

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 13 August 1987

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

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the Government of South Australia during the year ending 30 June 1988.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 12 August. Page 169.)

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): On behalf of my constituents I thank His Excellency the Governor for his speech in opening Parliament last Thursday and I extend our congratulations on the way in which he serves South Australia. I also thank his wife, Lady Dunstan, for her support in his service to the State. During the past week my electorate has been most fortunate to have had Sir Donald and Lady Dunstan visiting. I hope that they enjoyed their stay and I know that everyone in the electorate enjoyed having them in the area. I extend my sympathy to the families of the Hon. Ron Loveday and the Hon. Don Simmons. I did not know either of them personally, but I have been told by members from both sides of this House of their outstanding contributions to this State.

Over the past 20 years we have listened, *ad nauseam*, to the Australian Labor Party's views of democracy, especially in relation to voting systems, electoral boundaries and the interpretation that it places on one vote, one value. On these issues the ALP has had wide-ranging support from some journalists, quite a few academics, a couple of rock stars, several authors and many other groups in our society.

However, if one carefully examines the issues one can clearly see how misinformed some of these people are. The matter is even more disturbing when one finds that some of these advocates know that they are wrong, have been proven to be wrong, but will not admit it. More than that, these advocates of so-called democratic principles did not raise one complaint when this Government, with the support of the Democrats, inflicted on South Australian local government two options for a voting system, one of which was acceptable but had certain flaws and the other being the most undemocratic and unfair voting system that man could devise.

Section 122 of the Local Government Act imposes two choices on local government when council elections are held. The first system, proportional representation, has some difficulty if an even number of candidates is to be elected, or a low number of candidates stand. While it is arguable that proportional representation is a democratically accepted method, there are many people who oppose a principle that permits a minority which polls some 20 per cent of the vote gaining representation when 80 per cent of the electorate may not wish to have them. Even though there is opposition to proportional representation, if one accepts its principles—and many people do—I believe that it is fair.

The second system available to local government does not have a name to describe it. It is unique and applies

only to local government in South Australia. I challenge the Government to find any electoral process anywhere else in the world where this system applies. Even the ALP, the designers of this piece of electoral stupidity, would have a revolution within its ranks if it applied this system to its elections. I can imagine the outcry if the Parliament applied this system to legislation, to the trade union movement or to any other association or group in society. I suggest that the ALP should apply this second method of election counting to its Party room when it is electing its ministerial ranks: certainly, there would be an uproar.

Mr Lewis: The strongest faction would take the lot.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Exactly right. But this Government, with the assistance of the Democrats, has imposed this undemocratic, unfair system on local government and it has passed without criticism from those great advocates of democratic principles that we have heard from in the past few years.

To point out the frailties in this system, I will examine a local government election that was held in the electorate of Victoria in which four councillors were required and six candidates nominated. One candidate was a young and enthusiastic person who had wide community support; I will call him candidate A. That candidate polled over 60 per cent of the first preference votes. Nearly all that person's number two votes passed to candidate B: in other words, about 60 per cent of the voters wanted candidates A and B. However, because of the high vote for candidate A, candidate B was not elected. So the electors' choice was not fulfilled.

Mr Tyler: What ticket did he run?

Mr D.S. BAKER: You want tickets to be run. I do not want tickets to be run; that is your prerogative. Let us look at what would have been the result of this election if any other counting method or voting system had been used. First, under proportional representation both candidates A and B would be elected. Secondly, using a correct counting method for preferential voting in multi member elections, candidate A would be elected with over 50 per cent of the vote; the second choice votes would be counted as number one votes and candidate B would be elected. Thirdly, if people voted by making a tick or a cross for the four candidates required, both A and B would be elected. So in any other acceptable, democratic voting or counting system candidate B would be elected.

However, this is not so with the second method allowed for local government elections. To illustrate the complete stupidity of the system, let us examine a hypothetical case where there are six candidates in a ward and three are to be elected: there are 100 votes cast, 98 per cent of the voters vote 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 and 1 per cent votes 6, 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1.

The other 1 per cent vote 6, 5, 4, 3, 1, 2; 98 per cent of the voting public prefer the first three on the ballot paper, 2 per cent prefer the last three. The first candidate is elected, but candidates 5 and 6 are elected although only 2 per cent of voters prefer them. It is possible that 2 per cent of the vote can achieve 66 per cent of the elected representatives.

