I refer briefly to the Fielding report and specifically to the review of public transport in the north-western suburbs. For many years, ever since I came into this place, I have argued for a direct bus service from the West Lakes area, via the West Lakes Boulevard and Port Road, to the city. I believe that my constituents, be they in Semaphore Park, Tennyson, West Lakes, West Lakes Shore, Royal Park, Seaton, Woodville West or Hendon, are entitled to a direct bus service to the city. It is long overdue. Again, I urge the Minister and the State Transport Authority to give favourable consideration to this matter, because I will not rest until I see the provision of such a direct bus service to the city. I hope that favourable consideration is given to this matter in the next or subsequent budget.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): Earlier this afternoon the member for Mount Gambier highlighted the appalling track record of the Bannon and Hawke Governments in relation to protecting the livelihood of many of the people of Australia gained from the Murray-Darling Basin. It is not overstating the situation when I say that the state of the Murray-Darling Basin, and the approach by both the Federal and State Governments, is a national disgrace. We have a resource that contributes about \$10 000 million annually to the nation, and the Prime Minister contributes a miserable \$7 million additional moneys to try to overcome the problems of the Murray-Darling Basin. When we look at the value of that resource to the nation, and the miserable

contribution that is being returned to it from both the State and Federal Governments, we see that it is certainly a national disgrace.

I have suggested in this place on a number of occasions that we should be putting back into the Murray-Darling Basin at least \$100 million annually. That would be 1 per cent of what that resource generates annually and contributes to the economy of the nation. After getting what mileage he could from his statement at Wentworth last year when he spoke of a minimal tree planting program and an additional \$7 million annually, the Prime Minister has turned around and reduced that sum by \$2 million. Whether it is \$5 million or \$7 million, that allocation will have absolutely no effect on the problems of the Murray-Darling Basin. They are far greater than that. Unless we embark on a \$100 million program annually over the next 10 years, we will not make any headway in coming to grips with this problem. As I have said, the resource is Australia's greatest natural asset, and it is a national disgrace that the Government is walking away from its responsibility in relation to that resource.

The Minister in South Australia is now confronted with poor water quality and algae blooms that are threatening the quality of water supplies in South Australia, and that had to happen. The Minister can put it down to certain seasonal conditions, but the main factor is that the river system is in ill health and little has been done to improve its health. Until the sort of money I am talking about is returned to that resource, the river will continue to deteriorate. That resource will serve us well into the next century and far beyond. It will go on virtually forever, so long as we look after it and protect it. It is a recurring resource, unlike many of our other resources which are finite and which, once they are worked out, are gone forever. The Murray-Darling Basin will keep on generating \$10 000 million annually in present-day terms, as long as we look after it. At present, with the minute sum that is being put back into it by the Federal Government, it is—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Scandalous!

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: As the member for Coles says, it is absolutely scandalous. It is a national disgrace! I do not know just how the people of Australia continue to let Governments get away with it. On world standards, it is a disgrace. Governments of many other countries through which rivers flow have come to grips with the problem. They have completely turned around the degradation which is occurring. A good example of that is the River Thames in England, which has seen a dramatic turnaround in the quality of water. Another example is the Colorado in the United States. Unless the Federal Government in particular puts back into that resource a reasonable percentage of what it is generating, it will continue to deteriorate. With any business enterprise, whether it be a manufacturing business or a primary producing business, unless a reasonable percentage of the gross returns from that business are put back into it, it will deteriorate. There is no alternative than to put back a few million dollars.

I am suggesting that we put back only 1 per cent, but that would mean \$1 billion over the next 10 years would go into that resource. It would come to grips with the reforestation which is absolutely necessary to lower the water table and with improved irrigation practices on farms and, by degrees, we would see the river returned to its condition prior to white occupation of this country. I only hope that someone, somewhere, sooner or later in this country, recognises that there is far more than just the immediate vote-winning potential at stake.

As has been stated in newspapers on many occasions, water is not a highly emotional subject, other than when it makes one sick. Sooner or later, we will have a Prime Minister in this country who will stand up and be counted and allocate the necessary resources and funds into that system. The member for Napier shakes his head, suggesting that it is of no concern. Unfortunately, that is the attitude of the Labor Party. As long as that attitude continues, the river system will tend to deteriorate, and it is a tragedy for Australia that that is allowed to occur, but that is the philosophy of the Government that sits opposite.

Another issue that I bring to the attention of the House is that, on 13 February, I presented a petition from wine grape growers in the Riverland which stated:

That the grape growers of South Australia require, as a matter of urgency, that the wine grape pricing legislation be invoked so as to protect their livelihoods.

Your petitioners therefore pray that your honourable House will invoke wine grape pricing legislation in its entirety until a better alternative has been found.

Further, on 21 February, I presented another petition to the Minister of Agriculture which stated:

We the undersigned—being Riverland wine grape growers whose viability is being adversely affected by the continued monopolisation of the wine making sector—call on the Government to support the following:

1. The reinstatement of legislated pricing of wine grapes in South Australia providing that three State agreements can be reached.
2. That investigations by the Trade Practices Commission into the wine making industry be proceeded with at all speed given the current disastrous pricing arrangements being forced on growers.

Growers have signed those two petitions because there has been a dramatic downturn in the price of wine grapes again this year, after one or two years of reasonable prices. The industry as a whole in Australia can never be stable if wine grape prices continue to fluctuate enormously from year to year. The industry can be stable and produce the type of wine necessary for a good, stable wine export industry only if the growers are in a financial position to produce the grape varieties required to meet market demands. There is an unlimited overseas market for our top quality wines but, unfortunately, too many of the wines produced in Australia today are from old-fashioned grape varieties.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. I call on the member for Fisher.

Mr SUCH (Fisher): My first point is that the detail supplied in relation to the Supply Bill is wafer thin, and we are dealing with the appropriation of approximately \$800 million. As we all know, Supply Bills relate to money, and I should like to focus on the extent to which the southern area is deprived of a fair share of the money spent in this State, whether in recurrent or in capital terms. I might start to sound a little like a record, but I make no apologies for that, since I am here to obtain a better deal for the people of the south, and I will keep on until that objective is achieved.

The problem of the state of the roads in my electorate, to which I referred earlier in this House, continues. Today I received letters from two constituents on the subject of the inadequacy of arterial roads in the south, and I will refer to those later. As I stated a week or so ago, I invite the Government to send Ministers and their senior officers to explore some of the problems in the forgotten south, and I will be happy to accompany them.

Flagstaff Road has been an ongoing problem, highlighted again last week, with extensive delays, particularly at the Darlington end of the bottleneck where Flagstaff Road intersects with Main South Road. Kenihans Road is a hilly, very

dangerous road, one which has seen its fair share of serious accidents, including a fatality in the past 12 or so months. That road is long overdue for attention in terms of speed restriction devices. I have recently been supplied with concept plans for Panalatinga Road, but the name of the game in the south for this Government seems to be concept, discussion, but lack of action. I will be pleased to see that road gain some attention in the near future.

Old South Road through Reynella is another disgraceful example of the neglect of the south, particularly where that road meets Kenihans Road. Chandlers Hill Road, its intersection with Bishops Hill Road and Bishops Hill Road itself are further examples, and I could go on. To the credit of Marion council, it is planning on spending \$200 000 in the very near future on Lander Road, a road for which it has responsibility. In effect, it is putting the State Government to shame; a local government authority is prepared to spend a massive amount of money to address some of the problems on Lander Road.

Mr Matthew: Someone's got to do it; the Government won't.

Mr SUCH: I agree with the interjection from the member for Bright. As he well knows, it is part of the forgotten south. I should like to refer briefly to the letters I received today which, of course, are unsolicited. One is from a resident of Ramsay Avenue, Reynella. It is addressed to me and reads:

Dear Sir, It is with disgust that I find I must write to you to complain about the deplorable state of the roads of our country. Living in a commuting suburb, I find it very difficult to reconcile how budget surpluses can increase and petrol taxes be indexed while long overdue road projects are delayed seemingly *ad infinitum* as a result of road funding cut backs.

A prime example of this was recently witnessed when South Australia's Government introduced a higher petrol tax in the suburban area and virtually instantaneously announced the delay of major road projects such as the Noarlunga freeway, South Eastern Freeway extension, Panalatinga Road and Flagstaff Road. Combined with the sale of the 'north-south freeway corridor' the future of the motorist seems bleak indeed. Similar scenarios can be witnessed in all States.

The writer goes on to point out that the blame rests not solely with State Governments but also with the Federal Government, and in that I would concur. The writer continues:

An efficient and safe road network should be a paramount objective of any Government. The externalities to the community as a whole in lower commodity prices, fewer accidents and shorter and cheaper travelling times is easily recognised. It is all too often that the blame for horrific accidents is levelled wholly at the motorist—an easy ploy for an uncaring and neglectful Government to adopt to cover community anger at the state of the roads.

The indexation of petrol taxes is deplorable. Due to the size and composition of our urban and rural areas the costs of bad roads (including fuel, repairs, taxes, and related costs) are automatically costed into virtually all products and services. The inflationary pressure created by automatic indexation should be stopped immediately.

Equally deplorable is the idea that motorists should pay more tax for better roads. The amount of tax already paid by motorists is more than ample to pay for an improved road network.

That is just an example of the sort of letter I receive frequently from my constituents. As members would appreciate, it is a well thought out, considered letter. The people of the south are not fools and are not prepared to tolerate a situation in which they are continually ignored. I will quote a short section from another letter which is from a person living in Booth Street, Happy Valley, and reads in part:

My family has lived at Happy Valley for the last 17 years and has witnessed a massive growth in southern suburbs—Adelaide—southern suburbs peak traffic to a point where the situation is now 'Sydney-like'.

I would agree that that is the situation down in the forgotten south—that this Government has failed to address the serious problems facing commuters down there by not providing a decent arterial road system. Not only that, but it has failed to provide a decent public transport system that equates with an O-Bahn, a light rail system or an extension of the tram system. So, whether it be the road system or the public transport system, the south continues to be forgotten. I should like to ask the question: what happened to the money that was obtained from the sale of the land set aside for an arterial road from Darlington to the city which would have helped the people of the south? In all fairness, that money should be redirected to facilities in the south to improve roads and public transport.

I could speak for ages on that topic, but I wish to move on to two other important areas which are neglected by this Government. The first is water filtration. Water is topical at the moment—I was going to say 'flavour of the month' but it is the sort of flavour we could do without in terms of algal blooms. The people of the suburbs of Aberfoyle Park, Bellevue Heights, Eden Hills, Flagstaff Hill and part of Happy Valley are still without filtered water.

I am told that, because of the hurry to get the plant at Happy Valley in operation to serve most of Adelaide, there are now technical problems, and I hope that, given the circus to celebrate its opening, with giveaways, free rides, sideshows and so on, the Government will now move quickly to provide filtered water to the rest of the electorate of Fisher and to people generally in the south. I find it incredible that in 1990 we are still having problems with dirty water in the southern metropolitan area of Adelaide, not to mention problems with algal blooms in other areas of the State. I must remind members that it is 1990 and not 1890.

One other aspect I wish to address quickly relating to my electorate—and I am pleased to see the Minister of Education sitting opposite—is the question of the safety of access to schools. I believe that the Education Department must take more responsibility and play a greater role in providing safe access for children attending State schools.

We know that, in the establishment of new schools, the department often comes to the party in providing some facilities in terms of crossings and drop-off zones but, in relation to schools that have been operating for some time, those facilities are not provided. I refer to schools such as Flagstaff Hill Primary School, which is on a very busy road and which badly needs a drop-off zone so that children can be safely left at the school in the mornings and collected in the evenings. However, because that school has been operating for some years, it tends to be ignored in terms of the provision of that basic facility.

I could go on in relation to other schools such as Bellevue Heights Primary School, which badly needs a pedestrian crossing on Shepherds Hill Road and Craighburn Primary School, on Black Road, which needs a pedestrian crossing to service the children attending from across the road in Craighburn Heights and Woodlea Estate. I believe the department must address this issue vigorously because it is just as important to have safe access to and egress from school as it is to have a safe environment within the school.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): The other night I heard Judge Einfeld say that the greatest violators of human rights are Governments and bureaucracies. As I said I would in my maiden speech, I rise to speak on behalf of people for whom this Government has a responsibility, but whom they continue repeatedly to ignore. I remind members opposite that this Government has been in power for seven years and, in

some areas, its lack of achievement has been rather remarkable.

Today I refer specifically to those in our society who suffer from head injury. In doing so I cast the mind of members opposite back to 1981 when they were seeking election as the legitimate Government of this State. In that year they promised that if a Labor Government was elected it would spend \$200 000 a year in 1982, 1983 and 1984 on services for people who were brain injured. However, not one single dollar was spent.

The brain injured in our society have special needs. It was estimated in 1987, in a South Australian Health Commission report compiled by Leigh Baldock, that there were about 1 700 brain injured people in this State. The Head Injured Society of South Australia Incorporated currently estimates the number of brain injured to be about 2 000. Those people do not normally qualify for help. Most of the injuries are as a result of road accidents and other trauma. Therefore, they come into a different category from the intellectually disabled, who are serviced by Minda and Strathmont.

Before it was elected, the Government promised that it would do something for these people: it promised \$200 000 a year but, in fact, contributed nothing. So, we came to the 1985 election and, again, the promise was made that a Bannon Government was committed to a comprehensive head injury service and, if re-elected, it would set up a head injury service implementation committee. Well, it was re-elected and the Head Injury Service Implementation Committee was set up. It in turn set up a subcommittee and there was a tremendous flurry of meetings during January and February 1986. The committee was to address the following areas:

1. Respite care for the head injured, both short and long term.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: It is essential for their carers.

Mr BRINDAL: Of course it is essential for their carers, and it is part of the mainstreaming that the Government trumpets about in all areas of health activity, but about which it seems to do very little. I thank the honourable member for her interjection. The list continues:

2. Day activity centres—three in the metropolitan area and a pilot centre to be established by May 1986;

3. Accommodation for the long-term brain injured people;

4. A central case registry to be set up by 1 July 1986; and

5. Outreach and rural centres.

The HISIC has not met since March 1986, and the only improvement in respite is that Valhalla Place, which is privately owned, provides a couple of beds. Nothing has been done except the production of an excellent report, which is now probably gathering dust alongside Dame Roma Mitchell's earlier report. The central case registry—one of the 1985 promises—is in the too hard basket, and it looks like remaining there, despite the quite clear promise from the Government that it would be started on 1 July 1986.

I believe, from information I have received, that only one country visit was attempted. A pilot day activity centre was set up in late 1988. But, compared to what was promised and planned in 1986, the whole thing could, at best, be described as tokenism.

The Federal Government was invited by the Head Injured Society of South Australia to make a contribution. The society has explained the position in South Australia on various occasions. As with so many other responses from this Federal Government, the society was told that money had been available but simply that the brain injured in

South Australia had fallen through the net. So, as usual, nothing was to be done or could be done.

Therefore, if 1990 is to be the Chinese Year of the Horse, for this Government 1989 should have been the year of talk because, as with so many other initiatives, that is all that the Government seems able to do. For people in real need in our society, honourable members opposite—if they bother to listen—are full of rhetoric and not much else.

I contrast this to the Liberal Party's well publicised policy of last year, which set out some initiatives, which were well thought out and which sought to address people in real need in our society. The policy promised the following: if elected to Government, a Liberal Government would recognise the valuable work of family carers. I remind members in this place that mainstreaming of people in need is a plank of the Labor Government's policy. People should be, and can be, kept in their home for as long as possible, that is, provided that they receive adequate care. It is an abdication of the responsibility of this or any Government if those people are left in their home but receive not only inadequate care but no care at all. I put it to members opposite that that is the case with the head injured of South Australia: they receive very little—in fact, they receive nothing.

Secondly, the Liberal Party would strongly lobby the Federal Government for better funding for day centres and increased services for the head injured in South Australia. Thirdly, it would recognise that the South Australian Head Injury Service will not function efficiently until it operates as a separate entity from the Julia Farr Centre. At present, two wards of service are located at the Julia Farr Centre, while its administration and rehabilitation section is at Payneham Rehabilitation Centre. Fourthly, it would assess the development of the service as an adjunct to the Payneham Rehabilitation Centre, which could then be modelled on rehabilitation centres at Ivanhoe in Victoria and Lidcombe in New South Wales. Fifthly, the Liberal Party would establish a register of head injured at an appropriate institution. Again, that was a promise made by this Government in 1986 that has not been kept, and the Liberal Party calls upon this Government to honour at least some of its election promises.

Sixthly, the Liberal Party's policy is to assess the urgent need for appropriate community housing for the brain injured, particularly for younger people. Presently, many of the existing institutions for the brain injured are geared to cater for the aged and infirm with incurable conditions. Therefore, teenagers are required to spend their life with the aged, frail and acutely sick. Next, the Liberal Party would address the need for community living for the brain injured that maintains the family and community network while providing a quality of life for its residents. It would give priority to the provision of work, recreation, personal relationships, respite for care givers, education and training in independent and semi-independent living. It would address the problems of transport that face many of the brain injured.

A Liberal Government would examine coordinating transport arrangements for the brain injured so that the gap caused by this State Government's failure to take up the role handled by the Federal Government prior to 1986 is filled; use as a starting point the belief that everyone who is brain injured should have access to some intensive rehabilitation; examine the New South Wales adult development centres for the brain injured as the basis for similar centres in South Australia; involve community care services more in helping the brain injured; and support the establishment of a Chair in Neurosurgery in South Australia.

Brain, head and face injuries cost the State Government Insurance Commission in excess of \$30 million in 1988, with motor vehicle accidents by far the most frequent cause of head injuries. The cost, however, is immeasurable against the distress, suffering and emotional effects that brain and head injuries have on both victims and their families' lives. About 50 head-injured people returned home to be cared for by their families during 1988. Many of those families will break up within five years, often due to extreme pressures placed on them in looking after brain-injured relatives. It might not really—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): Briefly, I wish to refer to the problem of the cost of crime other than attacks upon persons, major corporate crime or the more vicious types of crime. I refer, in particular, to housebreaking and larceny and the cost to the average individual.

I noted recently that the Insurance Council is suggesting that household insurance may have to increase within 12 months by up to 20 per cent to help cover the cost of housebreaking claims made against insurance companies. I think it is fair to say that it costs a minimum of \$1 000 to install anything like an effective alarm system in order for a home to have some protection: that is the very least amount. I understand that some systems cost as much as \$3 000. On top of that, householders have been forced to install security doors, special locks on windows, high fences and possibly keep a large dog. All those items cost a lot of money.

If we were reasonable and said that it cost \$2 000 per home for all the things that the Insurance Council, the police and Ministers suggest that individuals should put into their homes to protect them from some of the larceny that takes place, and bearing in mind that in the metropolitan area there are 250 000 homes, plus all the commercial shops and premises, the figure which would have to be expended would be well in excess of \$500 million. It could even be double that figure. That is the sort of money involved in that area, plus the increased cost of insurance over the years, plus the increase that we shall face in the next 12 months. It is a huge sum of money.

We are told that many of the break-ins are the result of people wanting money or goods that they can sell for money in order to pay for drugs. We are told that there are disadvantaged people in our society who break into houses in order to get money to survive. Even in the depression of the early 1930s, we never had these problems when people needed food, not knowing where their next meal was coming from. I admit that there is a percentage like that in society today: that is sometimes through bad luck or bad management, and that may always be the case, but in the depression years there were even more people in that situation. However, people could leave their homes empty. They could leave doors and windows open to get some air through whilst they went out shopping, and when they came back they did not face the problems that we have today. People did not have to put up high fences. The suburbs were more pleasant. There were no high corrugated iron, brick and brush fences. Neighbours could see and talk to one another.

In the 1960s we encouraged people to plant more shrubs and trees around their homes. Now we are told that they should not have done that, because they offer the opportunity for people to venture into their homes and look around without being seen. It is now said that to have such things around your home places it at risk of being broken into. At the same time, our Police Force openly admits that

it is under-equipped and under-staffed. Does anybody take up the challenge seriously and suggest that we should better equip the police and increase the staff to carry out the duties that we expect of them? There is now more crime, from corporate crime right down the line. The police need a huge influx of personnel to be able to tackle it.