This system, which has been inflicted on local government, is the most disgraceful vote counting procedure that has ever been devised, and it is a disgrace to this Parliament. It is a disgrace to a Government which, over the years, has advocated equality of voting values, and that advocacy must be viewed with great doubt. It is an absolute sham on the Party of members opposite; that Party would not put up with it. It is a slur on the Local Government Association, which should be screaming from the tree tops, but unfortunately only a few councils are protesting. I thought that

at least the Government would include in the opening address a statement that it would change the policy that it has inflicted on local government, but it appears that the Government is showing no interest.

In order to correct this glaring electoral anomaly, I will introduce a Bill to consign the practice to its correct place, and that is the legislative graveyard. The Bill will include a clause to provide a counting system that is democratically acceptable to all. I sincerely trust that the Government will support this Bill, which will rid the State of an electoral system that must make us and local government a laughing stock in the eyes of anyone who has any understanding at all of democratic voting systems. If the Government does not accept that amendment, I will ask it to impose this system in its own Party room, in the ALP branches and executive, or on some of its mates in the union movement. Not even the hoods in the BLF would put up with this system; if it was introduced, I guarantee it would be expunged very quickly from our statute book.

The second matter with which I want to deal is the news release of the Minister of State Development and Technology on the change of policy on payroll tax and land tax remissions that have been available since 1979 to rural manufacturing industries and those industries that choose to decentralise into country areas. The policy provided a remission of payroll tax and land tax to manufacturers in rural areas covered by divisions 21 to 34 of the Australian Standard Industrial Classifications (ASIC) code and the remissions applied at two levels: 50 per cent remission to those areas close to the metropolitan area, and 100 per cent remission in outer country areas. During the year, the taxpayer paid his normal tax but received a remission at the end of the year. That remission was paid by the Department of State Development to the payroll tax office and was then remitted to the taxpayer. In the last financial year total remissions amounted to \$6.5 million.

Country payroll tax rebates will be phased out over the next three financial years with companies receiving a 75 per cent rebate on payroll tax in 1986-87, a 50 per cent rebate in 1987-88, a 25 per cent rebate in 1988-89 and no remission at all in the fourth year, 1989-90. The first point I want to stress is that there has been no advice at all to taxpayers in relation to the first year's removal of those remissions. Manufacturing business in rural areas has already set its 1987-88 budget; in fact, business is now three months into the 1987-88 financial year.

They have organised their business knowing that they would receive a refund on payroll tax. Indeed, one large organisation within my electorate, which began operating in October 1986 and employs 200 people, commenced business on the assurance (it believed) that it would receive a payroll tax remission. In a nine month period, that company paid \$120 000 in payroll tax but will receive only \$90 000 in tax remissions. This applies to all businesses in rural areas. One would have thought that, if there were to be a change, at least the policy would apply after 30 June 1987 and not before. The savings to State Treasury in not applying the previous remissions will be approximately \$2 million because it applies in retrospect—not in the future—to the 1986-87 year. This action is deplorable and needs to be criticised most fervently by this Parliament.

Let us examine a little more closely a press release of the Minister of State Development and Employment. It states:

The State Government has adopted an exciting new \$3.5 million policy to support regional industry development in South Australia.

One must remember that the Government is removing \$2 million in retrospect before this 'exciting new policy' sees the light of day. In this financial year the savings to

the Government increase to \$3.5 million by the removal of the payroll tax and land tax remissions to the full 50 per cent rebate as stated in the policy. By the time this so-called exciting new policy comes into being, the Government will be in front with \$2 million from last year plus another \$3.5 million for this year, which is a total saving of \$5.5 million. Next year, the savings will be \$5 million. In the third year of operation, the savings will have reached \$10.5 million, as a result of this 'exciting new policy', given that it may have paid out only \$7 million in total after two years of operation. By the fourth year, savings will amount to \$6.5 million, with an accumulated saving of \$17 million. If the \$3.5 million is given again in the third year, total outlays will be \$10.5 million. However, as the policy states, the program will provide cash grants or low interest loans to such firms with payments of up to \$500 000 available to eligible industries. There is no requirement in this 'exciting new policy' to give cash grants; it may all be given as loans.

The Minister's news release is a statement of impropriety and a farce, and the Government should view it with shame. If the Government wants to take away \$7 million from rural manufacturing industries, it should go out and tell them the truth. It should not hide it under a green paper called 'Regional Business Development Policy', from which I will quote in a moment. The Government should not hide behind some facade and try to con the country people that it is trying to help them. In actual terms, the Government will gain \$7 million per annum from this saving by the fourth year, but nowhere does it say how the scheme will be funded. As the policy has been explained, the increase in taxation revenue taken from decentralised country industry by the year 1990 will be at least \$17 million, and probably closer to \$20 million. This 'exciting new policy' predicts the expenditure of \$10.5 million in three years. However, if that is funded on a loans basis, and if the capital is continued to be rolled over, there is every chance that only the initial \$3.5 million will be expended.

If one does one's sums, as I have done, one sees that if the loan funds are lent out to rural industries even at a concessional rate of interest of, say, 7 per cent for a three year period, it means a 5 per cent commercial subsidy on interest rates and at the end of three years, the total outlay from Government revenues would be about \$1 million a year, with a total saving at the end of three years of about \$17 million. It really is an exciting new policy. If the Government came clean and told us the truth about it, I am sure that there would be a violent reaction by people who live in country areas.

It is very interesting to note who will be affected by this policy. One of the casualties that will result from removing this policy will be Heritage Industries Workshop in Mount Gambier, an industry which services and trains handicapped people. Indeed, people travel hundreds of kilometres a week to attend Heritage Industries, which trains them to a stage where they can go out into private industry and take up jobs within industry. It gainfully employs them on manufacturing for businesses around Mount Gambier and in the South-East generally. When this exciting new tax policy is introduced it will cost Heritage Industries \$15 000 to \$20 000 a year at the end of the three year period when tax rebates are taken out. It removes from another industry the ability to train young people in the meat processing trades. This company has spent its total tax remissions on training young people, and it has stated quite openly that it will not be able to do so in the future.

About 200 industries in country areas will be affected, and I believe that this policy will have a severe effect on country employment. I agree that there is a constant need

to examine Government policies, to improve them and to seek new ideas. Therefore, I do not criticise without reason the necessary changes that constantly must be made. However, I object strongly to the outrageous statements that try to sell to the public a new and exciting policy that claims to be spending \$3.5 million a year when, in reality, the new policy is taking away existing assistance and replacing it with a scheme that increases taxes on existing industries. It is important that we have some frankness, openness and honesty in the Government's presentation. If the Minister does that, he will find that he will be assisted with his economic problems. Certainly, if the Minister cannot tell the truth, he will be shown up. We have seen what has happened already this week in the case of a Minister who cannot tell the truth: he is exposed and gets into some quite horrific problems.

In the remaining time available, let me look at what decentralisation is all about. Decentralisation is about enticing industry, especially manufacturing industry, to set up operations in economically viable country locations that allow them not only to employ a stable work force but also to compete on the open market with their products. This policy has been actively pursued in this State for the past 15-20 years, and the policy is in the overall interests of the State. Of course, one of the great attractions is the industrial relations aspect.

Even the most bloody-minded union organisers have difficulty in stirring up the work force into strike action in country areas because the relationship between employer and employee, in most cases, is a cordial one. Therefore, I was very interested to hear the member for Florey carry on last night about industrial relations in the 1920s. It is about time that he came forward in time and realised that we are now living in the 1980s and will soon be in the 1990s.

What happened in the past has nothing whatsoever to do with the industrial relations of today. For the honourable member to stand up and say that if agreements are made between the employer and employee, as he quoted from Federal Liberal Party policy. This will take us back in industrial relations to the 1920s, shows that he does not understand the facts of life. That policy said very clearly that, if an employer and employee get together and make an agreement, that agreement must be ratified by the Arbitration Commission. To stand up and throw that sort of antiquated rubbish to this House shows how far from reality are some of these union organisers or people with a union background, and they are doing nothing for industrial relations in this State.

Industrial relations is a very important aspect of decentralisation and that, in itself, is a very great incentive. The other interrelated plus is that in many instances there is a pool of labour in the country, both male and female which, because of the distance from the city, is under-employed and anxious to become productive. Because of their distance from major capital cities these people are unable to find employment. It is most important that we can employ them, and decentralisation is a great way of doing it.

However, decentralisation has some minuses. I refer, first, to the distances that must be travelled, and, in many cases because those industries supply export industries, there is a tremendous increase in transport cost. The cost of many of the other State taxes which are levied is greater in the country. Also, the back-up facilities that are available to those people who decentralise are not as readily available in the country as they are in the city. It is important that we realise that we must have ongoing incentives for decentralisation, not one-off grants or loans.

That will not attract people to relocate their businesses in country areas, and it will not allow those businesses to take advantage of the improved industrial relations and the improved labour force which are available there. I want to quote from the green paper put out on this matter, which is the greatest load of bureaucratic rubbish that I have ever read. At present, in relation to State development, we have grants and loans available, so to sell this policy the Minister obviously had this document drawn up, and it is supposed to back up his tax grab of some \$20 million in three years from country industries. The preamble states:

The early 1970s saw a general thrust towards decentralisation of industry in Australia. Decentralisation programs sought to divert growth away from metropolitan centres to country centres.