We have Neighbourhood Watch, the credit for which all sorts of people are claiming. It has had some effect, but unless it is set up in every section of the community, all we shall do is push crime from one area to another.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: The honourable member says that it is not true; if it is not, in my view, it is a waste of time having Neighbourhood Watch. Where there is no Neighbourhood Watch there is an increase in the number of break-ins. If it is true that in areas where there is Neighbourhood Watch the crime rate is increasing, what benefit is it?

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: The honourable member suggests that there is no difference between areas where there is and where there is no Neighbourhood Watch. I go back to what I said earlier. If we do not have Neighbourhood Watch in all areas, the criminals will move from the areas where they are committing crimes where there is Neighbourhood Watch to the areas where there is no Neighbourhood Watch.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: The honourable member says that it is not true. Only one conclusion can be drawn from that: that the increasing amount of crime in areas where there is no Neighbourhood Watch will also affect Neighbourhood Watch areas. If that is the case, Neighbourhood Watch is not much good. However, I know that Neighbourhood Watch is of some benefit.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: If the honourable member wants to think about it, that is exactly what is being said in that sort of interjection. I accept that Neighbourhood Watch is a benefit. That is why I am saying—

Members interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: To those who have it. However, those who do not have it are paying the penalty.

An honourable member: What are you doing about it?

Mr S.G. EVANS: I have been asking for it. We are told that it is not allowed to be politicised; one is not allowed to bring pressure to bear as a member of Parliament; it has to be outside the political arena. But when it comes to election time, who is invited along to the openings to get them off the ground? It is the MPs who are allotted the marginal seats.

I go back to the point that I was making. In our community, it has become accepted that people can expect their homes to be broken into. Private personal belongings, which may mean much to a person, in particular, to a woman, may be stolen. Some women constituents have come to me having lost valuable heirlooms which can never be replaced. It may be something which has been passed down the family line from the great grandmother or grandmother. The article may not be worth more than \$2 000 or \$3 000 at most, but to the individual it is a devastating loss.

Yet, we as a society and the authorities say, 'She'll be right if you put in an alarm system, lock all your windows, put in security doors, get a dog, and make sure you get your neighbours to watch your place when you are not there.' I say that we have to increase the size of our Police Force. We have to open up the police stations again. The police station at Blackwood was closed. Why was that 24-hour

service closed? The Blackwood police station had been there for 80 years and the Government closed it.

We also have to make sure that the penalties that are applied are serious enough to stop people taking action against other people. That could mean some form of training camp, other than gaol, where people have to get up at 6 o'clock in the morning, go out and do some community work and return at night and be in bed by 10 o'clock—I am not suggesting the Army, the Navy or the Air Force; I am talking about a training camp—to teach them a bit of discipline and make them respect other people's property. If that is not done, all of us are in danger each and every day. It is all right for those of us who have not been broken into to say that it is all right for those out there who suffer, but we have to make sure that they are protected.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I would like to raise a couple of matters in relation to my electorate, and in particular road funding, which has become the subject of a political debate during the Federal election. Without a doubt, road funding is the lifeline of any community, and it is even more important for areas that are some distance from the metropolitan area. Roads are not just corridors that people use for recreation; they are the lifeline to transport products from suppliers, and they are a means of existence for many people. So, the upgrading of our roads is paramount. If a Government told me that it could grant me one wish, I would wish for better roads.

When the former Minister of Transport visited my electorate, he was able to arrange for the upgrading of the Dutton Bay jetty. After attending a social function and doing some fishing on that day, the Minister asked me, 'What else can we do?' I replied, 'Minister, if there is one thing that I would request, it is for upgraded roads.' I guess I speak in this Chamber on many occasions on the upgrading of roads. Regrettably, we are not seeing any large improvement in the length or quality of roads, although some assistance is being given. The Tumbly Bay to Warratta Vale Road is almost completed, or will be in a matter of months. The Highways Department gang will then move over to the Cummins turnoff and on to Karkoo Road. That is a main highway which is being upgraded. Of course, that is all very well, and we are all appreciative of that, because many thousands of tonnes is carried over that road.

However, other roads which have become rural arterial roads and highways—for example, the Lock to Elliston and Cleve to Kimba roads—are important to the people living in those areas because they are used as a transport corridor for most of their produce. In particular, the Elliston people do not have a sealed road which directly links them with the rest of the community and, for that matter, the rest of the State. So, the only way that they can use a sealed road to get to Adelaide is to go via Port Lincoln and then up the east coast of Eyre Peninsula, or to go north to Streaky Bay and cut across to Poochera and go down via Kyancutta.

So, the community is disadvantaged—it feels disadvantaged, and rightly so. It has good reason to feel disadvantaged. Members who have travelled the Lock to Elliston road would know full well that it would have to be one of the worst roads in the State. Our Governor, His Excellency Sir Donald Dunstan, refuses to travel on that road, although I know that on occasions he has gone part way out on to that road before turning around and coming back. So, it has become a road of State significance in its reputation as one of the worst roads around. Similarly, one could say the same for the Cleve to Kimba road. That is one of the main thoroughfares for the transport of grain south from the Kimba area.

Not many people would appreciate that many thousands if not hundreds of thousands of tonnes of grain have to be transported on dirt roads. Of course, the semitrailers try to use a road which is relatively well sheeted but, as soon as that is cut out—which may take only a matter of days with heavy transport on it—they move across to the next road which might be slightly better. So, out of four possible alternatives, each road, one by one, becomes cut up week by week. Of course, that problem will continue until a sealed road is constructed between Kimba and Cleve.

There are many other reasons why those roads should be upgraded including the medical situation whereby the shortage of doctors means it is necessary for people to be transported by ambulance or by private car for medical attention. Of course, in many cases, as many people would say, the trip to the doctor is considerably worse than the complaint itself. That might be playing on words but, nevertheless, it is indeed serious and there are people who can give considerable testimony of the need to upgrade these roads.

The Prime Minister recently announced road funding of \$318 million but, according to the Local Government Association President, only about \$10 million will come to South Australia; I regret that. I believe, that that amount is infinitesimal. It is not right as it is only a very small amount in overall terms. It has been estimated that a fuel tax of 2c per litre would return to the South Australian Government some \$52 million which could well be used for road funding. Last weekend, I had reason to be in western New South Wales, where the Government has just introduced a 3c per litre fuel tax, producing from it some \$600 million, and every cent will be used for road funding. It is guaranteed and locked on to the road system. Unfortunately, we cannot say that the same is happening here.

Another subject I wish to raise is that of education. I notice that the Minister of Education is present, and I am pleased about that. I am concerned about what is happening as a result of curriculum guarantee, or, more particularly, the inability of the Government to be able to provide the teachers to give curriculum guarantee to the required levels and standards. Unfortunately, there is not a requirement for teachers to serve in areas as designated: they can opt out if they are posted to a country school. In the past they could take four years leave without pay in lieu of serving in the country, but I believe that requirement is no longer applied—they can just refuse to go.

The regrettable part is that the schools further out are not getting teachers of a sufficiently qualified standard. The teachers in isolated areas are doing their absolute utmost, and there is no criticism of them at all. However, in many cases teachers who may well be trained to year 10 level are being asked to conduct year 11 and year 12 studies. One cannot be critical of teachers if they are not trained to that level and they are being asked to teach at a level beyond their training. The problem rests with being able to attract teachers with the required qualifications to those places. I understand the Minister's position: he is in a dilemma. It is difficult to attract teachers to isolated areas without offering some sort of incentive.

In my Address in Reply speech, I suggested that it may be time to consider introducing the bonding system. I know that the Institute of Teachers may well be violently opposed to the bonding system, but somewhere along the line this problem has to be addressed. We cannot have a different level of standards between country schools and city schools. It is a problem to which there is no easy answer, and I recognise that.

I know that problems are created when incentives are offered. Somebody will say, 'Why should a schoolteacher in

the country be given a house at a lower rental?" Again, that is a problem, but I know that many country areas are finding it difficult to attract doctors and that the communities are trying to provide homes rent free in order to attract a doctor. Perhaps that system should be investigated in relation to teachers. However, the problem is there and I use this time again to draw that point to the attention of the Minister.

Someone has raised with me the effects of the Adoption Act and, in particular, the requirement that each person who wishes to adopt must reapply every five years to have their name withheld from publication. That point worries me because I think that the requirement should be reversed and that, if a person wants to register the fact that their name be permanently withheld from other people, they should have that right. In four or five years, when those names come up for review, somebody may forget to reregister their name, and considerable embarrassment could result.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I am pleased to follow on from the comments by my colleague, the member for Flinders, about the debacle that is occurring at the moment in schools. I use the word 'debacle' because not only are senior officers of schools not prepared to talk to their local member, having been advised very positively that they will be in trouble with the KGB if they do (and that message is there) but also, with less than the necessary resources in a number of cases, they are required to educate the children. My colleague, the member for Flinders, highlighted one of the problems. Last evening a school council president advised me that he had no qualms in passing on to me some of the problems he encountered while attempting, along with his school principal and other senior members of the school staff, to do the best they possibly could for the children. He thought that it was a disgrace that, because they were seven teachers short on day 1, year 8, in particular, had to have four variations to their school schedule for the first three weeks of the school year. That is in a nearby country high school.

Because the staff did not know on the day that they commenced or the week before they commenced how many teachers would front and in what disciplines they would be able to teach, they had to bring together the student body in groupings they thought they could manage, and in one circumstance a group of over 100 year 8 students found themselves in four different classrooms in the first three weeks of the school year.

In this day and age, when we are supposed to provide a good education for our children, it is unsatisfactory that the system, whether because of a lack of computer prowess, a lack of Government funds, or for whatever reason, produces that sort of disaster for the beginning of the school year. The Director-General has waved a big stick at staff, but I believe that it is high time that the Minister took on board some of the real concerns that are being expressed by parent groups and senior staff out there in the real world.

I have mentioned an incident involving a high school but I could cite a similar incident regarding a primary school which, on the day of commencement, was 13 students short of the anticipated number and it was told that it would lose 1.1 teachers. One teacher was moved out, because she could be accommodated a little closer to her home but two further students were lost, because obviously she took her own children to the school where she was teaching. It was commonsense to take the children with her and to take them home at night. That compounded the problem. By the end of the second week, even though it had lost those two students, it was within three students of the required 13,

which was the original expectation. As the year goes on, the school will be grossly affected by this sort of problem.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: Do you want to change the formula for all the schools?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I want a formula that will work.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: We have a formula now and you want to change it.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I want a formula that will work and, with the sort of money that is being paid to the hierarchy of the Education Department, I would have thought it was not difficult for them to sort out a scheme that works in practice rather than a scheme that might be all right in theory but does not function in practice.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter interjecting:

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: If I were to ask each honourable member in this place on both sides of the political fence the circumstance regarding the beginning of the school year in their electorates, I would be very surprised if any one could stand up and say that they had not had rumblings from at least one, or all, or the greater percentage of the schools within their electorate. Let us put this into perspective. A large number of members on this side of the House represent anything up to 30 to 35 schools as opposed to perhaps five or six per electorate by those members on the other side, and that is because of the larger size of the schools in the electorates of members opposite.

That is demography. Many members opposite happen to live in the city area, but many on this side live in an area where the school size is very much smaller and we have these problems. On behalf of the parents who speak to me and the staff who are not allowed to speak to me, under threat of quite serious disciplinary action, I indicate my concern, and I thank the members of the school councils who have had the guts to come out and indicate that they are concerned about the sort of pressures that have been placed on their schools and children.

That was not why I wanted to rise this evening but, with my colleague the member for Flinders having commenced that discussion, I was happy to join in. I wanted to point out that, on the last occasion I spoke in a grievance debate in this forum (on 14 February at pages 180 to 181 of *Hansard*), a number of members opposite joined with me in accepting the fact that there is grave concern by parents and by people of all ages in the community because of the transgressions of those who do not want to live according to society's requirements. I mentioned the case of the lad who, in the Christmas-New Year period, was beaten about the head with a cricket bat in the Edithburgh Park, that that required 36 stitches in his head, and so on. I was more than heartened by the attitude expressed voluntarily by members opposite (in relation to the situation) that these people who want to act like adults are not prepared to be treated as adults in the legal system, and nor is our system prepared to treat them as adults.

Whilst it may be pre-empting discussion that will take place in this House in the near future as a result of two pieces of legislation that have been brought into existence in another place, I would like to believe that we will look very seriously at deciding that, if a young person, whether they start at age 12, 13 or 14, transgresses more than, say, two or three times, for all subsequent transgressions they are treated as adults, because the present system of giving them a bag of lollies and a pat on the head is not helping anybody.

The manner in which a number of these juveniles are being treated is quite farcical and quite a disaster for family life if a person or a family happens to be caught up in some

of their activities. I was quite concerned about an article in the edition of the *Messenger Press* that circulates in the Salisbury, Elizabeth and Gawler areas of 21 February 1990. Under the headline 'Bikies run amuck at Mac's', which is in the heart of the districts of Elizabeth and Napier. In this case, a young lady with children at Mac's on Elizabeth Way was spoken to by parents of other children who were being disadvantaged by the activities of this woman's children. She left Mac's, expressing concern at the manner in which she had been spoken to, and came back with eight bikies. These eight bikies then set upon the parents of those children who happened to be in Mac's restaurant. These are the sorts of activities that no amount of police attention will prevent. It is an indication of some of the problems that some juveniles in the community are causing.

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): This afternoon I wish to address a number of issues that are basically tied up together. We have heard them all debated before and they are security, home safety and personal safety. I am pleased that there has been so much concentration on these issues, because they are issues that ought to affect every member of Parliament because, after all, we are representing people who fully adhere to the old axiom that a person's home is his castle and ought to be inviolate. However, I get the feeling that, unless one's own personal security has been violated, we think that this problem is out of sight, out of mind.

Recently I noted a police operations caravan or something similar in Wellington Square, close to where I live. Whilst I was pleased to see it, because I always like police presence, I was equally anxious to know why the police were there. Shortly afterwards we noticed police going down each side of the road doorknocking and, in fact, they were investigating a particularly nasty series of crimes for which I understand the perpetrator has since been caught, and I am delighted to report that.

However, I must confess that until I had actually been faced with the police presence, shown a photograph and asked whether I had seen this man, and so on, it was easy to be a bit blasé. However, during the campaign to win the seat of Adelaide I did a lot of doorknocking, as did most members of this House. The most notable things were the security doors, the big dogs, and so on which were everywhere. People are scared; they are scared that they will be robbed and, even more to the point, they are scared that they will be physically abused.

I suggest, in fact, that members make a point of asking parents of young children in their electorate whether or not they are happy for their children to walk to the shops. I am not. I have an eight-year-old, a 10-year-old and a four-year-old and I get anxious about their security, and that makes me sad in this community today. I recently spoke to a constituent who told me that his 70-year-old wife is anxious about walking down the street. That is an appalling situation in what we claim to be a civilised community.

During the campaign much play was made, by our opponents on the other side, of safety, and various documents were released in South Australian newspapers. At this time I do not intend to discuss whether Government documents ought to be used for campaign purposes. It is a little bit like Paul Keating's much vaunted but eminently forgettable accord mark VI. But, nevertheless, I am pleased it is a focus of concern. But what has the Government done?

One example is the North Adelaide police station in my electorate, which is a beautiful heritage building, but I am informed that budgetary constraint is the main reason why this police station is not fully operational. There are many hotels in my electorate which are utilised by non-residents

of the area and many complaints emanate about the behaviour of people outside these hotels. I believe that, on the ground, increased police presence would be very valuable. I repeat: I am told budgetary constraint is the reason for police presence not being increased.

I suppose most members have heard of a series of robberies that have occurred at night in the northern suburbs, and they are definitely sweeping further southwards into my electorate. I am perturbed about the brazenness of these burglaries. I personally know three people who have been victims of these criminals. What makes me particularly angry and anxious for my constituents and their personal safety is that these people have actually disturbed the burglars at their tasks. I hope that no-one gets hurt.

The first example I cite is of a man who thought he heard his son walking around at night. He got up and, when he found his son asleep, went to investigate. I do not know about other members, but I would be terrified having just woken from a deep sleep to be confronted by a large man flashing a torch down the corridor and calling out that I was in danger. I certainly would be anxious. My constituent took what I thought was smart, evasive action then: he rang the police, got into his car and chased the burglars. Unfortunately, they got away but my constituent was greatly inconvenienced because of the loss of plastic cards, keys and personal goods.

The second example I would like to cite is similar except that it occurred at 10 p.m. not at 2 o'clock or 3 o'clock in the morning but at 10 o'clock at night when another person was confronted by a burglar in his own home. The third example is even more remarkable: my constituents were woken up by a loud banging noise which turned out to be a burglar trying to force a computer through a small doorway. The burglar then threw the computer at my constituent, who took reasonable, evasive action and, as he was dodging the computer, the burglar ran past him. Burglars in this and other areas are becoming more confident as they become more successful, and that is a dangerous sign. I indicate my total support for the police, but I believe they are overstretched and I call for more resources to be put into crime-fighting areas. The Holden Hill police station, which takes in the area from the railway, along Robe Terrace down to the Torrens River and Windsor Gardens—a huge area—has only three general patrol cars on duty. Figures for late December indicate that on one day 33 break ins were recorded. I do not believe that police in three patrol cars can give 33 break ins the attention that is required.

I would also like to draw attention, as we are debating the Supply Bill, to the status of Neighbourhood Watch. I am sure all members on both sides of the House agree that this is a wonderful scheme. I am impressed with it not only because it tends to reduce crime and I have specific examples of this in my electorate where some areas are covered and some are not covered—but also because of the community friendships which grow from these groups. I applaud all the Neighbourhood Watch groups in my electorate and when I go to the meetings—and there have been a number lately—I am always pleased to note the friendships that are engendered and the great warmth of the relationship between this group and the police. It is a very efficient group of crime fighters.

I recently presented to the Police Force a number of signatures to have other groups included in the scheme. Unfortunately, they have been told that the waiting list is two to three years. I understand that increased resources are in the pipeline but, from speaking to people as late as today, I also understand that there will still be a long waiting list. Given the benefits that flow to the community, from

the point of view of both community spirit and crime prevention, funding ought to be more forthcoming. Residents from all over South Australia are waiting to participate in Neighbourhood Watch and Rural Watch and, until their waiting and anxiety is addressed, the situation will not be satisfactory. As I understand it, the only constraint on these people joining in is that of insufficient resources. As I have pointed out, the benefits accrue to the whole society, and it would be wise for the Government to address the lack of resources provided for the establishment of new Neighbourhood Watch areas as a matter of greatest urgency.

Mr OLSEN (Custance): In making a contribution to this debate, first I will quote from the Fitzgerald report. It has some relevance for South Australia: there are some lessons to be learnt; there are some decisions that Government ought to make in the interests of parliamentary democracy. Chapter III of the Fitzgerald report states:

No Government will have all the ideas, expertise and insight on any particular topic. As well, Governments are not the only bodies which have these attributes. Whatever the expertise required, the solution to any problem is something about which people can and do reasonably differ. The best result will be produced from rational debate by those with opposing views. The community is entitled to such a result . . . The community is entitled to be fully and properly informed about what laws and policies are needed, their object, cost, purpose and effectiveness. The community must also be told the consequences of applying the laws.

. . . those in Government, they have a responsibility to invite and consider the counsel of those with differing views. Parliament is a forum for those differing views . . . Parliament can easily be prevented from properly performing its role by being denied time and resources. Any Government may use its dominance in the Parliament and its control of public resources to stifle and neuter effective criticism by the Opposition. An effective Opposition is also essential for the proper functioning of parliamentary democracy. The members of the Opposition are the constitutional critics of public affairs. Non-government Party members must be provided with appropriate resources and detailed information to enable them to supervise and criticise, just as Governments naturally are well-equipped and staffed.