With that, I totally agree. It goes on:

It has become clear that South Australia, if it is to optimise its development in a manner consistent with community wishes, needs to adopt a more planned, consultative and targeted approach.

I do not know what that has to do with competitiveness or with getting people employed in country areas and increasing their productivity. The bottom paragraph says:

Recognising the benefits of harnessing the expertise, energy and resources of individuals, organisations and institutional bodies as part of the development process, a fundamental requirement of a regional development program is that people who live in a region are prepared to work together and play a part in shaping the future of their community.

That is the greatest load of rubbish that I have every heard in my life! If one is trying to grab \$20 million from those of us who live in the country areas and those who decentralise, and one prefaces it with that, it is really dressing up the facts. Under 'Regional Development' I see a paragraph—

The Hon. H. Allison: It sounds like false advertising.

Mr D.S. BAKER: It would be classed as that, absolutely correct. It states:

Furthermore, the establishment of regional development committees should significantly improve the level of coordination between and within the various levels of State Government, local government and the private sector to assist in providing a clear and common set of objectives and direction for all these groups to work towards.

Great stuff! Then we move over to something headed 'Definition of regions'. It defines the regions and states:

To assist those regions that do not already have established regionally based development committees, the Minister of State Development and Technology has commissioned an independent consultant to:

- (a) provide a map and a description of each of the regions identified;
- (b) develop some options in areas where valid alternatives exist or where boundary locations are not clear cut.

What will that do for decentralisation in South Australia? What will that do for productivity and export income? It will do absolutely nothing, but the Minister dresses up this sham to try to cover up how much money he is grabbing from the country areas to put into State Treasury.

The next paragraph I want to quote from this horrific document states:

For developers, investors, exporters, and purchasers of regionally produced goods and services to be aware of the opportunities in regional areas, it is important that regional development committees establish and maintain a data base on the region, its products, industries, capabilities and opportunities.

What rubbish! We turn over further and it states:

Grants of up to \$20 000 per annum, towards the operating costs of approved regional committees.

Additional grants towards the cost of the preparation of regional publicity material and other approved projects, if needed.

It is a sham! What we want in decentralisation is ongoing tax rebates to country industries so that they can do their budgeting, and become competitive with city-based industries and our export markets. What we do not want is to

become further disadvantaged, and for the Minister to say that this is an exciting new policy is a travesty of justice. What it is all about is taking \$17.5 million from country industries and making them less competitive.

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

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Gilles): I support the motion. In so doing, I want first to refer to the Governor's opening remarks when he mentioned the fact that two of our former colleagues, Don Simmons and Ron Loveday, had passed away in the period between the opening of Parliament in 1986 and this year's opening. Both of those persons were well known to me. Of course, Don Simmons was a contemporary. He came into Parliament the same day as I and many others. He was one of the class of 1970 and was a very respected member of Parliament and also very respected both in the Labor Party and in his electorate. Although Ron Loveday was not in the Parliament in my time, I knew him well and he also was a well respected member of this House. I take this opportunity to express my condolences to their wives and families on their sad passing.

The Address in Reply gives us an opportunity, while referring to the remarks of the Governor in his speech, to speak on a wide range of subjects which are of particular interest. I have been here for some time, and it could be said that sometimes those speeches are pretty unimaginative and may be as predictable, dull and uninteresting as the *Sunday Mail*. Nevertheless we have this opportunity and I want to take it to speak first on probably the most consistent and regular inquiries I receive in my electorate office, and they relate to housing: persons seeking Housing Trust tenancy or, alternatively, tenants already in Housing Trust premises who for some reason or other wish to have a transfer of accommodation.

It is a regular inquiry—probably the most consistent inquiry I get in my electorate office, remembering that the electorate of Gilles does contain a substantial amount of Housing Trust rental homes. I make clear from the beginning that I am not criticising the Housing Trust; it has done a wonderful job over 50 years. It does its best, often in difficult and extenuating circumstances. Unfortunately, over the past 10 years social circumstances have changed somewhat and the breakdown in the family unit, creating a larger number of single parent families, has put the trust under extreme pressure in being able to cope with the demand for housing accommodation. Currently about 40 000 people are on the waiting list for Housing Trust homes.

Of all the State housing authorities in the Commonwealth, the South Australian Housing Trust has done exceedingly better than the other States as confirmed in an article that I have had brought to my attention. It appeared in *Australian Society* of August 1987, written by Mr Andrew Parkin, Chairman of the South Australian Housing Advisory Council. He looked at the impressive record of the South Australian Housing Trust over 50 years and stated:

South Australia's housing programs have for a long time tended to be quite distinctive; they have had quite different goals and enjoyed a greater share of State budget funds.

The difference in the quantity of public housing remains startling as figures on State housing funds demonstrate. In 1985-86, housing programs (mainly public housing and home purchase assistance) received from the South Australian budget the equivalent of \$176.50 per head of population. Compare that with the other States, whose *per capita* efforts ranged from just \$43.90 in New South Wales to \$111.30 in Tasmania. Commonwealth grants top up these figures in each State, but the relative differences remain.

The differences in hard cash add up to big difference in housing policy on the ground. Take as a handy measure the number of public housing units for every million people in the State's pop-

ulation. On this index, South Australia added 2010 units per million people to its stock, leaving it with a total public rental stock of 40 800 units per million people. The next highest relative figure for 1985-86 acquisitions is just 970 in Western Australia; the next highest relative figure for total public rental stock is just 28 400 in Tasmania.

These differences mean, quite simply, that needy South Australian households have a much greater chance of securing a public tenancy than their interstate equivalents.

That is not much consolation to the 40 000 people on the current waiting list but nevertheless indicates conclusively that the South Australian Housing Trust has done well in comparison with other States. The article continues:

One consequence is that fully 60 per cent of pensioner renters in South Australia are in public housing. Only Tasmania (42 per cent) gets anywhere near that. The implications for this vulnerable population are obvious.

It might be concluded from this that the South Australian policies have heavily favoured public rental investment over home purchase assistance, but that is not so. Budgetary allocations to both areas have been comparatively high. As of June 1986, there were 28 900 current State-assisted home loans or 21 100 per million population. The next highest figure is 13 900 per million population in Victoria, the lowest is 5 700 in New South Wales.

The South Australian Housing Trust has in fact sold more housing units to private purchasers than it has built and kept for public rental but in contrast to some other States the sales and rental programs have not been directly competitive. Separate funding sources have tended to be used for home purchase construction, while sales to existing tenants have not removed the best located rental units from public ownership.

Why is public investment in housing on so much greater a scale in South Australia? The answer lies partly in economic philosophy, partly in bureaucratic politics, partly in history.

In most other States, housing authorities bidding for funds in the State budget compete against departments and agencies with greater power and prestige. They also face Treasury arguments that housing investment diverts capital from more productive uses.

In South Australia, there has been a long standing consensus (embracing the Treasury) that public investment in housing is central to the State's overall economic development. Even in times of budgetary constraint, housing is accorded a high priority

And so it should be. The article continues:

The whole history of the South Australia Housing Trust is embedded in an economic development strategy. It was the key to the Playford industrialisation blueprint in the post-war decades, used to attract multinational investment by helping to reduce housing—and hence labour—costs. The trust's role expanded to that of urban developer, planner, land banker, financier and builder of shops and factories as well as public landlord and builder for private home purchase.

As an important illustration of State priorities consider the recent history of the Loan Council arrangements. Since 1982, States have been able to nominate for housing purposes funds from their overall Loan Council allocation. Such 'nominated' funds, unlike the rest of Loan Council borrowings, are provided to the States on highly generous terms—an interest rate of just 4.5 per cent per annum over 53 years repayment.

South Australia grabbed all the cheap money it could get. In 1983-84, it nominated its entire Loan Council allocation for housing. Compare that with nomination rates of just 26 per cent for Tasmania, 18 per cent for Victoria, and under 10 per cent elsewhere. Ever since then, South Australia has continued its 100 per cent nomination, funding its other capital expenditure from an overall higher level of taxation and dearer borrowings.

So, this shows conclusively that South Australia has done exceedingly better in public housing than have all the other States, both in providing public rental housing for people in low-cost accommodation and in providing an opportunity for people to purchase housing within their means.

Historically, the South Australian Housing Trust has been the innovator of the social aspects of public housing policy. It learned early to acknowledge some of the mistakes that had been made elsewhere and to take into account the social and employment infrastructure when building housing estates. Unfortunately, the Housing Trust has made a few errors, but I do not intend to criticise the trust.