Without information about Government activities and research staff to properly assess it, the Opposition Party or Parties have no basis on which to review or criticise the activities. Without information, there can be no accountability. It follows that in an atmosphere of secrecy or inadequate information, corruption flourishes. Wherever secrecy exists, there will be people who are prepared to manipulate it. One of the functions of any Opposition Party in Parliament is to expose errors and misconduct by public officials. Unless the Opposition can discover what has happened or is happening and give consideration to events with expert assistance, it cannot expose and criticise activities and the people involved. It is effectively prevented from doing its job. Apart from isolated incidents which are brought to its attention by individuals with inside knowledge, the Opposition is dependent for information on the Government's own accounting to Parliament. There is a need for structures and systems to ensure that the Parliament and the public are properly informed.

That is Fitzgerald reporting on the Queensland circumstances, and every member of this Parliament and of most Parliaments throughout Australia would recognise that there were not adequate checks and balances in the system in Queensland. However, those circumstances apply just as much here in South Australia as they applied in Queensland.

Let me refer to the resources provided by this Government to the Opposition. For the past seven years, the Opposition in South Australia has been consistently starved by the Government to the extent that members of the parliamentary Liberal Party, out of their monthly pay cheques, have contributed to a fund to pay for such incidental costs as the operation of fax machines and a whole range of other things. I bet there is not a Government Minister sitting on the other side or any member of that Party who contributes to the operation of ministerial fax machines or pays other costs and expenses of Ministers in the performance of their duties. However, the Government has starved the Opposi-

tion consistently on the premise that, if you starve them of resources, you do not give 'the bastards an even break', and that is what has happened in South Australia over the past seven years.

Let me give some examples of that. The Ministers were provided with 1.6 electorate office assistants, but did the Leader of the Opposition get the same as the Ministers? No. It was refused, despite the fact that the Parliamentary Remuneration Tribunal identifies ministerial salaries and the salary of the Leader of the Opposition on the same basis in terms of responsibility, performance of task and functions to be undertaken. But were the same staff resources given to the Leader of the Opposition? No. Deliberately no, and it has to be recognised that the Government's argument is, 'We have people from right across the State coming to us on different issues.' Exactly the same happens to the Leader of the Opposition. He is not dealing only with his own constituents. The Leader of the Opposition is also having to deal with people from all constituencies throughout the State on a whole range of issues, without the resources equivalent to those of Ministers.

Another example is the provision of a car phone. A number of Ministers have had car phones for a number of years. It is a simple device so that someone can keep in regular contact with the media and can be contacted while travelling. As Leader of the Opposition, I travelled approximately 80 000 kilometres annually in the car, because I had a country electorate as well as responsibilities in the metropolitan area, and that works out to a hell of a long time that I was sitting in the car. The car phone enables one to keep in contact with the office and the electorate, but the Government refused to pay the couple of thousand dollars per year towards a car phone for the Leader of the Opposition. It was quite prepared to pay for it for the Premier, but not so for the Leader of the Opposition.

The word processors in the office of the Leader of the Opposition were not provided by the Government: they were donated, because the Government would not provide word processors. They happen to be right out of date at the moment—there is no doubt about that—but, if it were not for a donation, we would have been in real strife. I am sorry that the former Minister of Housing and Construction is not present because he, above all, bent over backwards to ensure that we did not get an even break in that office. We called the departmental officers down to have a look at the equipment. We were told a budget line would be allocated for the replacement of the word processors. That was fine until, during that financial year, someone else was sent down from Government agencies to say, 'You can't put the word processors in because the furniture that you have in the office is not appropriate for word processors. Therefore, we will spend the money on providing the furniture but we won't provide you with the word processors.' Then we get to the next financial year. We asked, 'Where is the allocation for the word processors?' but it was rolled over into the next financial year.

The simple fact is that we have the desks, having had them for about three years, but there are no new word processors on those desks. When the glass typewriters were put into a number of electorate offices I asked the Minister whether, instead of going to my electorate office at Clare, one glass typewriter could be put into the office of the Leader of the Opposition to service the Opposition of South Australia; but, no, they were not to go to the Leader's office; they were allowed to go only to electorate offices. As the office here was not designated an electorate office, the Opposition did not get one.

We could go on and have a look at postage. On occasions, on a monthly basis, I as Leader used to overrun my postage allocation. One would think I was about to break the bank. Surely there should be some agreement so that the Opposition can send mail to constituents as it sees fit, particularly when we have a heap of petitions that I know the Government responds to. Why is the Opposition not entitled to do exactly the same? There is a restriction on the number of envelopes one can put through the office. It is all designed to come back to that fundamental point I raised earlier—and Fitzgerald highlights that need.

Let us look at staff resources. The Western Australian Leader of the Opposition has 13 staff and the New South Wales Leader has 15. That is one and half times more than Ministers have. Queensland has 12 staff; Victoria, 10; Tasmania, 5—and that about equates to the position here in South Australia. It is not good enough, and if we do not take corrective action or if the Government is not prepared to be big enough to take corrective action, we will in due course have a Fitzgerald report similar to that which has been tabled in Queensland.

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): In addressing the appropriation of moneys in Supply Bill (No. 1) I wish to elaborate on some of the statements I made in my Address in Reply speech, particularly concerning the use of State fuel tax moneys in road maintenance and construction programs. The State Government continues to rip off 4.5 cents per litre petrol tax from motorists in this State, yet puts only one-third of the money collected into road construction and maintenance, with the rest going into general revenue. I have reminded members on a previous occasion that legislation was introduced to take effect from the financial year 1983-84 to restrict the amount of petrol tax revenue going to roads to \$25.726 million. As a result, in this State we see an alarming decline in the proportion of State fuel tax proceeds allocated to the Highways Fund.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: If the honourable member cares to listen, he will hear a bit more as I continue. Since 1983 the State tax has generated more than \$324 million, but only \$154 million has been credited to the Highways Fund. The balance of \$170 million has gone straight to general revenue. This process of siphoning petrol tax into the Government's general revenue slush bucket has been continuing while traffic chaos worsens on our southern and south-western transport corridors.

Members would be aware that the RAA has been conducting for some time computerised travel time surveys along the four main arterial roads between the city and the southern suburbs. The routes surveyed are those running between the Majors Road and South Road intersection at O'Halloran Hill and the Anzac Highway and West Terrace intersection in Adelaide. Route 1 of the RAA survey travels along South Road to Anzac Highway, and in April 1986 the average speed for a trip along that section of road was 36 km/h. The most recent figures I have show that the speed is now only 29 km/h. The time taken for a trip along South Road from Majors Road to Anzac Highway in 1986 was 24 minutes 21 seconds. Currently, the same trip takes about 30 minutes.

Similarly, the average speed along the RAA's route 2, being Marion Road, and route 3, Goodwood Road, is 30 km/h, while the average speed along route 4, Goodwood Road, is 29 km/h. The RAA has estimated that delays or stationary time on all four routes amount to 25 or 30 per cent of total travelling time during the morning and afternoon peak periods. We have seen the way the State Gov-

ernment responds—apart from interjections while I am speaking—and it is with an endless procrastination and fence sitting process while projects to upgrade the Darlington intersection and build a third arterial road are moved to an indefinite date in the future. The people of the affected electorates of Bright, Fisher and Hayward responded appropriately by throwing out the sitting Labor members.

If members on the other side of this House are wondering what the effect of their policies has been on the electorate, perhaps they ought to look at the sparser numbers on their benches. The Government can be assured that neither I nor my colleagues in Hayward or Fisher will sit idly by and allow our constituents to continue to put up with this Government and its inaction any longer. The time to act is now, and more money must be allocated for our roads—and allocated now.

What does this Government propose to do by the mid-1990s, when there is no spare capacity left on our existing southern road network? I am sure that the Government simply intends to sit back and see it completely eroded, then respond in some knee-jerk fashion. The Government announced in 1983 that it had dropped plans for a north-south corridor and would sell off land it no longer needed on the corridor route. This would surely have to go down as one of the most short-sighted State Government decisions of all time. The then Minister of Transport stated that the likely traffic growth over the following 15 years could be catered for by improving the existing road network. I ask members opposite only seven years later—less than halfway through the honourable Minister's 15 years—whether they now agree with this short-sighted decision.

In August 1983 a delegation of seven mayors met with the Premier and the then Minister of Transport in an attempt to save a section of the corridor from Anzac Highway to Sturt Road. The delegation included the Mayor of Marion, the late Ted Newberry; Brighton's Lionel Byers-Thomas; Noarlunga's Morris Hunt; Unley's Dennis Sheridan; Meadows' Geoff Simpson; Mitcham's Keith Pearson; and Wilunga's Gordon Symonds. The Premier told the southern councils to forget any hope of the north-south corridor being built. The Premier was reported in the *Southern Times* of 24 August 1983 as stating:

The north-south corridor was basically a 60s concept. While it is possible we might be looking at the corridor concept on the north-south route some time in the future, I think we need to realise that it is not the total answer.

The corridor may well have been a 60s concept, but it is far better than the current options provided by this Government. Chaos reigns supreme on the southern and south-western road networks, and nothing is being done. Then in August 1984—surprise, surprise! The State Government realised that it had made a mess of the transport corridor and announced a \$45 million road plan to remove the Darlington bottleneck. The nine kilometre road was to be built in two stages, between Sturt Road at Tonsley and Reynella, to run parallel with South Road and Ocean Boulevard, with the first stage costing \$30 million between Sturt Road and Majors Road, O'Halloran Hill.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: Precisely—where is it now? The \$15 million second stage was to go between Majors Road and the northern end of the Reynella bypass, but in the *Advertiser* of 16 August 1984 the then Minister of Transport was quoted as stating that he hoped the road, 'a pretty high priority project, would be open in about 10 years'. That 10 years is fast running out.

All we have seen to date is procrastination, buck passing and fence sitting, and the people of my electorate are fed up with waiting. They want action and they want action

now. All the Government has done is defer the project until 1993. That is its answer to the southern arterial transport problems. I wish to draw to the attention of this House part of the findings of a major market research project entitled 'What bugs the silent majority?' which was undertaken by Clemenger in 1989. The survey revealed that fuel taxes and Government spending on roads are now among the top 14 concerns of ordinary Australians. Further, recent market research undertaken on behalf of the Australian Automobile Association and motoring organisations in all States revealed that motoring issues of most concern were Government taxes on petrol, safety problems resulting from poor roads and the state of roads and highways. In spite of this, the State Government continues to blunder along its merry way ignoring the wishes of the people it is supposed to serve, ignoring the southern and south-western traffic problems and allowing the average traffic speed in peak hour to drop to below 30 km/h. I am surprised that Government members are not claiming that it is part of their new road safety policy to slow traffic down!

I recognise that a decline in Federal funding in recent years has impacted adversely on the rate at which progress could be made on road improvement in South Australia. However, this can, at least partly, be redressed by providing a greater proportion of State fuel tax revenue to roads—and I am glad to see the member for Hartley returning to the Chamber—part of that revenue that is currently going into the general slush bucket.

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

Mr MATTHEW: As I was saying before the break, this Government must direct a greater proportion of fuel tax revenue to our State roads as a matter of priority. Two priority projects for such funds must without dispute be the third arterial road construction and Darlington intersections upgrade. Members were no doubt enlightened to hear the statements made earlier today by the Minister of Transport regarding increased Commonwealth road funding. I was hopeful that the residents of the south could at least look toward some funding coming their way and that in the future they would not be overlooked. I see in tonight's *News* that already people are hitting out at the Federal Government pledge. In fact, the South Australian Local Government Association has slammed the Prime Minister's road policy announcement today as pathetic and petty cash. It is interesting to note that it has highlighted that the Federal Government's allocation to South Australia will be a mere \$10 million per year. That is a pathetic input into a State that so desperately needs road funding. I would hope that members opposite would be talking to their Federal colleagues to ensure a better Federal funding allocation for roads in South Australia. Perhaps, the Federal Government has merely looked at the moneys that the State has been allocating to roads and has come to the conclusion that, on that basis, it does not need much road funding at all. Therefore, members must look at their own funding priorities as well as talking to their Federal colleagues to try to obtain a better deal for South Australia.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): This evening I will address my remarks to a couple of subjects that are of great concern to the residents of Glenelg. They relate to the poor deal that the residents of the City of Glenelg get from this Government. I refer to a couple of major local projects: first, to the redevelopment of Moseley Square. As long as I have been associated with the Glenelg district, we have been trying to organise some land swaps around the square so that development can take place.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: Well, I will come to that. It is probably a good idea. The honourable member who represented the area before me says, 'Take out the cars.' We are moving down that track, but very slowly. Since I took over the area—and I am sure it was the case when the member for Hartley represented the area—and from 1984 onwards we have had ongoing negotiations between council and the Government about swapping land parcels. Members who have visited the area and know the square will know that we have the town hall, the library and, next to that—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: I am coming to the West Beach Trust. We will move up the coast in a second. We have the library and then the police station and on down to the post office and around the corner there is another little community library. Through the council and the Government, we have been trying to organise land swaps to relocate the police station so that the council can redevelop the square and so that we can make it a focal point for the tourist industry up and down the coast.

I am sure that the member for Hartley will agree that in 1978 negotiations were under way, and they are still under way today in 1990. We have made virtually no progress. The Commonwealth has stepped in and redesigned and upgraded the post office, and I applaud the work that has been done. But, as far as relocating the police station is concerned, nothing has happened. It is an absolute travesty of administration that this Government has done nothing at all to help us relocate the police station, move the courthouse so that the area can be used, or turn the courthouse into a city library; and that it has done nothing to organise the land swap so that we can rebuild our police station. It is indeed about time the Government addressed this land swap situation.

The Glenelg council has made overtures for years for the land swap to come about and the Government has just turned a blind eye to it. There are other areas where the Government has just turned a blind eye to the requests of the Glenelg council. Anyone who knows the Glenelg area knows that the West Beach Trust area and the Glenelg council are inextricably linked together when it comes down to the development of the area. What happens in Glenelg impacts on West Beach and the West Beach Trust area, and what happens in the West Beach Trust area also impacts on Glenelg.

There seems to be an obsession in this Government not to tell the Glenelg council anything—although the council represents the ratepayers—that is going on in the area. If major developments are planned for West Beach—and we know that there are—it is about time that this Government informed the residents of Glenelg what those projects are and how they will impact on them. For example, I refer to the Jubilee Point project with which we are all familiar. It had a planned breakwater extending many hundreds of metres out to sea. Amongst some of its options, the Government is looking at doing the same thing at West Beach. People have seen a plan showing a cut through West Beach—a massive breakwater—and there is talk of this as an alternative site for a marina. The Government rejected Jubilee Point for various environmental reasons, but the sand management—

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: Let me make this point: the sand management problem that would have existed at the breakwater at Jubilee Point is exactly the same problem that will be encountered if the Government builds a breakwater and cuts the beach at West Beach. Further, if a channel is put

through at West Beach—and one can imagine the size of the sand-dunes by the Sea Rescue Squadron—the size of the cut will make some sections of the Suez Canal pale into insignificance because the height of the sand-dunes cut will be absolutely massive.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Who will pay for it?

Mr OSWALD: That is a very good question. The Government will not even tell us how far the project has advanced, who it is talking to or where it is going. Not only do we find that the project impacts on other marina projects—

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: Knock it off, Ted.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Napier has a point of order.

Mr OSWALD: There is no point of order at all. The honourable member is only interrupting for the sake of a notation in *Hansard*. There is no point of order and I suggest that he sit down and let me continue with my remarks.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat while the Chair hears the point of order raised by the member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: My point of order is that I distinctly heard the member for Morphett refer to the member for Alexandra by his name and in a disparaging way, and I draw your attention to that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The Chair did not hear that as part of the speech. The member for Morphett.

Mr OSWALD: That was a pathetic interjection from a pathetic performer. Let me get back to the important issue at stake here. First, developments in the West Beach Trust area impact on the city of Glenelg and the Government is refusing to tell anyone in the Glenelg council, or me as the local member, about what is going to happen. Secondly, a hotel development is planned in the West Beach Trust area. A year ago the Government encouraged Bill Sparr the developer to build what is to be the new Grand Hotel at Glenelg. The Government encouraged him to proceed.

The Government did not say that it was about to give the okay for a Government-sponsored four-star hotel at West Beach. Only a certain number of people can be put in hotel beds along the coast at the moment. Once the Grand Hotel is completed, it should be given a lead time of about four years or so before the Government allows another four-star hotel to be built in that area. However, the Government has not done that—it encouraged Bill Sparr to build his hotel at Glenelg and now the Government is allowing another hotel to be built further down the track.

We also have the bottom of the Patawalonga—a tired area. It is acknowledged that we need development at the end of the Patawalonga. Something needs to be done to resolve the sand management problem, to get a channel there, to sweeten up the Patawalonga water and build some restaurants. The area is tired. A ferry developer was prepared to come in the area and do all those things and the Glenelg council, most of the community groups and I supported that. What did the Government do? It did not give any encouragement to that developer to come in because it wanted him to join with the West Beach Trust proposal to try to get Geoff Virgo off the hook, as he has busted \$4 million of taxpayers' money in the West Torrens area.

Honourable members may frown, and say what they like, but that is the story around Glenelg. It is about time that some facts came out about what is happening on the West

Beach Trust proposal. I hope that the select committee will start to draw out the facts because there is something radically wrong in the West Beach Trust area. An absolute wall of silence and secrecy has descended on Glenelg. Whatever happens in the West Beach Trust area impacts on Glenelg and on our future. One cannot say to the council, 'We will tell you everything that is happening up to the end of the council boundary, but we will not tell you what is going to happen on the other side.' Everything that is built on the north of the council boundary in the West Beach Trust area impacts on Glenelg. I ask the Government, for goodness sake, to come out and confide in us. For some reason, which only the Government knows, it is starting to give some information to Brian Nadilo, the Mayor. The Government should take the Mayor into its confidence.

I wrote to the Premier before Christmas, and it took a personal explanation in the House only last week to remind the Premier that until last week he had not had the courtesy to reply to my letter. Now, through his department, he is to give me a briefing on some aspects of the project. I shall be most interested to see how thorough that briefing will be. But to go for weeks and weeks without responding to my correspondence was in extremely poor taste on the part of the Premier. I represent the area in Parliament and Brian Nadilo represents the area at local government level. We deserve and have a right to know what is going on. I trust that that briefing produces some of the answers. If not, I assure honourable members that I shall be on my feet in this place demanding answers so that local residents will know what is happening and will know the impact of the proposed developments at West Beach. We want to know what the developments are in West Beach. If we can at least be told, we can cooperate and maybe bring some of them to fruition.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: This afternoon in Question Time, the Minister of Water Resources publicly answered a two-week-old call for information about the toxicity levels in the water of Lake Alexandrina. At that time she was also answering a number of queries raised by members on both sides of the House, both unofficially and officially. I do not give away too many bouquets in this place, but I think that on this occasion the Minister of Water Resources went out of her way to place on record the efforts of the department to try, albeit with very little technical and scientific information up their sleeve yet, to display the condition of that water and the problems associated with it to the public at large.

I am grateful that some information has now finally been placed on the record in relation to this subject, because I have a number of concerned constituents who live on the Strathalbyn and Angas Bremer Plains and environs, and obviously they are worried about the welfare and health of their own families as well as of their livestock. I am comforted by the assurance given by the Minister that drinking water will continue to be available to those residents until such time as the water in the lake is safe to consume; that is, by those who rely on the water for human consumption.

I am even more grateful and in fact most interested to learn that there is a device either in the making or in the pipeline that will ultimately be used to try to reduce the nodularia algae build-up in those waters. Hopefully, by that mechanical device, we can head off any such toxicity levels in the future and not be faced with this emergency carting

and public concern that has been experienced in recent times.

It would appear that to date little is known about the subject. However, I understand, from information that has been provided today and from the Minister's department, that this particular algae is very reliant on sunlight; that it only thrives when near the surface of the water; and that if heavy weather conditions, for example, heavy winds, prevail then the algae breaks up, sinks to the bottom, does not enjoy the level of sunlight it requires to thrive and, in many cases, in fact, dies.

While that produces a build-up of undesirable sediment and pollution in the water, it does not produce, I understand, the dangerous levels of toxicity that prevail at the moment. I further understand, from the limited information that is available to us, that the toxicity levels on the west side of the lake are greater than those on the east side of the lake. That would indicate that due to the unseasonable north-easterly weather that has been prevailing during February we have had this build-up of algae and, hence, the slime on the west side of the lake and the high build-up of toxins.