South Australians, whether they have a Liberal or Labor Government, have remained loyal to the old reformist idea and I believe, as this article quite justifiably claims, that they put their money where their mouths are. I was informed only a few weeks ago that the trust planned to upgrade a section of its accommodation in Hillcrest, in my electorate. Only last week an announcement appeared in the press that a multimillion dollar trust plan will proceed to replace old houses. In the suburb of Hillcrest there is a problem with deterioration of Housing Trust homes, and soil movement adds to that problem. I believe that this is a step in the right direction.

Sometimes I receive complaints from tenants who have difficulties with deterioration of Housing Trust accommodation. The trust has readily responded to those complaints that I have brought to its attention and it has done the best it can. The news release by the South Australian Housing Trust states that this move for replacing ageing rental accommodation at Hillcrest follows a move by the trust to replace 800 trust dwellings at Mitchell Park. I believe that that program has commenced, and it is anticipated that the Hillcrest project will begin probably at the end of this year. I know that a number of tenants have been informed that this program will be commenced and that, while those renovations proceed, they will be accommodated in other premises. The homes are of gypsum slab construction clad with asbestos sheeting. They were built some 25 to 30 years ago and, as indicated, even though they are not very old, problems with cracking and deterioration have arisen. I point out that the area houses a high proportion of single parents and elderly people and that the homes have a low occupancy rate.

The whole aim of the exercise is to get more housing into the area than exists at present. The houses will be smaller. Some of the existing homes consist of two or three bedrooms and, because of the large blocks on which they are situated, it is possible that better use can be made of the area at the same time as upgrading the accommodation. In the interests of the residents in the area, I support that plan, and I compliment the Housing Trust on its initiative in that regard.

Earlier this year we all received a news release from the Minister of Housing and Construction indicating that there will be some increase in Housing Trust rents. Since that advice was given to tenants, I have received very few complaints about those rent increases, but nevertheless I will quote from the news release that was sent to us in February this year.

Headed 'Housing Trust rents rise to protect housing supply and to contain possible huge deficit', it states:

Housing Trust rents will rise 20 per cent above normal inflation increases over the next three years as part of a State Government move to protect the supply of public housing and control a possible huge trust deficit.

I might mention that the trust is expected to gain some \$35 million in additional revenue from rent increases in the three years to 1988-89. It is interesting to note that the trust ended the 1985-86 year with a deficit of \$7.4 million. The move is to try to contain the deficit and indeed to provide the trust with an opportunity to continue its housing program. The news release continues:

State Housing and Construction Minister, Mr Terry Hemmings, said today the increases were made necessary by the serious financial position of the Trust resulting from a \$30 million cut to the State in Federal funding for housing, and the growing number of trust tenants unable to afford full rents. Currently, 62 per cent of trust tenants pay reduced rents. The Government expects an even higher percentage of incoming tenants to require reduced rents.

Mr Hemmings said these problems had been exacerbated by the phasing in of a cost-rent formula under the Commonwealth-

State Housing Agreement which required public housing authorities to set rents at levels that would cover the cost of replacement of the housing stock. The new formula replaced a market rent clause that would have resulted in unacceptably high rents, pushing all trust tenants onto reduced rents.

The increases were to be effected in four stages over a period of two years. The first increase occurred in February 1987, with the second increase to occur in August 1987. I point out that simply increasing the rent level is not the total answer to the trust's deficit problem. I think that the trust must find a way to reduce the funding required to replace the low interest Federal funding that has been lost this year; and it must try to contain the deficit by means of not only rent increases but also through savings in administration costs, and so on.

I point out that the level of rent paid is income related, so no tenant pays more than 25 per cent of their income. I believe that over the 50 years that the trust has been in operation, despite whether a Liberal or Labor Government has been in office, it has done exceedingly well in offering housing to a large proportion of the population at reasonable rent. I purchased a Housing Trust home, and I have never regretted that purchase. I think that I received value for what I paid. Unfortunately, some local councils have an aversion to Housing Trust homes and they claim that such homes depreciate the value of other properties in the district. There are some councils which feel that way, and some are pressured by some of their ratepayers. However, I do not think that such an attitude is justified. From my own personal experience, I am very pleased with the purchase that I made, and I point out that I have lived in that house for some 30 years. I suppose that the next block I look for will be much smaller: it will be run by a trust, but it will probably be the Enfield Cemetery Trust rather than the Housing Trust!

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

Mr SLATER: That may be the case, but I will not worry about that—I will leave it to my estate. Anyway, I do not regard as valid the claims made by some councils that Housing Trust homes depreciate the value of properties within a district.

I think it is a bit of a fairytale. We see examples of Housing Trust developments which were quite beneficial to certain parts of the metropolitan area. I am reminded about West Lakes by my colleague the member for Albert Park. I think that that is a good example. There are many examples of the opportunities provided by the Housing Trust to those people who are not on high income levels so that they can live in this type of area. The important thing is to have a mix of population and to give people on low or medium incomes the opportunity to either purchase a Housing Trust home or to become a Housing Trust tenant.

I turn now to the massacre in the suburbs of Melbourne a few days ago. We should be concerned about the increasing trend towards violence in our society. We can all hop on the political bandwagon and say that we should tighten the gun laws, but I do not think that that is the real answer to the problem. The real answer lies in something which is much deeper than that within the society in which we live. I note that a prominent criminologist, who agrees with that point, has warned that this type of incident could be repeated. Several crimes of this type have been committed over the past few years. That creates the impression that there is an increasing trend towards violence within our society. It is happening almost every day. Whether you watch the electronic media or read the paper, you see a litany or a chronological account of all sorts of crime. I believe that the media has a responsibility—and as members of society we share that responsibility—to attempt to obviate those prob-

lems. We live in a complex and competitive society. We are all under pressure, particularly the younger generation, to succeed, in relation to either status or wealth. Those sorts of pressures are indicative of the problems which are created for some of the more vulnerable members of our society.

As I have said, rarely a day goes by that we do not read in a newspaper or see on a television news program bizarre and gory stories spelt out for us in great detail. I think that those stories have an effect on people who are susceptible to those sorts of influences. I do not know the answer, but I do understand that family stability has been gradually undermined. I do not wish to moralise, but because of that lack of family stability greater stress is placed on those who are unable to cope with our complex and competitive system; and those who fail in that contest try to prove themselves in many different ways. I do not want to detail what happened in Victoria, but this man probably regarded himself as a failure as a result of his experiences in life, and he took the step of massacring a number of innocent individuals.

One thing that does not appeal to me is that the media at times portrays criminals as folk heroes. For example, this occurred with Ronald Biggs who, as we all know, is just a criminal. Another example is Robert Trimbole, and we heard all about his illness, his pain and suffering, which was dragged out for months and years.

The media has a responsibility to give us the facts but not to dwell on particular aspects and try to create an impression that these individuals have some respectability when they are common crooks and criminals. Tighter gun laws, increased penalties and other legislative measures are not the answer. Our society needs to look at itself more closely to discover the root cause of the problem. Despite all the laws that might be made, a deeper reason exists for people who are emotionally disturbed or psychologically distraught.

At times in our electorate offices members of Parliament deal with constituents who unfortunately are not able to cope with the pressures and stresses of modern life. I have never studied psychology but my experience as a member of Parliament leads me to understand what kinds of problems exist in our society. Even though one feels sympathy for these people I do not know the ultimate answer. However, we should try to do as much as we can to improve society and get back to fundamentals. In every aspect of modern life we have become impersonal. The so-called 'caring' really does not exist deep down inside. We must return to showing respect for persons and property and try to inculcate that into the younger generations, not to impress on their minds the things that occur on television, video and sometimes in the press. If we do not do that we will continue to breed a race of people who are economically—

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

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I, too, thank His Excellency the Governor for his speech in opening the third session of the Forty-Sixth Parliament. I also express my condolences to the families of the Hon. Don Simmons and the Hon. Ron Loveday. I did not know these two gentlemen personally, but from comments heard during this debate and at other times I believe that they made a significant contribution to South Australia. All members extend sympathy to their families.

The program outlined by the Governor was very short in substance and devoid of major promises. Anyone who reads it, I believe, will agree with me. It is ironic to note that paragraph 4 of the Governor's speech indicates that the

Government is 'cognisant of its responsibility to ensure a balanced approach to economic management'. It is high time that the Government showed some responsibility in relation to economic management, because I believe that the Government has been very irresponsible in the way in which it has handled the economy. It is a little late to be waking up now and deciding that it is time to be responsible. Thinking back to the Tonkin Government's time, for three years that Government had to take very tough economic decisions and make spending cuts. What did the then Labor Opposition do? All it could do was knock, knock, knock. It just attacked, attacked, attacked! It did not appreciate what the Tonkin Government was doing for the future of South Australia.

An honourable member: Very little.

Mr MEIER: The honourable member interjects 'very little'. What absolute rubbish! This is the irony of the situation: in the Governor's speech it is pointed out that this Government has decided it is time to get responsible. It is four or five years too late—it should have started doing it immediately it got into office after the Tonkin Government's time. We, as taxpayers, the people of South Australia, have suffered as a result: we have suffered huge increases in taxes. Where has that money gone? It has been literally squandered!