I am assured that at the point where the pump is sited at Milang, for the purposes of distribution of water across the plains, there is no slime build-up. I am assured that, likewise, at Clayton there is no slime build-up. However, the extent of caution that has been given by the department, and endorsed by the Government in this instance, I believe is justified and is, in fact, welcomed by members on this side of the House. My gratitude extends also to the shadow Minister of Water Resources for his interest in this matter, which was displayed last week and again this week. His address to the House on that subject confirms his genuine interest.

It is one of those situations prevailing in the public arena that does not require Party-political intervention; it is one that requires as positive attention as can be generated for the purposes of caring for the welfare of the community. As I said, in this instance I am grateful that the welfare of my constituents on the plains area, Strathalbyn and Milang, is being given the attention that is warranted.

On another subject, not totally unrelated to sites and situations, earlier this evening an interjection came across the Chamber from a responsible, albeit somewhat new, Minister who queried me about why I am seated in the 'jump off' position, as it has been described in this Parliament. Well, members who were around last session, that is, other than those 11 new members, would recall that in fact I am seated in exactly the same position as I was then. Indeed, I have become quite attached to this position. I have done some homework and I have been informed that great men like Sir Thomas Playford, Allan Rodda, and others, in fact occupied this seat immediately before their departure from the Parliament, and for one or two other reasons I am very grateful that this position has been made available for me again this session.

Mr Acting Speaker, when I returned from a few days fishing on Kangaroo Island immediately before the opening of this Parliament, I found my name on a little green tag down there on the centre bench and, in fact, quite near to the front bench of this Chamber. I wondered how in hell my name had got on a little green tag down there. Who, indeed, had been interfering with the positions of the members of this place? In fact, I made some inquiries.

Mr Groom: Who was it?

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Well, I will not name the honourable member whom I ultimately found to be responsible, but I can tell members that we had a little session

about the reasons why he thought I should be there. Do members know who it was planned to have seated on my bench—none other than the former Independent from the Hills, the Hon. Stan Evans, the now member for Davenport. I apologise for mentioning his name but you, Mr Acting Speaker, know my feelings about 'old Stanley'—the member for Davenport—and particularly my feelings about the proposal that came about a year or two ago to bring him back into the Party, but I will not go into that.

However, on my left flank—and members will not believe this—who do members think they had seated next to me? It was none other than the member for Coles. What a joke! I have a crook leg, so just imagine the member for Coles clambering over my knee to get in and out of her seat. I could not believe this. I will not go into the details, but it really poses a very interesting history of events. However, never let it be said that an interjection from the other side of the House is not answered by old Ted because, if it comes, I will answer it if I possibly can. That broadly surrounded my very temporary seating (pre 1990 session) arrangements in this place. So, with some persuasive talk and a little bit of consideration from our members, particularly from our Whip, and a little ribbing from the other side, I was allowed to come back to this jump-off position.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hanson.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I wish to refer to a case involving WorkCover that recently came to my attention and also to my disgust at the delays being caused by WorkCover, particularly cases in the transitional period. Some of the objectives of WorkCover are as follows:

- early and effective restoration of injured workers to the workforce and the community
- a cost-efficient administration
- adoption of a benefit package which is protected from the effects of inflation, which is certain in its application, comprehensive in its coverage, structured according to the needs of injured workers and not the cause of their disability, which provides adequate and fair compensation and provides a positive incentive to rehabilitation . . .
- speedy settlement of claims and the provision of full rights of independent appeal and representation
- avoidance of legal adversary procedures with their inherent delays and costs.

A constituent wrote to me in January and stated:

My husband died on 23 April 1988 and my first hearing date with WorkCover was set for 22 June 1989, more than 12 months after I had lodged my application. I had consulted a solicitor on whose advice I had sought opinion of counsel. In his opinion, I do indeed have a legitimate claim under the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986. My husband collapsed on his way home from work as a result of cardiac arrest and subsequently died. Counsel's opinion is that death arose from a compensable disability as defined in Part IV, section 30, clauses (2) (b) (ii) and (3) (a) of the Act.

There were several adjournments in the course of the hearing of my claim. One of these adjournments was caused by the fact that the respondent (State Transport Authority) stated that they were not ready to proceed and needed more time. On another occasion I, my barrister, my solicitor and my son (not to mention the respondent and its solicitor) were all kept waiting by the WorkCover review officer for more than two hours because 'someone had forgotten to put the date in his diary' and he could not be found.

This delay, as you can imagine, was of considerable cost to me, an apparently minor point which was not even mentioned nor an apology forthcoming by WorkCover.

During the course of the hearing, the respondent made it abundantly clear to my legal representatives that it had no intention of putting up a serious defence as it intended to appeal the decision in any case, should I win, and 'take the case right up to the Full Court if necessary'. The reasoning for this apparently was that the case would set a precedent and, as such, must be defended to the full extent possible.

In the event, a previous claim set the desired precedent, that of Ascione's case (case delivered 21 September 1989, Judgment Nos 1780 and 1781). The appeal by the defendant in that case

was lost and the judgment for the plaintiff upheld by the Full Supreme Court. Part of my barrister's submission was based on that case, which he considers is in my favour. However, just prior to Christmas I heard on the radio that because of the decision in Ascione's case it had been decided to retrospectively alter the WorkCover legislation as 'it was never intended that the legislation cover cases of death as a result of stroke (Ascione) or heart attack'. The plaintiff in Ascione's case would, however, be awarded compensation but any further claims would be barred. In other words, it is proposed to change the rules after the game has ended because the umpire's decision may not be the desired one. This would be a devastating blow for me. I acted in good faith, on soundly given legal advice based on current legislation. I did not act to deliberately defraud or to take advantage of a loophole.

This claim has already cost me in excess of \$10 000 in legal fees and I face the horrifying prospect of a financial debt that I cannot support. In addition, the respondent has made it clear that, even if I win this round, it will force me to go on. My legal costs would be crippling. The time involved could be years. Even this first round decision will be a long time in coming. Although final submissions were made on 22 November 1989, I am told that it is unlikely that the review officer will hand down his decision within the next six months.

It seems to me that the whole WorkCover process prejudices the applicant. I had to put up a complete case from the beginning, necessarily incurring much expense. The respondent, however, need not put up much of a defence at all but can just sit back and wait for a decision, secure in the knowledge that it has the financial resources and time available to launch an appeal if necessary. Under the Act, I could be penalised if I had brought 'frivolous or vexatious proceedings'. There is no such penalty for a respondent who does not bother to really respond but still has the right to appeal the decision. In most cases the respondent would be a multi-million dollar enterprise with almost limitless financial resources with which to intimidate any plaintiff who had the temerity to bring a claim.

Under the Act I am entitled to be reimbursed to an extent prescribed by regulation for the cost of the proceedings. This reimbursement, I am informed by my solicitor, is limited to the grand sum of \$60! So ludicrous as to be a deliberate obscene and sadistic joke!

This entire experience has been, for me and my son, a nightmare from which we are almost afraid to awake. I am fortunate in having an understanding employer and supportive friends and legal advisers. For those applicants who do not have such a network, the pain and the cost must be unendurable, perhaps to the extent of forcing them into giving up or even not commencing proceedings in the first instance. I must add here that, although my late husband had been a member of his union for 15 years, I had no advice, assistance or support from that body whatsoever. My inquiries and pleas for help were met merely with bored indifference.

That is a tragedy. It is disappointing to think that this House supported the establishment of WorkCover. We believed that it would be an improvement on previous legislation, and it was aimed at and designed to give the worker and his family better cover and assistance.

Before me in my office are four cases which are in the transitional period. In one case the worker died at work and, in another case, the worker died on the way home from work. The third case, which is over 2½ years old, concerns a person who incurred injuries at work. There has yet to be a decision in that case. In the other case, the injured person is taking the matter to the tribunal.

During the tribunal hearing in one case the judge is believed to have said words to the effect that there are a lot of loopholes in the Act and that WorkCover should get its act together. If that is the opinion of the judiciary in dealing with WorkCover in South Australia, is it any wonder that workers believe that WorkCover is a cat-and-mouse game, a common law and worker situation and that the employee is the mug in the middle. That was said by one of those people who has expressed concern and disappointment over the delays, the harassment, the fact that WorkCover employs detectives to spy on people and the fact that all claimants are treated as though they are out to cheat the system when, in fact, that is not so. It is disappointing that the legislation has not worked and, therefore, I believe we should insist on a total review of the current

legislation and the practices that are employed in relation to WorkCover in South Australia.

I feel for these people because, as my constituent said in her letter, everyone is hoping that people will give up. But fancy spending \$10 000 at this stage knowing that her husband's former employer, the State Transport Authority, intends to take the case all the way to the Supreme Court. It will go as far as it can with unlimited funding. Is this the way that this Parliament, this Government—the workers' representative, as we are told—wants to treat workers in this State? Of course it is not. It is certainly not the way that I want this Parliament to treat the workers. They are being hassled in terms of what I believe to be a fundamental right of employment.

Everyone is entitled to be protected and is entitled to workers compensation. WorkCover should give them that right and that protection but it should certainly not harass them to the point where they have to involve themselves in crippling debt by taking up the legal cudgels to obtain their rights as a worker. I appeal to the Government to immediately review the legislation, to immediately respond to this appeal to ensure that all outstanding cases are finalised.

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

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Before I address the main issue before the House tonight, I would just like to refer briefly, to the comments of the member for Alexandra. I am pleased that the honourable member has placed on the record exactly why he still continues to sit in his position on the opposite side of the House. No-one can say that the member for Alexandra is not his own man. He is a very truthful man. I may not agree with some of the policies he espouses from time to time but he definitely is a man who, if he sincerely believes in something, will make it known. There have been many rumours around the corridors and the refreshment room about why the member for Alexandra refused to sit between the member for Davenport and the member for Coles. Now we know, and I feel very grateful to the member for Alexandra for telling us.

I recall the member for Alexandra, I think it was some time last year, speaking about his allegiances as a member of Parliament, listing them in the following order: to his electorate, to his Party and to the Leader. I understand he has amended that slightly. His allegiances are to old Ted, the electorate, and to the District of Alexandra. But I digress slightly.

I would like to talk about the two policies that have been put before the people of Australia in regard to unemployment. I was at a meeting of non-government agencies in my electorate last week at which a lengthy discussion took place on the plight of the unemployed in my area should we ever have the misfortune to have a Liberal-National Party in national Government. The view was put to me that whilst the Liberal Party claims that there is basically no difference in the two policies put forward in this campaign, in fact Dr Hewson has said that the Hawke Government has stolen the Coalition policy on the unemployed. I can advise the House that there is a vast difference between the two policies put forward to the people of Australia in regard to the unemployed in this Federal election campaign.

If there is a Liberal/National Party coalition, the long term unemployed in my electorate (where unfortunately the percentage of unemployed is far too high) will find that all the work done over the past seven years in cooperation with State and Federal Governments to provide support services to them, the young and the old, will go down the

gurgler. With the Hawke Government's election policy on unemployment we have a complete reform of the social security system as it relates to the unemployment benefit. In essence, the proposed restructuring of assistance to the unemployed relates to four major areas.

It is a major extension of our successful programs already introduced and is consistent with the policy direction recommended by the social security review. It recognises explicitly the problems faced by the unemployed and provides the necessary labour market and training assistance as problems become more complex. It abolishes an unemployment system created for the 1940s and establishes a system which is far more appropriate for the 1990s. Finally, it places total emphasis on getting people back to work as quickly as possible. A major restructuring of labour market programs is proposed more appropriately to provide opportunities to get people into work by equipping them with the necessary skills and removing other barriers.

In contrast, the Opposition's proposals tinker at the margin. The Opposition proposes no change to an outmoded unemployment benefit system. Instead it proposes to cut off income support for the unemployed at nine months. Some, but not all, will receive a special benefit. We will have a situation where those people, after receiving an unemployment benefit for nine months, will have to go back to the Social Security people and face some public servant (who is only doing their job) and answer questions on why they are not actively seeking work. We will go back to the inquisition that used to take place under the Fraser Government. Dependent on whether those people give the right answers and it suits the mood of the day, those people will continue to receive special benefits. If they do not, they will be thrown on the scrap heap. At the same time, other support services that we have been providing at the State level to non-government agencies and services provided by the Commonwealth Government will be cut off. We will have a large group of people being thrown on the scrap heap, through no fault of their own.

The Opposition's approach is crude and callous and does nothing to address the real problem faced by unemployed people. It would dramatically reverse the rapid decline in expenditure on benefits for the unemployed. One only has to look at what the Federal Government has done in relation to Skillshare. I invite any member from either side to come to see what Skillshare has done in my electorate. It has given long-term unemployed people—young, middle-aged or old—some dignity and means of being able to get involved in training so that they can better equip themselves to go out and get a job in the labour market. Despite some people saying federally that Skillshare should be retained, if the Federal Opposition wins Government it will be abolished.

We will have a situation where people, such as the unemployed in my area who cannot get work will, in some cases, through no fault of their own, be forced, in effect, to bed. I have heard speeches from members opposite about law and order, and I agree with the sentiments of some of them that we must lock up our houses and install burglar alarms, etc. But members opposite do not realise that, if a situation is created where those long-term unemployed—

Mr Ferguson: They have to live off the streets.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: As my colleague says, they have to live off the streets, but that could perhaps be a little harsh, although it could happen. Members opposite do not realise that they are actively encouraging those kinds of people to go down another avenue to provide an income not only for themselves but also for their families. People might say that that is a simplistic way to describe the increased number of break-ins in those areas.

If one looks at the petty crime that takes place in an electorate such as mine as opposed to an electorate such as that of the member for Adelaide, one sees that the crimes that are committed in my electorate or the electorates of my colleagues who represent the northern region are committed by people who, because of the system that the Coalition Parties are actually wanting to promote in this country, are denied some form of regular income and who resort to those kinds of activities. The member for Newland may laugh but she wants to look at some of the crime reports for her own area compared with mine.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: She doesn't live in her own area.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The Minister says that the member for Newland does not live in her own area. I suggest that she spend a little more time in her own area. She may wish also to come to my area to see some of the crime reports. They are committed by young kids who, in the main, because of the system (which, in many ways has been encouraged by the present Federal Government; I make that point as well), are forced to engage in petty crime. Members opposite cannot have it both ways. They cannot support a policy which treats the unemployed as scum, as the dregs of society while, at the same time, expecting people to live in their nice little boxes doing all the kinds of things that members opposite would like.

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

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I rise tonight first to talk about the Electricity Trust fiasco of today and, secondly, to talk about earth leakage devices and how they relate to TAFE colleges. First, today in this House we saw the weaving, ducking, shoving and shifting of the feet of the Premier like we have not seen for a long time in this place. We know that when things become difficult, they are described as being 'commercially confidential'. Then when it gets a little more difficult, the Premier just ducks and weaves, as he did today. To enable the Premier to come clean tomorrow, I thought I would read to the House tonight the document that was presented to Cabinet yesterday. It is a very interesting document from several points of view.

First, we have a statutory authority, the Electricity Trust of South Australia, saying that we should reduce the cost of electricity in the industrial and small business area. I have heard many times in this House and hundreds of times out in the community how this Government supports small business. What a laugh! Last week we had the land tax fiasco when the Government was not prepared to look at more than 30 per cent of small businesses that have had to cope with increases in excess of inflation. Some of them were over 50 per cent; some were over 1 000 per cent. However, 30 per cent of small businesses are involved, and the Government just ignores them. Today, we have an official Cabinet document that turned up in my office clearly showing that the Electricity Trust of South Australia has recommended that we have a reduction in tariff for industry and, in particular, small business. I will quote a few extracts from this paper because I think it is very important. The paper is headed 'To the Premier—For Cabinet', and the proposals are:

- 1.1 To approve reductions of electricity tariffs in industrial, general purpose (including, *inter alia*, commercial and charitable organisations) and farm categories as of 1 March 1990 at a cost of \$9.3 million in revenue foregone over the period of 1 July 1990, equivalent to a 3.5 per cent average tariff reduction, as an initial step in a three year restructuring program aimed at making tariffs for individual customer groups more cost reflective.
- 1.2 To continue discussions with ETSA with a view to formulating a longer-term agreement on electricity tariff

arrangements which is likely to lead to a real reduction in electricity prices over each of the next three years of about 4 per cent. This would mean a cumulative reduction of 13 per cent in addition to the 3.5 per cent reduction proposed in paragraph 1.1.

So, the ETSA proposal recommended a 3.5 per cent across-the-board reduction in tariff for industry groups and, I note, small business in particular, and the Government threw it out because, I understand, the Treasury thought that the loss of \$500 000 in fees to the Government was a bit high. I will come to that in a moment. The paragraph headed 'Background' is very interesting. It says:

The working party to review energy pricing and tariff structures reported in July 1987 that substantial cross-subsidies existed in electricity tariffs which, in particular, discriminated against small general purpose and industrial users to the advantage of domestic customers.

I repeat that it disadvantaged and discriminated against small general purpose users. Here we have a Government which yesterday knocked out a significant reduction in cost for small business because it might lose \$500 000 worth of revenue. This document continues:

The report recommended that action be taken to remove the cross-subsidy progressively and to establish a tariff system which reflected the cost of supply more accurately. Cabinet endorsed the recommendations of that report on 14 June 1988.

So, in 1988 the Cabinet recommended and accepted a report that this sort of cross-subsidisation should be cleaned up and a more cost reflective tariff system established. Today it has ignored this proposal. I wonder why? Is the Treasury short of a few dollars? Have all the promises that the Government made during the election suddenly come home to roost? Have all the costs in relation to free travel for kids, new programs and interest rate reductions for families come home to roost, and suddenly the Treasury cannot afford to let go of \$500 000 which would help some 90 000 consumers by the reduction of electricity tariffs in this State? Under the heading 'Discussion' the document states:

The proposal by ETSA for a restructuring from 1 March 1990, and which will result in a revenue reduction of \$9.3 million (about 3.5 per cent of total revenue) in the period ending 30 June 1990, is shown in attachment 1 and involves the following:

- (1) An 11 per cent reduction in off-peak rates to general purpose, industrial and farm customers (including an extension of the application of off-peak rates to include the entire weekend for such customers);
- (2) A 6 per cent overall reduction in the rates for normal tariffs (non off-peak) for general purpose, industrial and farm customers, with particular emphasis on the smaller of such customers (with a consumption of less than 2 500 kwh per month), for which the reduction will be between 13 per cent and 21 per cent.

This paper by ETSA recommends a reduction in electricity tariffs of between 13 per cent and 21 per cent for small users, yet yesterday the Government rejected this recommendation. It is quite scandalous. The document continues:

- (3) Up to a 3 per cent overall reduction for very large industrial customers on the current maximum demand tariff.
- Details of the tariff reductions at varying levels of consumption are shown in attachment 2. The split of benefits would be as follows:

	\$m
Industrial	1.52
General Purpose	4.48
Farm	0.36
Maximum Demand	0.16
Off Peak	2.84
Total	9.36

Of the \$4.48 million for general purpose customers, the estimated benefit for charitable institutions is approximately \$0.5 million.

Those are the electricity costs for Minda, Red Cross, all the other charities, and all the nursing homes run by the Catholic Church. The recommendation is for a reduction in cost

to them of \$500 000, yet Cabinet yesterday rejected it—all for a measly half a million dollars, which it has already recouped, because its take in the levy this year is \$900 000. That is a significant increase to the Government yet, incredibly, it was not prepared to accept a recommendation from the Electricity Trust. The document goes on to say that no change in domestic tariffs is proposed at this time, and states:

However, domestic customers will benefit from the proposal to keep tariff increases for all customer groups well below the rate of inflation over the next three years.

It is quite amazing that there should be a general projection for a reduction in tariff over the next three years, yet this document, which would advantage small business, has been ignored. As a result of the implementation of the tariff adjustment, the only direct cost to be incurred by the Government is through a reduction of approximately \$500 000 in the period to 30 June 1990 in the statutory fee payable by ETSA compared with the situation if no adjustment were to be made.

However, even with the adoption of this proposal, the anticipated revenue from the statutory fee will be \$900 000 above that originally budgeted for 1989-90. So, the Government will get a bigger budgetary fee from ETSA than it would be giving away. However, it was not prepared to make any concession, against the advice of the ETSA, which had made an increased profit and decided it was in the best interests of consumers to pass that profit back to them. This Government has therefore, looked small business in the eye and said, 'Sorry—no help for you today.'

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Henley Beach is out of order. He is out of his seat and interjecting.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier is out of order interjecting. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to take part in this debate this evening.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I am delighted that you are pleased to have me! I am sure my colleagues always appreciate having me around. I want to address one or two remarks to the matter under discussion. This evening we are debating the expenditure of some \$800 million. The matter to be addressed is how the Government raises that \$800 million and what the Government will do with it when it has collected it from the long-suffering taxpayers of South Australia. We are currently engaged in an exercise of giving the Government virtually an open cheque in spending this money. I am concerned about the way in which socialist administrations, both in this State and at a Federal level, have set out to hogtie and impede the normal business operation of people trying to produce and those who wish to employ.

Anyone with experience in that field will realise that small business, in particular, is in a most difficult situation. Whatever it has to do with Government involves, in my view, an unreasonable charge. Whether it be to file an annual return with the Corporate Affairs Commission or to obtain a licence of any kind, there is a charge. I have just been trying to add up the sorts of charges I am involved with as a farmer, and they are astronomical. Every time a small business person moves there is a charge, and at the end of the day it is making life most difficult.

The first thing this Government must to do is completely review its taxing methods and review also whether many of the impediments it currently places in the way of business

are necessary; whether we must continue with all the boards, committees and licensing arrangements, or whether we can adopt the far simpler and fairer system of having fewer licences. In my view we should have fewer. Once one sets up any form of licensing, one must have people to administer it. We know what has happened in many other areas. Once the bureaucracy is established, it spends most of its time justifying its existence and, in many cases, it is not very productive and has a detrimental effect on the community at large.

In many areas in my electorate reasonable expenditure could be justified and would be in the long-term interests of the community of South Australia. In view of the fact that 52 per cent of the population voted for the Liberal Party, this Government is morally obliged to extend the water west of Ceduna. It was part of the Liberal Party's election campaign and was put forward regularly by the then Leader, the member for Custance. The people of South Australia voted for that program and, therefore, I believe that, if it has any decency, the Government is morally obliged to proceed with that proposal. We know that the Government appears to think that once one gets to Gawler one is at the end of South Australia and that most expenditure should be directed within about 25 km of the GPO.

However, if the Government wants to take courses of action which will improve the employment base of this State and which will create more wealth for all citizens, it must provide some money to help those industries. We are currently going through a protracted exercise about what should happen with the port at Thevenard. Blind Freddy knows that it is essential to the welfare of the economy of South Australia. This Government has its priorities. If it has to make a decision to help people who are producing, it thinks of all the excuses why it cannot do so, but if I were a betting person I would wager that \$50 million will be spent on an entertainment centre that will run at a loss. If that is sound economics, my limited economic knowledge is somewhat astray.

Such things are well and good when the Government of the day has an excess of funds. However, when it is a matter of setting priorities the Government should have considered that project in cooperation with some organisation, such as the Basketball Association. A dual facility should have been built. However, the Government does not see things that way and apparently my constituents and the economy of South Australia will continue to suffer until we get a Liberal Government.

Members opposite have been saying a lot about the health and employment policies of the two competing Parties at the current Federal election. I strongly object to this misleading and quite scurrilous campaign being undertaken by Mr Keating and one or two others about the Federal Opposition's policy on a capital gains tax. The capital gains tax is like a sleeping tiger sitting ready to bite off the head of the agricultural community and small business. Most people do not fully understand the impact that this tax will have on operations in the future, when they attempt to pass those businesses or properties over to their family, or when they try to convert funds into superannuation. They will get a tremendous shock.

The Prime Minister promised that he would not bring in a capital gains tax. He broke that election promise, just as he broke the promise about the railway line to Darwin. What he is doing is contrary to the best interests of all South Australians, let alone the interests of the nation as a whole. The capital gains tax will absolutely destroy the agricultural sector.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GUNN: Of course, the honourable member does not know what he is talking about. The honourable member fails to understand that many people involved in the agricultural industry have progressed; they are keen to improve themselves and to expand their operations. Many people have managed to obtain a small farm; have worked hard to improve it and have sold it and bought another property.

An honourable member: They are all in family trusts.

Mr GUNN: The honourable member does not seem to understand that to enter into any of those arrangements is a costly exercise and creates a great deal of unnecessary paper. It also lines the pockets of accountants and other advisers, but does nothing for the person who wants to be involved in some productive activity on behalf of the nation.

The capital gains tax, as with the decision to remove the 40 per cent investment allowance, is having a detrimental effect on the farming community because the capital costs involved in these rural properties, in replacing the massive amount of plant and equipment that is necessary so that our agricultural sector can remain the most highly productive and efficient in the world, are extremely high at present.

Many farmers who have not replaced their equipment in the past few years now wish to replace some of their equipment but the cost is absolutely astronomical. Therefore, it is essential that some taxation concessions be given to people who provide the bread and butter of the nation. Only two industries continue to provide the income necessary to sustain a reasonable living—agriculture and mining—yet those two industries have been attacked taxwise and by the Government's pandering to irrational groups such as environmentalists, greenies and other groups racing around the country popping up their heads every day. In particular, Federal Ministers are trying to appease them by preventing enterprises are in the long-term interest of the nation.

One cannot create employment unless one has development. Anyone who thinks that one can do that in any other way is living in cloud cuckoo land. The Government of the day and Senator Richardson and others can put out all the press statements they like but at the end of the day commonsense should prevail. We need to encourage people to invest and produce, because the only way in which we will be able to offset our balance of payments problem is to produce more. The two industries that can do that more quickly and efficiently than any other industries are agriculture and mining.

I would now like to say one or two things about the election campaign. The present Government had far more people on its payroll to assist in its election campaign than was previously the case. The former Leader of the Opposition (the member for Custance) explained this in detail, but what he did not say is that the Government had at least one unpaid press secretary—one Randall Ashbourne. To know this, all members have to do is read regularly Randall Ashbourne's newspaper column. One can bet a penny to a pound that on every occasion he will be an apologist for the Labor Party. Occasionally he will make a couple of fleeting criticisms about the ALP, but he always evens it up and prints one of his scurrilous and grossly inaccurate comments about the Liberal Party.

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

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I was interested to hear the member for Bragg commenting about the problems experienced by small business. I was also interested to read in *Business to Business* magazine (January edition) the article entitled 'But, the battle has just begun'. The editorial states:

Any member of the business community who is neither deaf, dumb, nor blind recognises the fact that the business climate in South Australia is not in the best of health.

I guess that that is an understatement. Certainly, the Opposition pointed that out during the last election campaign. Businesses are really hurting. The article also states:

One executive said that the past decade is the worst in years for small business, and the *Australian* ran a rather pessimistic article titled 'The coming crash'.

Members can see that the problem is not just restricted to South Australia but is also Australia-wide in most cases. However, this State cannot take any comfort from the way things are going and, now that a minority Government is in power, I simply hope that it will pull its act together and start doing something positive for small business. The article states:

Doesn't the Labor Government realise that when a small business closes its doors, not only is the entrepreneur out of a job, but also the secretary, the mechanic, the salesman, the driver and possibly a host of other 'everymen'?

That certainly is the case, and I know that in the agricultural sector it applies equally as well. I want to say more about that shortly. What really struck my attention was at the end of this article, because it related back to the State election campaign. Many members will recall the advertisement in the last week of the campaign that said 'Business backs Bannon'. The advertisement was placed by concerned South Australian business. I was wondering what business person could put in such an advertisement. *Business to Business* said:

... we were surprised, then amused, to see a full-page advertisement in the *Advertiser* proclaiming 'Business backs Bannon', placed by 'Concerned South Australian business' (all of us?). However, we weren't at all surprised when the person who 'placed' the ad, J. Glamocak, whoever and whatever he may be, didn't return our calls. Should we have been, Mr Bannon?

It is obvious that this person was put up by the Labor Party.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: It is quite obvious. If time permitted, I would requote it. Have a look at *Business to Business*. The Labor Party realised that the end had come for it. It is quite possible that the few hundred votes that the Labor Party won that last seat by could well have gone to the Liberal Party had not such a false advertisement been placed in the press. The falsity in the last campaign was shown in many ways. I remember seeing a sign at Glenelg, 'Keep our trams. Vote Labor'. That was totally ridiculous, yet people are taken in by it. There is no doubt that, as *Business to Business* has correctly recognised, businesses in this State are in for a hard time, and they have been.

I have with me the South Australian bankruptcy figures for 1977 to 1988. With your permission, Mr Speaker, I would like to incorporate this table into *Hansard*.

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Mr MEIER: Leave granted. Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MEIER: I did ask for your permission, Mr Speaker, to incorporate this table into *Hansard*, and I thought that I heard that leave was granted.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member is being very presumptuous. Is the table purely statistical?

Mr MEIER: It is, Mr Speaker.

Leave granted.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN BANKRUPTCY, 1977-88

	Bankruptcy	Companies	Total
1977	551	1 20	671
1978	754	124	878
1979	944	178	1 122
1980	1 035	254	1 289
1981	957	231	1 188

	Bankruptcy	Companies	Total
1982	887	259	1 146
1983	921	238	1 159
1984	776	200	976
1985	774	201	975
1986	1 217	243	1 460
1987	1 528	206	1 734
1988	1 526	272	1 798
Total	11 870	2 526	14 396

Source: *Dun's Gazette*, Adelaide.

Mr MEIER: I think that all members will be interested to see this table, because it shows a massive increase in the number of bankruptcies in this State, particularly in the past three years from 1986, and remember that it goes only to 1988. The 1989 figures were not available this morning from the authority from which I was getting them. The table shows an increase from 1985 when, in ordinary bankruptcies, 774 businesses went bankrupt. That figure jumped to 1 217 in 1986, and that has continued to rise so that the last figure—for 1988—is 1 526 bankruptcies. If one adds to that the companies that went bankrupt—another 272, which I guess is a record—we have a total of 1 798 bankruptcies for this State, and the trend is not getting any better.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Why are we not on the other side of the House? We should be, but for false advertising on behalf of the Labor Party. That is part of the reason.

The Hon. H. Allison: And 52 per cent of the vote.

Mr MEIER: Fifty-two per cent of the vote is another part of the reason. As a Party, we have always stuck to honesty, and we will get into government through honest means. It is a shame on all members opposite that they have to use dishonest techniques such as those that I highlighted earlier, and there are many others, to get into and stay in government.

Mr Groom: What do you understand by honesty?

Mr MEIER: I would love to tell you what honesty is and go through a dissertation on it. I think I did one in my university days, but four minutes will not allow me to get very far. The way that this Government is performing is going from bad to worse. I have mentioned the bankruptcy figures. In today's paper we see a headline, 'Land tax hike protesters vow to risk gaol'. In this so-called enlightened age—1990—we find that we still have a Government in South Australia that is prepared to wield its force and power and throw people into gaol if they are not prepared to do the right thing from the point of view of the Government by paying their rates.

The land tax hikes involve increases up to 1 600 per cent in some cases, and that was identified by Mr Binns, one of the key spokespersons at last night's rally. Increases of this order are not believable. One would suggest that surely that could not happen in Australia, let alone in South Australia—but, it is, and it is to this Government's detriment that it simply stands by and does nothing.

We have all heard the Premier say, 'I would like to do something about it but I don't know what I can do.' The Premier has completely lost control of his Party. One has only to look at Government members when the Premier tries to answer a question: they turn the other way and try to cover their faces. It will be only a matter of time before Mr Ashbourne writes an article asking who the State's next Premier will be; and he probably will not have to wait long because I believe that we will have another Premier soon.

It really is a problem that small business in particular is facing these massive increases in land tax. During the election campaign the Opposition highlighted, in the week before the election, the fact that the State Government deliberately

delayed sending out the 1989-90 land tax bills. However, the Government denied that. The truth has now come forward, and that is another reason why the minority Government opposite is only just hanging on—the people have seen through it in more ways than one.

We must not forget that it is not only the State Government but Labor generally that is quite happy to increase taxes and rip the business sector to bits—and not only the business sector but families as well. It is interesting to see that the average family now pays over \$100 more in tax per week than was the case in 1983 when the Hawke Government came to power. The Hawke Government is also responsible for the worst housing crisis Australia has ever seen. When Labor came to power in 1983, it took 19 per cent of household income to purchase the average home; today it takes a massive 30 per cent—and, as we all know, that continues to rise. The massive interest rate hikes have resulted in the highest rates we have ever had. In 1984 Hawke had the audacity to say that he would make housing affordable, and only a year or two ago he said that interest rates would come down. I admit that I chuckled with laughter—

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

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): In addressing the Supply Bill I will highlight areas of extremely urgent need in the electorate of Newland—areas of need that have been highlighted to me by a host of people who have made contact with me through my electorate office in recent weeks and people whose position in the community place them in direct contact with persons whose individual needs have not been met by this Government's distribution of funds.

The first area I wish to highlight is the needs of school-aged children who require out-of-school hours care. These are the children of the residents in my electorate. In Newland alone, nine primary schools cater for the area's educational requirements. It should be immediately obvious that an area requiring nine schools to cater for its school-aged children has a higher propensity need to provide services singularly identified as genuine need in relation to this higher population of school-aged children.

It is important to note that no child-care centre specifically for school-aged children is available in the area. In recent years four of my schools have applied successfully for funding for after school hours care and, under the local supervision of management committees, they are working successfully. However, I suggest that the success of the existing programs most certainly designates the priority that should be awarded to other district schools applying, with duly compelling reasons, for funding to provide after school care programs.

The infrastructures for these programs are provided by the existing schools and the management is provided by parents. In comparison with the service provided the funding is therefore minimal. I believe it is necessary to provide after-school hours care to all schools calling for this provision. To provide selectively is to discriminate and, as two further schools in my area have applied for funding and have been rejected, discrimination is, in effect, occurring now.

The Bureau of Statistics shows that within the electorate of Newland up to 75 per cent of married women are in the work force. If funding is not forthcoming in this area of need, the question can reasonably be asked: is the Government serious in its stated commitment to support the family? Our economy is dictated by high interest rates, and this severely affects the family budget and forces women in the

home to seek employment—in many cases not by choice—in order to supplement the family budget and to provide for the needs of their children. I, therefore, do not think it unreasonable to expect support from our Government to shore up this gap in children's needs brought about by the active policy implementation of both State and Federal Governments.

I also bring to the attention of the House an apparent anomaly within the financial support scheme for disadvantaged schoolchildren. This scheme is the Government Assisted Subsidy (GAS). The anomaly was made apparent when, due to lack of available funds, a local school council had to adopt a proposal whereby books were withheld from students whose parents had sought Government assistance until such time as those funds became available. This could mean a delay of up to eight weeks which, of course, is the major part of the first term. This action caused considerable stress for the students, and extreme embarrassment for the parents.

I believe it is necessary that action be taken to circumvent this discriminating delay in transference of funds—funds which have been identified as necessary due to disadvantage. I trust that the Minister will seek to remedy this anomaly and I suggest that interim funds be made available to enable the book requirements of these students to be met until the official Government funding becomes available.

Another area of disadvantage to the residents of the northern and north-east suburbs relates to the disabled. There is a need—a very great need—to expand the high level support accommodation service in the northern area for people with an intellectual disability. In 1986 Parent Advocacy Incorporated identified that the lack of accommodation with high level support in the northern area was a major concern to families of people with intellectual disability. At that time there were no services for families to link, with many of them barely surviving from one crisis to the next. One can imagine how hopeful they were when, in December 1988, a joint program of \$1 million was announced by the Federal Minister for Community Services and Health, Dr Blewett, and the then State Minister of Health, Mr Blevins, to allow people with disabilities to live in community settings. Funding was for five supported accommodation services for children, adolescents and adults with severe disabilities. One of the five was in the northern area and was given through the auspices of Barkuma Incorporated to assist four people.

The southern area was allocated funding for 19 people. Obviously, this cannot be seen as equitable, particularly when the demand is about the same. It is important to reiterate that only one of the five was in the northern area and funding was available only for four people. Barkuma Incorporated has now applied to expand its service by up to 12 places and, as the urgent waiting lists continue to grow, people in this area have advocated most strongly that funding be allocated immediately.

The proposed allocation would begin to address the current inequity of service provision between northern and southern areas of Adelaide. It is agreed by all concerned, that is, the funding bodies, the agencies and families that the northern area has missed out fairly dramatically in the past with regard to funding, resulting in long waiting lists for accommodation services. Assurances were given to the 70-plus families involved in seeking accommodation services for the north that this inequity would be addressed in the 1989-90 financial year. The horrifying fact is that, as yet, families are still waiting for decisions to be reached. They find the lack of urgency by agencies making decisions

totally incomprehensible, considering the desperate situation of many families.

It is interesting to note that the Victorian Government has increased funding for services to people with an intellectual disability by \$30 million taking it to \$205 million in 1990-91, and this is for some 14 000 people. South Australia has more than 6 000 people with an intellectual disability and a budget of \$55 million. That is less than half per capita than our Victorian counterparts. Families on the urgent waiting list continue to live under extreme pressure. Having been on the urgent list for a considerable time, many of them are using respite and other services quite heavily, which limits accessibility to other families, thereby creating a shortage of these services. This problem will continue to expand and impact on other services until adequate funding is provided. Families have requested my assistance to secure funding to expand the Barkuma service.

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

Mr GROOM (Hartley): In this financial debate, I will answer a few matters that the Opposition raised in what were some very disappointing contributions. The member for Eyre dealt with the capital gains tax and said that it was an iniquitous tax. Let me point out that it has brought fairness to the taxation system. It has meant that tax rates for personal income tax have come down from 60c in the dollar to 47c in the dollar and will drop further. It has meant that corporate tax rates have dropped from 47c in the dollar to 39c in the dollar. There is no reason why, if someone gains an increase in wealth through capital gains, a fair proportion of that ought not be paid back in the same way as people who get an expansion of their ordinary income pay additional income tax.

Almost all OECD countries have some form of capital gains tax. It has meant that investment has grown in Australia as a result. There is less speculation. The fact of the matter is that, in the past five years, there has been a 10.8 per cent growth rate in the Australian economy, compared with a 2.2 per cent growth rate over the previous 15 years. Approximately 2.5 per cent of corporate taxpayers pay capital gains tax and 68 per cent of that 2.5 per cent are in the highest bracket. Last financial year, something like \$500 million was raised through capital gains tax. It is true that it will grow, but it has shifted the burden from people who cannot afford taxation, people who are in a tighter situation than the wealthier members of the community.

What will the Liberal Party do? It will effectively abolish the capital gains tax and, if that is abolished, it will either have to cut services or raise revenue in some other way. What will occur? Those policies will take us back to the old days of speculation, back to tax avoidance; and they will mean increases in speculation so that house and rural land prices increase substantially. Tell that to first home buyers when the price of houses and rural properties skyrockets, because that is what will occur. Speculation will be rife.

There has been investment in productive enterprises such as factories and jobs as a consequence of the capital gains tax—less speculation. What will the Liberal Party do? It is no good the member for Newland going on about services, because they will be the first to be cut under a Liberal Federal Government, which will not have the money. That is exactly what will occur.

Pensions will be cut. Pensioners will not get the increases they received under Labor Governments. Health services will be cut. If the capital gains tax is abolished and services are not cut the only other alternative is increased taxation, and we know what the Liberals will do: they will bring in

a consumption tax—make no mistake about it. That is their policy. One cannot take \$1 billion out of revenue and not replace it unless one cuts services dramatically. So they will either cut services or bring in a consumption tax. That was their policy until the heat became too great.

What did they do? They backed off and said, 'Not in our first term. But it is open for the second term.' What will occur under a Liberal Government is that a consumption tax will be introduced. Whereas 1 per cent of Australian taxpayers and corporate taxpayers now pay the capital gains tax, the consumption tax will shift that burden to the other 99 per cent of the population, because people will pay it through goods and services. Who will benefit? People such as the Federal President of the Liberal Party, Mr Elliott, will gain; he will gain \$17 million on his share dealings as a consequence of the capital gains tax being lifted.

It is no good the member for Eyre going on about farmers and small business being hit. That does not happen. But the wealthy members of the community, people who are better off if they get an increase in their wealth through capital gains, should pay a fair share by way of tax.

I want to deal now with land tax and leases. There is no question that these sorts of imposts have a substantial affect on small business. Land tax is a capital tax. It is a tax on the owners of land. It is not a tax on lessees. What has happened to commercial leasing arrangements in Australia? Through lease contractual provisions, through dominance in the marketplace, capital taxes have been forced onto small businesses. A land tax is a tax on the owner of land: it is not a tax on small retailers. It is the same as council rates. It does not occur with residential properties. If one rents a residential property, one pays only the rent and the rent is divided into various components of profitability, outgoings, overheads, repairs, and so on. There is a base rate. But with commercial tenancies over the past 20 to 35 years this cost has been forced onto small businesses through contractual provisions in leases. It should not be passed onto tenants in this way. The member for Bragg misrepresented my position a week or so ago. I have made speeches on this matter over many years and I have argued that that should be part of the base rate because, if it were, there would be a timing benefit to small business. It is true that it can be built into the base rate but one would not see the dramatic increases that are evident today. Small business people who are lessees are not sharing in the wealth.

It is all very well for people to pay capital taxes if they are to get a proportion of the land when it is sold, but that does not happen. They pay the capital taxes of the lessors, and that is not right. This matter must be tackled on a national basis, because big businesses will say to the South Australian Government, 'We will go interstate.' That has been the traditional way of playing off State Governments. We must tackle this problem on a national basis. Land tax is a capital tax on the owners of land and it should not be passed on. About 25 to 30 years ago it was included in the base rate. What will happen is that there will be a timing advantage to small business, because people know that, if the land tax is due in October or November, at least there is 12 months before the rent can be adjusted again. Not only that, if it is included in the base rate, there will be CPI adjustments, because leases are usually subject to annual review or relate to the CPI, so there will be a CPI adjustment only if it is included in the base rate. It is not right and proper that commercial lessees should pay the capital taxes of lessors when they are not gaining any benefits.

Although members opposite go on about land tax, they do so for political reasons. I do not believe that they are genuine about land tax, and the public knows that. Why

are they not tackling the way in which annual rentals are adjusted under commercial leases?

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: A Bill will be introduced very shortly.

Mr Lewis: Get on with it.

Mr GROOM: The member for Murray-Mallee must have been asleep last session, because it was introduced before the House prorogued. That shows how much the member for Murray-Mallee pays attention to small business. It is the same legislation as was introduced in October last year.

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: When members opposite were in government they commissioned a report in 1981, and what did they find? They whitewashed the whole thing. They said that there was no exploitation of the small business community. They advocated letting market forces predominate; in other words, let big business eat small business. That is what members opposite did in government, and that report is on the parliamentary record. It was a do nothing Government and members opposite were prepared to leave small business to the mercy of big business. Whenever there is a clash between small and big business, members opposite will support big business.

I have seen rental increases of 30 per cent to 40 per cent on leases on annual reviews. Capital taxes pale in significance alongside the rip-offs relating to the rentals of commercial tenants. The honourable member knows that I am right. Someone paying \$1 000 a month who is suddenly faced with a 40 per cent increase in rent pays another \$400 a month. Over a year that amounts to \$4 800, without any increase in turnover.

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: We are going to do that, and I hope that the honourable member supports the legislation when it is debated and supports small business, because members opposite belong to a Party that supports big business and they have elected a big business Leader. They have elected a man who represents the big business community.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr GROOM: The honourable member must have a short memory, because in 1983 I introduced the first private member's Bill in Australia to reform the law relating to commercial leasing. That was picked up on an inquiry, became a Government Bill, was passed in this Parliament in 1985 and operated from 1 January.

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

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): The Labor Party is obviously desperate to put aside some of the facts that have impressed themselves upon the public of Australia, one being that the Labor Party is the friend of the very wealthy. We know perfectly well that the Labor Party is worried about the fact that the richest people in Australia have, for a number of years, supported the Labor Party and supported it heavily. We have to look at some of the money shufflers who are now in trouble. Friends have fallen out in Western Australia, for instance. We remember Mr Bond's newspaper advocating forcefully a vote for the Labor Party in that State. It is reported that Mr Bond gave the then Premier \$5 million to fight the campaign. He certainly supported them very heavily.

We know that many other leading lights who have led the charge and whose wealth was increased dramatically over the past few years have supported the Labor Party, because they got a lot fatter and richer under its policies. Of course, the honourable member tries to knock this view because it is widely held and understood that that is the

case around Australia. During the life of the Hawke/Keating Government the rich have got infinitely richer (until the stock market crash when a few home truths were learnt) whilst everyone else got poorer. The poor got infinitely poorer and middle Australia is feeling the pinch. Who is suffering under this regime? The average Australian is suffering.

When I came into this place some years ago, the catchcry of Premier Dunstan was 'We will cut down the tall poppies and tax the rich.' I took the trouble to take out some statistics and indicated the fact that, if you wanted to raise the sort of revenue required to fund all of the Labor Party's fancy social programs, it was no good thinking they could soak the rich. If all the income of those in the top bracket was taken, the social programs that Labor, both State and Federal, were advocating, such as Medicare, could not be funded. Middle class Australia would have to be soaked, and that is what this mob has done. They have soaked middle Australia, killed them off and pandered to their wealthy mates, a number of whom were in control of the media and supported the Labor Party strongly during that period.

It is all right for the member to get up and try to accuse the Liberal Party of their own sins. The fact is that the Labor Party has looked after its wealthy mates and made them wealthier. It was a fairly valiant attempt to talk down a capital gains tax. However, I suggest that the honourable member has a talk to the small business community, the farming community, anyone who has improved his or her property, anyone who has taken in a boarder—indeed, anyone in business—and he will find that the capital gains tax will hit the small business people who have worked and whose only investment and security for the future is the capital which they have managed to accumulate because they have been prepared to work 80 hours a week in their small business. That is to be sliced and sliced heavily by this Government, which obviously is determined to break the business community, particularly the small business community, because they are the people who will be hurt. They are the people who will be thrown onto the social security system because their life savings, their life's effort, which is only realised in terms of capital gain, will be taxed.

I saw the Hawke debate on Sunday night. He thought he was a winner on this one, but let him talk to the small business community, which will be really penalised by this tax. Let him talk to those who have invested in superannuation funds. They will be hit by the capital gains tax.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: They will be. The Liberal Party proposed a speculative gains tax which will catch those who make the quick buck within a period of five years. The honourable member has the gall to talk about speculators not getting rich under the Labor Party, when the people whom I have mentioned became fabulously wealthy until the stock market crash caught up with them. I remember an article in the afternoon *News* which indicated that Holmes a Court was making about \$3 000 per second at that stage. This is under the Labor Party, the friends of the poor, who really are struggling. The honourable member mentioned consumption tax. We all know perfectly well that the Labor Treasurer's preferred option when Hawke announced his tax summit was a consumption tax.

Mr Groom interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, let us hear the honourable member's. We know that the Labor Party wished to introduce a consumption tax. Blind Freddie knew it. Keating was advocating it. It was the Labor Party's preferred option until the unions killed it off. Hawke went off late

one night for a meeting with the ACTU, the Labor Party's master who determines what the wages policy will be, and the ACTU said that it was not on, so it was not on. Do not let the honourable member get up here and try to fool us that a consumption tax was not the preferred option of the Labor Government. The fact is that it did not have the authority, because it does not have the authority to govern in its own right. It cannot govern without the concurrence of the ACTU. That is what killed off the consumption tax. Do not let us have this humbug about who wants a consumption tax. Then the honourable member had the temerity to try to defend his Government's record on land tax.

The Liberal Government removed land tax on the principal place of residence. The Premier in one of his more forthright moments—and there are not many of them—suggested that that move had unbalanced and distorted the land tax scales. He would dearly love to put land tax back on the principal place of residence. However, he does not have the stomach to even—

Mr Ingerson: He hasn't got the guts.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course he does not, he does not have the guts to take any decisions, let alone a decision like this. In a letter to a constituent who complained about this matter—a highly political letter no doubt written by one of his minders, but signed by the Premier—he stated that the Liberal Party's decision had distorted the land tax schedules. In other words, he decried the fact that the Liberal Party had removed land tax on the principal place of residence.

Who are the people who now complain bitterly about land tax? It is the small business community because the land tax has added to their costs and pushed them closer towards that category of small business people who are going bankrupt—and South Australia has a record number of those. During Question Time today a proposal by ETSA to remove some charges on the small business community was put forward. This was a firm proposal put forward by ETSA. We know that we have the dearest electricity in Australia and that industrial tariffs are the highest in the land. No wonder we are not competitive. A firm proposal was put to the Government by the ETSA board, which includes a couple of union heavies, to reduce the cost on small business and the farming community. and what did the Government do? It knocked it on the head.

Members get up here and shed crocodile tears about land tax when we know that the Government will do nothing about it. And, when we know that there are firm proposals to do something to help the small business community, such as relief from the capital gains tax and relief from ETSA charges here on the local scene, what happens? The Government knocks it on the head! This would have to be the most hypocritical speech that I have heard from this honourable member for some time. He comes in late to these debates—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am only late by chance. The Government holds its fire and throws him in. He is one of the big guns. He has legal training, so up he gets—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am sorry, they use him. They would not put him in the Ministry because he crossed the Premier on WorkCover. He committed the unforgivable sin—he spoke his mind. Anyone in the Labor Party who speaks his mind and does not coincide with the thinking of the Premier is done. One thing is for sure—he has a long memory. The honourable member spoke his mind on WorkCover and is now relegated—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He has got out of cobweb corner into the middle bench and his role now is to try late in the debate to refute any arguments put up by members on this side. That would have to be one of the most ill-considered speeches that I have heard from the honourable member in a long time, although I must confess that I have not been hanging on his every word over the past week or two. So, he should not get up here and rant and rave about capital gains tax and land tax, and about who are the mates of the very wealthy in this country because, we all know that it was a tongue in cheek exercise.

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

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): It is a pleasure to follow the member for Kavel because we realise how much he knows about the economy and tonight he has enunciated very well the main problems. I am interested to note that the member for Hartley, who has been the fore-runner for his side of politics in the past couple of weeks, is the only one who stood up and tried to bring up the debate to us on this side of the House. I do not know why he has tried to do that. I know that he missed out and that the member for Briggs got into the Ministry. The member for Hartley is valiantly trying to come down from cobweb corner. He has got this far.

I do not know whether he wants to take the Premier's spot or that of the member for Briggs, but he is making the biggest run that he has made since I have been in this Parliament. He is trying to impress us with his knowledge of the economy, but I am not sure whether that knowledge is getting across to the members of this House. I do not know what you, Mr Speaker, think about this, but, of course, you cannot comment on it at this stage.

In speaking on the Supply Bill—and I notice that I have 29 minutes left, but I will not take up the time of the House because I know that some members have to go to other functions—it is obvious that the Government is trying to cover up something. In the papers presented to the Opposition for the first time the Premier has not got up and said that there will be a surplus in the budget. He has said, 'We don't know how things are going and we must be very careful.' Of course he does not know, because what he is trying to get through to us is that things are not going too well in South Australia and there will be a budget deficit. How he has covered it in the past, of course, is by the amount of money SAFA puts in. That, of course, is the goose that lays the golden egg on 30 June. However, it is getting harder and harder to fiddle, because the Opposition is probing day by day and finding out what is going on at SAFA.

When we look at what is going on in South Australia, it is very interesting to note what is happening to small business in this State. The member for Kavel covered this matter in the land tax issue. Land tax is one of the most iniquitous taxes we have ever had in South Australia, and one that the Government does not have the guts to address. Fancy coming out and saying to small business people in South Australia, some of whom have had up to 2 000 per cent increases, 'Pay this year's 60 days later and we will have a look at it.' Fancy coming out in the business world and saying that! That is an insult.

Go back to 1988-89, freeze it, adjust it to the CPI and have a good look at it. We have told you for two years about land tax, but you do not have the guts to do anything for small business in South Australia. All you do is rake in the \$70 million-plus that you are going to get from small

business, while record numbers are going broke in this State, and you are not doing one thing about it. I want the member for Hartley to get up and tell us what he believes is a fair thing, because that is not a fair thing.

Mr Groom: They're not going broke.

Mr D.S. BAKER: We have the largest number of bankruptcies recorded since the depression, and the member for Hartley does not get out there in the real world and find out what is going on in the business community. That is the problem with you people. No-one has had any experience in business. The member for Henley Beach, I know, has a lot of shares and is wealthy in his own right, but none of the rest of you have ever done anything in the business community. You do not know what it is all about to struggle and slave and employ people. You have been the employed class all your life and you have not done anything for the goodwill of this State.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader will address his remarks through the Chair.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I am sorry, Mr Speaker. A typical example arose today during Question Time. ETSA, one of the best entities in South Australia, had put to the people of South Australia that it wanted to reduce fees; it wanted to reduce the burden of taxes on people in South Australia and do something to help small business, business in general and the farming community. I do not have to tell members that the farming community produces most of the wealth of this State.

However, ETSA in its magnanimity, has put this exercise to Cabinet. The Opposition produced the documents and, in his defence, the Minister put it to Cabinet, but what did Cabinet say? It said, 'We're not going to take it on because we'll lose some other fees. We're sucking ETSA dry every year and we're not going to listen to it.' It just shows what these people on the other side of the House really think about the people of South Australia.

I wish some of them would stand up and try to defend what they have done today and what they did in Cabinet on Monday. What they have done, Mr Speaker, is absolutely deny struggling business people in this State any chance whatsoever of keeping their heads above water. Why do they have problems in business in South Australia? We have record interest rates in this State which are absolutely crueling all business, large and small, and what is that doing? Employment in this State is falling quite rapidly. We are trying to cover it up in the next four weeks, of course, because an election is coming on, but we have seen what happened in October and November. We covered everything up before the State election; then, as soon as it was over, the truth started coming out. Just look at Homesure, Homesafe or whatever they called it before the election. The documents have been presented to this Parliament. I know what the promise was: the Premier knows what the promise was, but all of a sudden the minders got hold of it and said, 'You can't afford it.' Treasury said, 'Mr Premier, you have held your hand out in goodwill to the people of South Australia, but we're now going to cut it off,' and they went along with it.

Members interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: A Clayton's scheme? It's worse than that! 'Clayton's' would be the best way to describe it. It is an absolutely arrogant way to treat the voters of South Australia and those who are in financial difficulty: to promise them something and then rewrite the rules after Christmas so that most of them cannot obtain it. The Deputy Leader with his financial knowledge—which no people on that side have—has spoken on it on many occasions and explained how they are trying to cut off 15 000 families in

South Australia from what is rightfully theirs. That is some help with interest rates!

The Liberal Party had the guts to get up and promise it, stand by it and cost it. Yet the Labor Party did not even have the guts to come clean after the event. When we exposed what happened, the Labor Party hid behind inaccurate advertisements and did everything else that it could do to ensure that the promise was not fulfilled because the Treasury said, 'You cannot afford to do it little boy, you will have to cut somewhere else.' Since it has been in power this Government has never tried to sensibly cut the cloth to fit. That is why business in this State is in so much trouble—because this Government goes on spending. It has no business management skills whatsoever and, what is more, has no financial expertise.

I do not know why the member for Briggs does not interject because he should know; he is purported to have some business expertise. The greatest expertise he has exhibited since he has been in this place is to tear the back page off the very positive report on Roxby Downs. I was not around in those days, but that will live with him for as long as he is here because it epitomises the activities of the Government. The member for Briggs says that he will take over from the Premier when he resigns in the next two years. We know that he is getting out and going to Canberra after the Labor Party loses the Federal election and after the Federal Minister for Health retires. The Premier will get away as quickly as he can and the member for Briggs will take over the job. A few of his colleagues do not believe that he is that competent. However, it will be a very good infight in the Caucus and I would love to be a fly on the wall and count the votes, because it will be a very intriguing exercise in the Labor Party room. Everything is clear cut on our side; it happens very quickly. However, it will be very interesting to see what goes on.

I will now refer to a couple of other matters that are very pertinent to the debate tonight. One issue is the cover-up that the Premier is undertaking in relation to the State Bank and the support he is giving it. The State Bank has been caught out on several occasions and every time we on this side of the House bring up the issue we hear, 'Foul. It is our bank. What are you doing criticising our bank?' I believe that the State Bank has a lot to answer for. It made a provision for bad debts last year and, all of a sudden, it has found that provision to be inadequate. Suddenly we have another hurried press release in the past couple of days saying, 'Look, we have made a bit of a mistake, we are allowing for a greater amount in bad debts.' However, we are told behind the scenes that there is still a big cover-up.

The Opposition will keep probing even though the Premier asks what right the Opposition has to probe what is happening in the State Bank, because the Government does not have anything to do with it. Not much it doesn't! It has a big draw into Treasury funds from the State Bank and the Opposition believes that it is about time the State Bank came clean and told us its financial position, because there is a cloud hanging over it. Why does the Premier—this guru of economics of this State—say that we do not have the right to ask the questions. That is absolute nonsense!

Mr Becker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr D.S. BAKER: Do not worry about the manipulator; it is bad enough having the fabricator in here. Then we have the Premier saying, 'I am sorry the State cannot do several things because it is short of money'. Short of money! The Government has been propping up the South Austra-

lian Timber Corporation for the four years that I have been in this place. It is continuing to prop up the scriumber operation in Mount Gambier, which has now cost this State \$50 million. In the past three years two Ministers have said the project is on track and will start very soon to produce 40 000 cubic metres of timber, but that has never come to fruition.

Not a fortnight ago, the scriumber operators told us, 'Sorry, there will be three stages of implementation of production but we cannot tell you when they will commence.' Investment of \$50 million in new technology has been made and, as yet, it has not produced \$1 for the taxpayers of South Australia. It is gross incompetence and it must fall right back on the head of the Treasurer of this State, who went into it with his eyes open and with the full knowledge of the ramifications. The Government has tried to fudge the situation for the past three years.

It is a bit like the *Island Seaway*. If you know nothing about it, you just hope that she sails. The *Island Seaway* is a bit like scriumber—she has never sailed yet. The financial management of these operations is an absolute indictment of the Government, and it just goes to show that any Government that tries to fiddle where private enterprise can do best gets its fingers burnt. I do not know when the Government will understand that private enterprise does its best.

Mr Ferguson: Are you going to sell off the State Bank?

Mr D.S. BAKER: No, we are going to make it work properly; we will make it disclose to the public of South Australia exactly where its funds are and exactly what it is doing. The member for Henley Beach is one of the better members on the Government side on economic measures because he is one of the wealthiest. Certainly, I do not know why the Government did not bring him forward on to the front bench. Why did the Government kick him on to the back bench, because he is one of the most competent of the Government members on economics. I know that you, Mr Speaker, did not take his place, but I do not know who did. The member for Henley Beach has been hard done by and I do not know why the Government has put him on the back bench. The member for Hartley does not have much hope ever again.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: We know why you are there. WorkCover is another example. When I first came to this House we debated WorkCover at length. The Deputy Leader, the then member for Mitcham, debated WorkCover for hours, pointing out the problems. We debated what it would do to work practices in South Australia and what it would cost South Australian employers. Everything that was put on the record that night has come home to roost. WorkCover has become an absolute cost burden to business in this State, as with land tax and all the other taxes being imposed. Now we hear that the Government will have another look at land tax. We have been pressing for two years in respect of WorkCover, saying that efficient industries with a safety record should have reductions. What is WorkCover doing? It is leaving the efficient industries where they are and increasing the levy on others because WorkCover has to get in more money. How can anyone run a business in those circumstances?

Already, WorkCover has lost \$18 million to \$20 million, but the Government told the House that there would be no unfunded liability. Somehow that money has to be recovered. That scheme will be one of the greatest millstones around the neck of industry in this State unless we can grab it out of Government hands and make it competitive with private enterprise. We need to get private enterprise values back in

it. If we do not do that, it will end up like the Victorian scheme.

It is about time that some of the financial gurus on that side realised that. The Government should send the member for Henley Beach to look at the Savings Bank of Victoria, WorkCare and a few of those other schemes. He might be able to come back and advise the Government about how these things really work. However, I have not noticed him going there, and probably it will not happen. On top of it all, we introduced a motion in the last week for electoral reform, a simple motion—

Mr Groom: Your Party doesn't believe in—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr D.S. BAKER: I am glad that the member for Hartley interjects, because all we are asking is that we have fair elections in this State. It is a simple proposition—nothing else. We are saying that the Party that gets 50 per cent of the two-Party preferred vote, plus one, should have the chance to form a Government. Is that not fair? The member for Hartley might want to comment later, but he has had his 10 minutes and cannot comment. Obviously, the member for Hartley does not understand what one vote one value is. It means that it does not matter where a person lives in South Australia—whether it be in Mount Gambier, Semaphore or Roxby Downs—one has an equal chance of electing the Government. That is very simple.

Mr Groom: No, it's not.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr D.S. BAKER: The member for Hartley tells me that he has more academic qualifications than anyone else in the House, and I hope to explain to him the simple formula of one vote one value. I will repeat it: one vote one value means that wherever one casts one's vote, whether it be in the electorate of Victoria, Henley Beach or Kavel, each vote cast has an equal chance of electing a Government. It is a simple proposition. That is all we are asking for. To hear the bleating from the other side of the House and the nonsense talked by the member for Hartley, who should know better, is an indictment on what we stand for in this State.

I cannot understand why, when we have to get 52 per cent of the two-Party preferred vote in South Australia, it is called a fair election. If we had had 52.1 per cent in this last one, that would have done it. However, 52.1 per cent to win Government in this State is called a fair election; but in Queensland the Party has to get 52 per cent and that is called a gerrymander. The facts of life are that since 1939 no Government has been elected in Queensland that did not get over 50 per cent of the two-Party preferred vote. That is what that mob, those honourable members, call a gerrymander. They are the facts of life.

For the first time for 15 years we have the chance—I hope that members on the other side of the House will support the select committee, because I know that members on this side will support it—to make sure that we have fair elections in this State. That is all that we are asking for. The drivel that is talked by some members over there, especially the member for Hartley who should have enough intelligence, is demeaning to the people of South Australia. We want both Houses to look at it. We want them to take evidence from all interested Parties. It will show that equal numbers of electors in electorates does not necessarily give fair elections.

All we are asking for is a system which provides that the Party that gets 50 per cent of the vote plus one has a chance to form the Government. As the Opposition, we will be very happy to fight the Labor Party on any issue that it

wants to bring up. At the next election, I can assure members opposite that, if we have a fair election, they will be sitting over here, and the State will be a lot better off for it because, all of a sudden, we shall get some economic management of South Australia which we have not got under that lot.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): The Leader has covered a number of subjects very well in regard to the economy, taxation, electoral reform, and a lot of other matters. I want to come back to basics and talk about a few environmental issues. I want to talk about some interesting things with which I was involved yesterday. A couple of other members also attended the same functions. They will be able to share the pleasure that was experienced at those two functions yesterday.

The first that I had the pleasure to attend was the launching of Operation Land Care. My colleague the member for Goyder also attended that launch. It was an excellent day. I was very pleased to see that the *Advertiser*, in its editorial, referred to it as the most important environmental action taken, and I support that. It was exciting because it was an opportunity to see conservationists, farmers, pastoralists and various departments coming together for one cause. So often in this place and outside we hear of many differences between those who would be seen to be conservationists and those who would be seen to be landowners. I think that we have always argued that both work very closely together, and in fact they have to.

If a person working on the land is to be successful, he has to be a conservationist. The editorial in this morning's *Advertiser* states:

By an irony, the farmers, who are those most often blamed for degrading the land, led the push on governments for Operation Landcare. Good modern farmers have become conservationists, understanding that the land is not there to be raped for one season, or one lifetime, but to be sustained for feeding the future.

I disagree with only one small point in that paragraph: I do not think that farmers have just learned to become conservationists; I think that that has been the case for some time in the majority of cases. I support what was stated in the *Advertiser* about yesterday's important launch and I hope that all those involved, both in this and other States around Australia, will receive support for what they are doing because the responsibility that they have in Operation Landcare is very important for future generations of Australians.

Yesterday I also had the opportunity to attend the launching of the Greenhouse Association of South Australia. I am disappointed that more members of this House were not able to attend that launch; perhaps the opportunity was not provided for them to do so. I was most impressed—and I say that quite sincerely—with both the organisation of that launch and the organisation itself. The attendance and the cross-section of people—young and elderly, from all walks of life—proved very clearly the support for such an organisation and the concern for aspects of the greenhouse effect. The objects of the Greenhouse Association of South Australia are as follows:

- (a) to provide an independent community-based focus concerning issues associated with the greenhouse effect;
- (b) to advocate actions regarding the greenhouse issue with Governments, industry and the community;
- (c) to coordinate and serve as a resource for activities relating to the greenhouse issue;
- (d) to contribute to education and information about the greenhouse issue and to facilitate information exchange;
- (e) to sponsor, undertake and encourage research to be carried out in relation to the greenhouse issue; and
- (f) to do all other things as are conducive or incidental to the attainment of the above objects.

The President, Mr Paul Downton, very well described the organisation, its aims and why it has been formed. The media, which were there in force, were given the opportunity to speak about what they expect of this planet in the year 2005. It was rather interesting to hear members of the media, who usually interview us, making profound statements, in the majority of cases, on this important subject. It was good that they were there because they will be able to carry on that message.

The Greenhouse Association has also prepared a list of what it refers to as a dozen things individuals can do. I do not think that anybody underestimates the extent of this worldwide problem, but it really boils down to individuals taking some positive action—and that is what the Greenhouse Association encourages us to do. It encourages us to sign the greenhouse declaration. I was pleased to see that yesterday many people were prepared to do just that. If I had more time, I would refer to that declaration in some detail. I commend the association to all members. As was the case with the motion which was debated in this place last year and which was supported on a bipartisan basis, I think it would be good for this House to recognise the importance of that association and to join up. It is a very worthwhile organisation to which to belong.

In my remaining two minutes, I also want to refer to the Mattingly survey which was released late last year. Some comment was made about it in the media. According to that survey of community attitudes towards the environment, the majority of Australians are more concerned about the environment than the economy. The results of the survey are most interesting. They demonstrate that there is ample evidence that concern for the environment is, and will continue to be, a major issue for Government, for Parliament, for industry and for all of us for a very long time. The survey suggests that it will be to the 1990s what the issue of health and nutrition was to the 1980s. In fact, it is a logical and natural extension of the 'take good care of yourself' ethos; it now extends beyond what people eat to the environment in which they and their children will live. It is an excellent survey. Again, it is available through the Parliamentary Library, and I commend it to any honourable member who is interested in environmental issues, because it is very factual and it is worthwhile reading.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): It never fails to amaze me that some members in this place believe that less than 12 should be equivalent to more than 13. I am simple but I am not that simple: I can see that they are not equals either arithmetically, sociologically or, for that matter, electorally. However, as my Leader earlier canvassed this subject very well, I will do no more than simply place on record my encouragement to other members in this Chamber to support the proposition that we have a full and wide-ranging inquiry into the voting system which operates in this State for the election of members to the House of Assembly. A situation in which it is possible for 12 people to have more of a say than 13 is not fair, yet that is exactly the case in this Chamber right now. In ratio terms those people who, on the two-Party preferred basis, voted for Labor are less than 12 compared with the more than 13 who chose to vote for the Liberal Party. So, we have a Government in office that is not a popular Government in comparison with the vote it has received and with that which its opponents have received.

When circumstances virtually identical to this arose just over 20 years ago, the call was constantly made by the man

who was to become Premier of the day (Donald Dunstan, the member for Norwood) and by another prominent Labor Party member, the current Premier, who at that time was simply John Bannon, a student on campus at Adelaide University, doing well in his studies and editor of the student newspaper *On Dit*. Notwithstanding the high-sounding, moral platitudes that he wrote at that time, or the sound arguments that he felt so passionately about, he cannot bring himself to make the same comments now or even own the remarks that he made then. I find that disappointing.

I turn now to the problem that has been mentioned in part by the member for Alexandra, my colleague and neighbour in electoral district terms, the Hon. Ted Chapman. The problem arises as a consequence of several factors, not the least of which is the high level of nutrients to be found in the water presently in Lake Alexandrina. The other factors required in general are that there be clear, warm water and sunlight. If there is no sunlight, the blooms will not develop: it is not good enough to have clear, warm water in the dark. The blooms are green in colour and have various cell structures.

Anabaena algae produce a bad odour and they can be distinguished from algae that is toxic to all mammals including man, that is, nodularia algae. As you know, Mr Speaker, since becoming a member of this place, I have drawn attention to the kind of pollutants that have caused problems in the water supply of this State, the principal water source being the Murray River. I spoke very strongly in favour of extending the Murray Valley League from simply those district council areas along the Murray River's general basin catchment areas to include those other people, especially in South Australia, who depend upon the Murray for their potable water source. That includes people as far away as Woomera, Iron Knob, Whyalla, all of Yorke Peninsula, the Mid North, the Upper South-East as far south as Keith, including Meningie, and the people of Adelaide. All those people depend on that river; yet, too little is being done too late.

The Government made great play of its commitment to establishing a research body to examine what has been happening and what needs to be done to rectify the problems created in the river by human occupation in one form or another. However, prior to the election, the Federal Government, believing that the issue was not one of significance, yet seeking endorsement from the people of South Australia, slashed its commitment by \$2.07 million or so to just \$5 million. That is close on 40 per cent of the residual sum it has now left in the budget for this purpose. That is appalling and to that extent I agree with the Federal President of the Murray Valley League, Mr Graham Camac, who is a constituent in the electorate that I have the honour to represent here. He is a very successful dairy farmer at Narrung. He does this State and this nation a great service, at great cost to himself and for no remuneration.

I commend the *Advertiser* for what it has had to say about the matter. First of all let us look at some of the things that are happening. The Albury City Council is proposing to put a new sewage plant in place. It will be downstream from Albury. They do not have the guts to put it upstream from where they will be withdrawing their own potable water. To their credit, I understand that some of the aldermen and councillors in Albury do not favour the proposal which is endorsed by a majority to put this new sewage works in such a position as to make it inevitable that the effluent must go back into the river. That is crook because it enhances the nutrient load and other contaminants.

Many people these days use water softeners and that increases the salinity level in the water. Salt is also picked up from other sources, be they domestic or industrial. So, invariably the water going back into the river is always greater in salinity load than it was at the time it was taken from the river to go into the potable supply for any township in the first instance. To his credit, Senator Coulter got it right when he said that phosphates are an essential and important ingredient in the overall level of nutrients that cause this problem. He called upon government to take action to remove the risk of phosphates polluting the water in the river and contributing to these algal blooms which are causing so much concern and which I am sure will ultimately cost some money.

I hope that if any stock losses result the Government will compensate the people who have lost that stock in the lower Murray and around the lakes district, because I know the Government has paid householders in the southern suburbs compensation for the clothing which they claimed had been ruined by dirty water in the mains. But the Government has never paid compensation to any of the people in my electorate at Tailem Bend, Karoonda or Murray Bridge, for instance, who have had much filthier water to contend with than the water which has caused the problems in the southern suburbs. However, of course, there is no risk of the Government ever unseating me, so I guess it is simply a pork-barrelling exercise on its part. Notwithstanding all that, we must ensure that the Federal Government is compelled morally to restore its funding level and indeed increase it, and I support everything which my friend, Mr Graham Camac, and other members of the Murray Valley League, of which I am also a member, are trying to do in that regard. I urge all honourable members to support that.

The next matter to which I would like to address my attention and that of the House involves a problem that arises in my electorate in relation to which nothing yet has been done, and I refer to the stupidity of charging a minimum fee every time a meter is read, in the delivery of power by ETSA to places like small country town halls, and so on. It is wrong that they should have to pay \$25 for \$2-worth of electricity, or whatever. Quite clearly, such meters do not need to be read four times a year. They could easily be read once a year and that would substantially reduce the administrative cost involved.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader.

Mr S.J. BAKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. M.D. RANN: (Minister of Employment and Further Education): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Last week I presented two petitions each from over 1 400 residents of my electorate which are opposed to the establishment of a mausoleum in the Centennial Park Cemetery at Pasadena. This proposal by the Centennial Park Cemetery Trust involves over 790 vaults to be located near a number of dwellings on the northern side of the Centennial Park Cemetery. The particular location chosen is next to a garden of remembrance established by the Department of Veterans' Affairs. This proposal does not involve embalming the bodies, but each of the individual vaults drains the bodily fluids from the corpses into the ground and releases the bodily gases into the air.

This proposal is the first of its kind in Australia, certainly on this scale. The location of this mausoleum is close to residences, in some places as close as 15 metres. In addition, the site selected by the Centennial Park Cemetery Trust was transferred from the Housing Trust in 1966. The then member for the area, Frank Walsh who was Premier at the time, and the Mitcham council guaranteed that that plot of land would be used for gardens, as a buffer between the cemetery and the residents.

Last July my predecessor, Ron Payne, wrote a letter to the Minister of Health regarding the proposed construction and outlining the substantial community concern. Like Ron Payne, I also strongly oppose a mausoleum being located in a built-up residential area and believe that, if a need exists for such a facility, it should be considered on a special basis well away from residential areas. The Minister, in his response of 26 September last year, indicated that a Crown law opinion was being sought on the ability of the Centennial Park Cemetery Trust to construct a mausoleum under the existing provisions of the Local Government Act and the general cemetery regulations.

An article in the *Messenger Press Courier* of 7 February relating to this matter and to the Crown Law opinion sought for Ron Payne states:

The Health Commission has sent a letter to the cemetery trust questioning the trust's legal power to develop the State's first mausoleum at the Pasadena cemetery. According to the Health Commission's legal advice the cemetery trust's plans do not comply with State cemetery regulations. 'The proposal to build the mausoleum conflicts with the provisions for the establishment of the trust,' the spokesman said.

In spite of this, the Centennial Park Cemetery Trust is proceeding with the proposal. The matter will go before the State Planning Commission, because Mitcham council was unable to consider the proposal as three of its members are on the board of the trust, the other three being members of the Unley council, and thus there was a conflict of interest. The article further states:

The Planning Commission spokesman said the Centennial Park Cemetery had not provided much detail about the development and experts from outside South Australia would have to advise the commission about the building of the mausoleum. The Planning Commission's main concerns were to protect residents from any smell of decomposing bodies in the tomb and to prevent noise from 'vocal mourners'. Residents were also concerned that fluids from decomposing bodies would seep into the underground watertable.

Members would realise why residents of my electorate are particularly concerned about this proposal. Their concern relates not only to the matter that is before the State Planning Commission under existing regulations: they are also concerned that there may be changes to legislation to permit mausolea. The second petition I presented stated that any mausoleum should be at least one kilometre from residential dwellings.

The concern of my constituents relates to the report of the Legislative Council Select Committee on the Disposal of Human Remains in South Australia in 1986. That report stated:

Your committee supports the view—

that is the view that above-ground interment be allowed—and considers that mausolea should be permitted subject to their plan and specifications being approved by the South Australian Health Commission to ensure that they will prevent the egress of noxious fluids and exhalations. Building regulations should also make provision for minimum standards for the construction of mausolea. Whilst your committee recommends that mausolea should be permitted, we also recommend that it be left to the controlling authority of the cemetery to decide whether or not mausolea would be permitted in a particular cemetery.

It would appear from the report that the current proposal of the Centennial Park Cemetery Trust would be prevented. Point 3.8.1.3 of the report states:

The report recommended that coffins for interment in vaults and mausolea should be contained within an individual compartment which is sealed after interment. However, your committee believes that decisions on that matter should be left to the South Australian Health Commission and that the commission should have the power to make the necessary regulations.

Your committee also recommends that the decision as to the preparation of bodies for interment in mausolea and the standards applying to coffins should again be left to the South Australian Health Commission through a regulatory power.

The objection of most of the residents of my electorate is not to a mausoleum as such although, to many, this type of interment is abhorrent. My constituents object to the fact that it is a totally inappropriate choice of land at this site in Centennial Park. It is too close to houses and, further, it abrogates promises on the land made back in 1966. An article in the local press refers to '1966 correspondence in which the cemetery trust promised that land between Goodwood Road and Western Avenue would not be used for burials'. The article continues:

According to a letter dated 3 May 1966, from the then Mitcham town clerk to a resident, '... the land could not be used for burial purposes, but would be added to the crematorium gardens and beautified with trees, shrubs, roses and lawns'. A letter from the cemetery trust dated 3 June 1966 said: 'It is the policy of this trust to have the area beautified by the planting of trees, shrubs and lawns to form an extension of the existing gardens east and north of the crematorium.'

Clearly, the mausoleum plans break that agreement. The article continues:

... many people who had built or bought houses along Mullins Street and McIntosh Avenue in the early 1960s had done so because they believed the South Australian Housing Trust would be building houses across the road. They were told those houses would act as a buffer between them and the cemetery... the fuss started when the Housing Trust sold its land to the cemetery—that's when the cemetery was made to promise they wouldn't bury bodies along that boundary. The mausoleum plans clearly go against the directives that Mitcham council gave to the trust when they bought the land from the Housing Trust.

So, the objections of my constituents relate not only to the choice of site but also to their fear that these vaults, which would not be fully sealed, would allow odours or noxious exhalations to escape and bodily fluids to drain into the watertable.

I had a meeting with residents of this area in January this year and a number of very good submissions were presented. Unfortunately, I cannot quote all of them but I will read part of one submission which I think sums up the views. First, it refers to the vaults being in close proximity to the residential area, and I have covered that issue. It then considers 'the possible danger to health from the drainage and ventilation plans suggested for the mausoleum operation. The proposal to drain the putrefaction from decomposing corpses to a central depository somewhere between five to eight metres below the ground level would seem to increase the likelihood of intersecting the various channels of the watertable'.

The submission further states:

The prospect of noxious fumes entering the atmosphere so close to residential occupation is unacceptable—even if there is no immediate danger to health... do we really have to consider living next to such an objectionable odour?

Unfortunately, I do not have time to read it all, but there is detail about the methods considered to remove the odours, none of which is likely to be successful. It also expresses concern about the security of the structure as it is in an earthquake zone. The author also raises the need for a mausoleum. It would appear that there is no real demand for it. I congratulate those residents who have brought

forward this issue. They have handled the matter in a constructive way, despite the obvious problems this would cause for their quality of life, and I congratulate them for making the community aware of the problem. They certainly have my support in their grievance.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): Mr Speaker—
Members interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: I think in these times when there is water pollution we should all agree that Alexandra is a broad, wet lake, shallow and, unfortunately, in recent times, has been a bit off colour. However, I do not wish to talk about that subject this evening: I wish to talk about the Craighburn land which belongs to Minda Incorporated. In April/May 1988, the Minda board submitted a proposal, we are led to believe, to the Mitcham council to have some of the land subdivided. I do not know whether it involved 1 200 or 1 800 allotments, but it was of that order. The then Minister for Environment and Planning moved to use section 50 to stop this occurring.

In about June 1988 the Minda board took action through the courts to challenge the council on the use of section 50. This action resulted in the Minister's negotiating with the board and saying, 'If you will not go ahead with the court action we will set up a committee with representation from both sides to look at the whole subject of what will happen to the land that is left on the Craighburn farm.' This large area of land comprises about 520 hectares of some of the most beautiful, undulating land, either developed or undeveloped, that can be found close to the city. This particular piece of undeveloped land is magnificent country, studded with gums, some of which are possibly over 100 years old. The balance of the land comprises some of the Sturt Gorge; it is steep, native bushland, some of which has over the years been cleared for grazing. On this farm is a piggery, a poultry area, a nursery where the clients of Minda are trained for the workforce and carry out an excellent operation of producing plants for retail or wholesale purposes. It also has a dairy, and part of the property is used by the Riding for the Disabled Association and other equestrian groups.

The Minister promised to bring down the report by the end of October 1988, but that did not occur. On several occasions in early 1989 I raised this matter with the Minister, as well as by letter and was told the report was near completion. I was prepared to accept that no action would be taken by the Government until after the election if the report contained anything that was a little bit nasty, such as suggesting that part of the land be subdivided and the balance left—as a deal—as a reserve for the public or perhaps as a second parkland area.

However, nothing has happened. The election was held in November and it is now nearly March and we have heard nothing. This property is a great asset. It is possibly worth in the vicinity of \$16 million, and now is the time for the Government to say, 'Here is the report.' The Government should not tell us that it is not finished, because that will mean that one of the members has failed to put a signature to it. The Government should bring out the report so that we can have a public debate on its recommendations and settle the issue once and for all. If the land can be bought for use as public land, the Government should do so, but it should not leave it hanging like the sword of Damocles over the head of the Minda board.

The Minda board carries out a great service in the community. I know that both Parties when in Government have had to look at this issue. I do not concur in the proposition which was put forward by one of my colleagues when we

were having a bit of a contest and which was referred to earlier today, namely, that the Government should buy this land over a period of years, paying off a percentage each year. Unless interest is to be paid on this money, that would be unfair to the Minda board. I am referring to the disadvantaged people, not the members of the board. The disadvantaged people to whom Minda is trying to give a chance would suffer. So, I say to the Government: bring out the report, let us have a debate about it and settle it one way or the other.

The other matter that I wish to raise relates to the forest reserve at Hawthorndene, the area known as the Blackwood Experimental Orchard. It is now used only for storage of equipment, wetting agents and motorised sprays for fruit fly campaigns. The rest of it is forest area that was planted as a crop, but when the Woods and Forests Department had control of it people objected to the trees being removed. It then passed to the Lands Department, after which it was offered to Mitcham Council, I believe, on the basis that part of it be sub-divided and the rest left as community reserve. About 60 allotments were to be sub-divided from the area, which would have left more than half as reserve.

The Mitcham council was not keen to touch it at that time, because it had the Sword of Damocles over its head in relation to council boundaries. It was not going to buy the land if it was to be passed over to the so-called Flinders council, which has now disappeared—and we cannot blame it for that. So, now is the time for the Government to move. This land is perhaps a little too far out of Blackwood for a complex for the more elderly, but for the group that may be more mobile in lifestyle, perhaps between 55 and 75, it would not be.

As we are short of areas for accommodation for the aged in the Blackwood-Mitcham Hills area, I say that now is the time to move on that property and take the opportunity to use the land. It could be used, if need be, for cottage accommodation for the aged or—and I will be quite happy if this is done—a deal could perhaps be worked out between the Mitcham council and the Government so that the whole area was left as reserve for community recreation purposes, whether passive or structured.

While we are talking about that, in Gladstone Road, Blackwood, we have the old playing area for the Blackwood Junior Primary School, which has now been relocated at Seymour Terrace alongside the Blackwood High School and Primary School. I believe that the Housing Trust is looking at that area to establish accommodation for the aged, and it is an ideal spot. Although it is not a large area, it would cater for quite a lot of people. I have written to the Minister, although I have not had an answer yet after several weeks. I am sure that I will get an answer.

I know that there will be some flak in the community from some people saying, 'We don't want Housing Trust people in this street.' I want to say publicly and quite clearly that I have written to the Minister and said that there is a need for accommodation for the aged, and that I believe that it is the responsibility of the Housing Trust, and that this is an ideal spot in which to put it. It is near the shopping centres, professional services and public transport, and it would benefit the community if it was established there.

I do not believe that the community can go on accepting that these things get pushed aside by the Government. I know that it is difficult before an election, but the election is over. Let us all stand up and be counted. I am sticking my neck out in the eyes of some people, suggesting that Housing Trust accommodation for the aged be established there. However, many people in Blackwood have their friends and relatives in the area. They have their professional

people with whom they have been dealing for years, and they would like it established.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Over the past couple of weeks I have listened to the contributions of members opposite on law and order issues. If they want to take me on any time on law and order issues, I am quite happy to accommodate them as I have done in the past. It is quite clear that they do not like it: they can dish it out like Paddy's dog. They are like an artificially inseminated cow: they know that something has happened but do not know exactly what. That is typical of members opposite on law and order. Let us have a look at what has happened in terms of policing in this State.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: The chatterbox over there can continue if he likes, but I will address my remarks to the Chair. In terms of resources, I hear from members opposite that since 1982 nothing has been done. But let us have a look at what has been done. Spending on police has increased by over \$100 million since 1982. We have retained the best police to population ratio of any State in Australia. Those figures were incorporated in *Hansard* last week.

The number of metropolitan police stations open 24-hours a day has been increased to 17. Police equipment and resources have been upgraded significantly, and a new police communications system is being installed at a cost of about \$20 million. Sophisticated computer equipment and software have been introduced to assist with the case management of complex and protracted investigations. A computerised fingerprint record storage search and retrieval system has been introduced. Equipment such as portable communications, firearms and nightsticks for individual officers have been upgraded to make the job safer and to help the police protect the community. A new police complex has been completed, including a patrol base at Norwood. A communications and emergency operations centre is under construction and a new police complex at Ceduna has been commenced. Significant maintenance and repairs have commenced on police central headquarters.

In terms of police powers, the Bannon Government has provided the South Australian Police Force with the power to tap telephone lines in relation to serious offences such as kidnapping, murder and drug trafficking. Legislation has been passed to allow the National Crime Authority to use concealed listening devices to assist in investigating crime and furnishing evidence. Police now have the power to hold suspects for questioning for up to four hours after arrest. Anti-corruption organisations address organised crime. A system of community policing was introduced on 1 January 1986 to deal with community protection and safety and, of course, that involves the Neighbourhood Watch program.

The member for Davenport rather stupidly made a facetious remark in relation to me, and that is typical of an honourable member who puts up a proposition and then argues it and attributes it to someone on this side of the House. It is a tactic that he has used over the years and one that I am not prepared to cop. If he thinks we are idiots on this side, he has another think coming. I am not prepared to cop the nonsense from members opposite and I have not been prepared to cop it since 1979.

This Government has had the courage to address the question of domestic violence. That is something that the previous Liberal Government did not have the intestinal fortitude to address. It left it to the Labor Government—which is very much concerned about this issue—to address

the problem. A workload survey estimates that police have attended in excess of 9 000 incidents of domestic violence in every 12 months in the Adelaide metropolitan area. Domestic violence should concern us all and, as a society, we must confront the issue directly. This Government has given a promise to do exactly that.

I now refer to penalties and deterrents. In its term of office, the Bannon Government has been concerned about low sentences imposed on offenders convicted of serious or violent crimes. The Government has taken action in those areas by increasing statutory penalties and introducing consolidated sentencing legislation. It has legislated to allow courts to take into account time off for good behaviour and it has overhauled the State's parole laws. The Government has taken strong action in the Parliament to ensure that prisoners serve their full sentence. The Attorney-General has initiated appeals against sentences considered to be too lenient.

In respect of appeals against lenient sentences and inadequate non-parole periods, as at October 1989, 140 appeals had been lodged by the Attorney-General since the Bannon Government was elected. Many of the appeals have been successful, for example a murder sentence was increased from 24 years to 36 years; rape from three years to eight years; armed robbery from three years to nine years; cultivating Indian hemp from six months to four years—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: In response to an interjection, the Attorney-General under the previous Liberal Government launched only 17 appeals in two years. So much for so-called sincerity on the part of members opposite who quote figures selectively! Members opposite shake their head, but the facts remain and they are on the record. Members opposite can be as red faced as they like, but that that is a fact and they cannot walk away from it. I am fed up with and have had a gut full of members opposite who want to use and abuse the parliamentary system to peddle lies to the community about what this Government has done in relation to law and order.

I will never walk away from the issue in terms of law and order in this State, as my colleagues know. If there are problems, they are to be addressed. I am not going to hide behind political views if problems need to be addressed by the Government. There is no way that I will do that. I am not built that way, as my colleagues know only too well. The reality is that people are genuinely concerned in the community and want to see issues addressed.

A sad indictment of today's modern society is that irrespective of which Government is in power, we have those purveyors of death peddling drugs out in the community. Unfortunately, kids and adults get hooked on them and, as a consequence, they are forced by their habit to break into homes. I believe that this Government and the Attorney-General have tried sincerely to attack this problem. I am not here to make cheap political capital out of the law and order issues in this State, but I smart strongly when I hear the clowns opposite wanting to make it a political issue when it really is an issue about which everyone in the community should be concerned.

Certainly, if there is a problem, we should address the issue head on. The Government has thrown out a challenge to the Opposition to meet on this issue in a coalition on crime and I look forward to the input of members opposite in this area. Members opposite can laugh and put on false faces in respect of this issue, but they know that I am sincere; all members must know that I am concerned about the problem. As I have said, irrespective of which Party is in power, the same problem will apply in respect of crime.

If the Opposition took office tomorrow, how would it address the problem? Would Opposition members be able to address it within two or three years? I do not think so. I do not believe that society can address the problem within 10 years and overcome these problems.

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Members opposite can interject and try to shout me down, but they have no chance of doing that, as they will learn. What about when we wanted to overhaul the State's parole system? What response did we get from the Opposition? It was enlightening. I refer to the response by members opposite and particularly the Hon. Mr Griffin, in another place. Together with the Australian Democrats, the Opposition shafted us in the Upper House. That is what they did to the Government and the people of South Australia. So much for the Opposition's sincerity

in trying to amend the sentencing principles in South Australia. Clearly, some members of the Opposition have not done their homework, although I can make allowances for newer members. Certainly, I cannot do that for the member for Davenport, who has been here for 20 years—perhaps it is 20 years too long, as some uncharitable members might want to suggest.

I cannot recall one positive suggestion made by the member for Davenport in my time here since 1979 in terms of an initiative that has been introduced into law in this State. Therefore, I challenge the member for Davenport to put up or shut up.

Motion carried.

At 10.24 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 28 February at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 27 February 1990

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

MORTGAGE REGISTRATION

1. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Lands:

1. Why does registration of a mortgage take between six to ten weeks?

2. Can the mortgagee be advised immediately the Lands Titles Office receives the application to register the mortgage and, if not, why not?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Registration of a mortgage has, on some occasions, taken between six and eight weeks. During 1989 there was a substantial increase in the number of documents lodged compared with the previous year and this upsurge in activity created backlogs in some areas of the Lands Titles Office. Action was taken to rectify the situation and at the present time it is taking between four and five weeks to register dealings such as mortgages.

2. When a mortgage is accepted for registration by the Lands Titles Office it is immediately numbered and entered to the Registrar-General's unregistered document system. Anyone contemplating dealing with that title would undertake a search of the unregistered document system and become aware of the existence of the mortgage. Further inquiries can then be made on the system to ascertain the names of the mortgagees, etc. It is not possible for the Registrar-General to notify each mortgagee that their application for registration has been received by the Lands Titles Office.

MARINELAND

6. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Lands:

1. Why did the Minister not oversee or attend the destruction of the seals and sea lion at Marineland on 28 December 1989?

2. Why did the Minister authorise the euthanasia of these marine animals and under what powers?

3. What became of the body of the bottle-nosed dolphin 'Zippy'?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The Minister did not oversee the destruction of seals and sea lions at Marineland on 28 December 1989 as it would have served no useful purpose.

2. Previous tests on these animals had produced indeterminate results. A number of veterinary experts agreed that a conclusive decision as to whether in fact these animals were infected with TB could be obtained by conducting a thorough autopsy. None of the remaining Marineland animals can be transferred to other facilities until it is determined whether or not they have been in contact with TB infected animals. The powers under which the animals were euthanased was section 53 (1) (d) of the National Parks and Wildlife Act.

3. The body of the dolphin 'Zippy' was forwarded to the Central Veterinary Laboratory for autopsy after which the carcass was forwarded to the curator of mammals at the South Australian Museum.

YATALA LABOUR PRISON

8. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Correctional Services: Were offenders at Yatala Labour Prison denied access to telephones to contact State members of Parliament during the recent inmates dispute and, if so, why and what steps were taken by the prison manager to ensure that such denial was not in contravention of rule No. 14?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: During the recent period of disobedience by prisoners, there have been times when prisoners have been restricted to wings within accommodation areas in 'B' division. During passive sit-ins, the departmental instruction at that time provided that any person leaving the place of the passive sit-in would not be returned to that same area. Prisoners were informed that if they wished to move from the passive sit-in to use the telephone, they would be deemed to have left the protest. Some prisoners decided not to use the telephone under such circumstances.

16. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Correctional Services: Has the Department of Correctional Services had discussions with inmates of 'B' division, Yatala Labour Prison, over issues such as food and allegations of the department's failure to abide by rules?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes, the Department of Correctional Services continually communicates with prisoners over issues raised by the prisoners.

KANGARILLA INTERSECTION

21. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: What are the latest developments regarding the upgrading of the Clarendon Road/McLaren Vale Road/Meadows Road intersection at Kangarilla?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Department of Road Transport has undertaken the following improvements at the junction of the Clarendon Road/McLaren Vale Road/Meadows Road at Kangarilla:

Extended the median on the McLaren Vale Road.

Erected advance direction signs, depicting Meadows to the right and Clarendon to the left, on the McLaren Vale Road approach to the junction.

Traffic is using the junction without difficulty and the present treatment is considered satisfactory.

RECYCLING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

23. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. Who are members of the Recycling Advisory Committee, when were they appointed and at what salary and allowance?

2. What specific qualifications does each appointee have in relation to their appointment?

3. What information has the committee provided to the Minister to date?

4. When will a recycling plant, particularly for paper, be established?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The Recycling Advisory Committee comprises of the following members (organisations they represent are also listed):

Robert Rodenburg (Chairman)
Manager, Solid Waste
S.A. Waste Management Commission

Ian W. Alexander
 Manager, Salisbury and Elizabeth Bottle Co.
 Licensed Marine Store Dealers Association Inc.
 Michael G. Carroll
 State Manager, Cleanaway
 Waste Disposal Association Inc. of S.A.
 E. Meredith Crome
 Executive Officer
 Southern Region of Councils Inc.
 Warren R. Headly
 Manager, Special Projects
 Department of Industry, Trade and Technology
 John L. Langton
 Manager—Product and Public Liability, Bridgestone
 Australia Ltd
 Australian Council of Recyclers
 J. Andrew Lothian
 Manager, Environmental Policy Branch
 Department of Environment and Planning
 David J. McCarthy
 Overseer, Corporation of the City of Unley
 Local Government Association of S.A.
 Ian C. Modistach
 Conservation Council of South Australia
 Keith E. Oehme
 United Trades and Labor Council of S.A.
 John D. Phillips
 Manager
 KESAB
 Barry R. Vogt
 Manager, Vogt Engineering
 National Association of Recycling Operators
 Meredith A. B. Wallwork
 Australian Consumer's Association

The committee first met on 25 August 1989. As membership of the committee is on a voluntary basis, salaries and allowances are not paid to members.

- Members represent specific organisations with an interest in recycling as listed.
- The Minister receives copies of each meeting's minutes once adopted and is briefed on the committee's activities.
- Consultants have been requested to prepare a diagnostic study outlining the viability of a paper recycling plant. The next step is to prepare a detailed business plan for the plant, including an analysis of markets, capital requirements, collection systems and plant location. Establishment timing is dependent upon the outcome of these studies.

CITY WATCH-HOUSE

25. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Correctional Services:

1. When offenders are placed in the City Watch-house, whether on remand pending trial, or when their trial is being heard, are they required to be given four days remission for each day of an industrial dispute by Correctional Service Officers?

2. Were offenders held in the City Watch-house during a recent Correctional Service Officers' industrial dispute which affected their movement given four days remission for each day of the dispute and, if not, why not?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. The Department of Correctional Services generally seeks the approval of the Governor to remit by four days the sentences of both prisoners who have been remanded in custody and those who have been sentenced by the courts and who are held in the City Watch-house if an industrial dispute severely disadvantages them.

2. I am unable to provide a response to this question without being provided with details of the industrial dispute in question.

METROPOLITAN FORESHORE

74. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Was a study conducted by the Government into the metropolitan foreshore in 1972-73 and, if so, is the present study duplicating in any way what has already been done and what recommendations have been carried out following the 1972-73 study and, if none, why not?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: No study on the metropolitan foreshore was carried out in 1972-73. The renowned Culver report on metropolitan foreshore erosion was completed in 1970 and led to the establishment of the Coast Protection Act and board in 1972. The extensive work by coastal councils and the board has been carried out on the report's recommendations. The Culver report and its results were reviewed in a 1984 report entitled 'Adelaide Coast Protection Strategy Review' and forms the basis of the current protection strategies.

YATALA LABOUR PRISON

76. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Correctional Services:

1. Were three fires lit in workshops at Yatala Labour Prison in October 1989 and, if so, what were the circumstances?

2. Was a prisoner taken to 'G' division as punishment while the matter was being investigated and, if so, how could this be done?

3. Did the prisoners in workshops conduct a 'go slow' campaign and, if so, why and have they lost three days remission as a result?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. A crude incendiary device was found in the storeroom of the Boot Shop at 1200 hours on Thursday 28 September 1989. The device was extinguished by two officers. On Friday 29 September 1989 at 0840 hours a trolley load of linen was found burning in the laundry. This resulted in approximately \$200 damage. At 1006 hours on 29 September 1989 a roll of toilet paper was ignited in the Engineers Workshop; no damage resulted. On 29 September 1989 at 1300 hours a burning piece of cloth was found in the ceiling of the Joiners Shop.

2. Two prisoners have been placed in segregation under section 36 (1) of the Correctional Services Act, for investigation into two of the incidents. They were not placed there for punishment.

3. Some prisoners at this time did not work to their full potential in the workshops. They maintained that they wished to be paid more. Allowances for those prisoners were varied accordingly. Further, and during a separate incident, 121 prisoners refused to return to their cells when ordered at 1650 hours on 27 September 1989. All prisoners obeyed the second order given at 1740 hours and were not awarded three days' remission for the month of September 1989 for disobeying the first order.

STOLEN GOODS

77. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General:

1. Does the Government propose to increase penalties for person convicted of receiving stolen goods and, if not, why not?

2. What other action is the Government taking to deter people receiving and trading in stolen goods?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. There are a number of offences of receiving, the most serious of which is punishable by a maximum of eight years imprisonment. That is equivalent to the maximum which applies in relation to break and enter buildings, larceny in a dwelling house, larceny by a servant, and is one year more than fraudulent conversion. While the relativities between offence maxima are always difficult questions, the Government is of the opinion that the current maxima for receiving have the balance about right, and is unaware of any difficulties experienced by the courts in setting appropriate penalties for the offences concerned.

2. Officers in the Attorney-General's Department are currently conducting a review of all offences of dishonesty contained in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and Summary Offences Act, including the receiving offences. Principles of consistency and fundamental fairness demand that the content and penalty of offences of dishonesty must be considered in relation to other offence in the same area rather than on an offence by offence basis.

COMPUTER OFFENCES

85. **The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General:

1. Has the Government considered the report of the English Law Commission on 'Criminal Law: Computer Misuse'?

2. Has the Government given consideration to legislating for computer offences which embrace—

(a) the cost, disruption and uncertainty caused to owners and users of computer systems by 'hacking'; and

(b) the loss and damage caused by unauthorised alterations to computer-held data or programs?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government has not considered the report of the English Law Commission on computer crime as it has not yet got a copy of the report. It has considered the commission's working paper No. 110 on computer misuse. Among other reports the Government has considered is the Scottish Law Commission's Report on Computer Crime (Law Com. No. 106).

2. (a) Computer 'hacking' was made an offence by the Summary Offences Act Amendment Act, 1989.

(b) Offences with respect to property were completely revised in the 1986 amendment to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1935. Under Part IV of that Act, unauthorised alterations to computer-held data or programs are an offence.