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: People want to talk about tax rebates and the tax system and in some of the speeches given in this Address in Reply debate some members have knocked the Howard policy of lower taxes. Surely this Government should wake up and realise that one of the key initiatives for people to get on is for them to earn more money for the work they do. At present, after a person earns over a certain amount, 49 per cent goes in tax. We found during the last campaign that the Labor Government said, 'We don't want people to earn too much. We want to take more than our fair share.' It was a tragedy that the scare tactics were applied as they were.

Returning to the irresponsibility of the Bannon Government, one remembers that over the past few years South Australia has had the highest increase in the tax rate: between 1982-83 and 1985-86 there was a 49 per cent increase. One can compare that with Queensland, where there was an increase of only 25 per cent in the tax rate. I think that this, again, shows clearly that the socialist Labor Government is determined to hit people as hard as it can.

People also perhaps remember that South Australia has had the highest number of bankruptcies for the nine months to 31 March this year compared to the previous 12 months—a 58.6 per cent increase. Again, we can compare that to a non-socialist Government in Tasmania, where there was an 11 per cent increase in bankruptcies. So, again the business community has been feeling Labor's pinch very hard. Of course, we could also note other factors, such as the low increase in retail sales growth during the six months to March 1987 and the low increase in population growth, the lowest increase of the Australian States, of .8 per cent.

We remember how the Labor Opposition tried to knock the Tonkin Government during its period using population figures, yet since they have come to government things have not improved: perhaps they ought to look at the way they are trying to run this State and adjust their program accordingly. There has also been a massive increase in the size of the Public Service. It is a great shame that so much of our taxes—

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: I believe the figures show that there has been an increase in the vicinity of 4 000 persons during the past four years.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: The honourable member mentions teachers: boy, he has a hide! First, the Government promised that there would be no cuts in teaching services and no cuts overall. What has happened? Teacher numbers are being pruned and the Government is threatening closure of the Goodwood High School.

Mr Klunder: You will keep all the schools, will you?

Mr MEIER: We are not talking about what we are doing; we are talking about what the Government said it would do. This Government has been in office almost non-stop since 1970 and has absolutely mucked up this State.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the member for Goyder please resume his seat for one moment. The honourable member for Goyder is quite capable of making his contribution to the House without the assistance of the honourable member for Todd or the honourable member for Briggs. The honourable member for Goyder.

Mr MEIER: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker, for helping to control the rabble opposite; I appreciate it. The irresponsibility of the Bannon Government is continuing when we see that it could not care less about the rural sector. The member for Victoria highlighted in detail (and I will mention it briefly) the abolition of the payroll tax remission scheme. About \$6 million is being taken away from rural industries—\$6 million that was helping those industries to employ more people, to increase productivity and to expand. But, the Government is taking away that money and supplementing it with \$3 million, and it has not identified specifically where that money will be spent, although the Government has mentioned one thing—that the money will help set up committees to investigate how rural industry can be assisted. I tell you that, if there is one good way to pass the buck, it is to set up a committee, because when that happens nothing is done for 12 months or two years. A positive scheme that was introduced by the Liberal Government has been axed, and that shows the complete lack of concern of this Government for the rural sector.

I could go on and say that the Governor's speech highlighted what could be termed 'Bannon's great disappearing act'. One could ask where in the Governor's speech was there reference to the entertainment centre, the police communications centre, the proposed new STA depot, and the further extension of the north-east busway. Those references have disappeared; the projects are not mentioned.

Mr Hamilton: They should be in the budget.

Mr MEIER: It is very interesting that they are big projects at election time but they are not mentioned in a key speech to the State. They are just nicely forgotten. I will be interested to see whether or not they are referred to in the budget. It was interesting to hear the Premier say only this morning on radio that the budget details have not yet been finalised. He might have second thoughts about some of the issues that he forgot to include. I certainly hope that he tries to keep a few of the many promises he has made.

I guess we could compare the Premier's great disappearing act with his earlier great appearing act. Over the past three or four years there has been an appearing act. Members may recall when there was no sight on the horizon of new taxes or increases in charges as backdoor taxation. But there has been a record increase over three or four years. Those things appeared out of nowhere even though the Premier promised that they would not appear. We remember the

remarks about privatisation and how the Premier promised that under his Government that would not occur, but over the past 12 months we have seen massive privatisation initiatives. I guess I must applaud the Premier for that, but what I condemn is that he had the audacity at election time to knock the Opposition and say, 'Our Government would never do that sort of thing. Just imagine the consequences' and then put it into practice. We could point to the massive examples of waste, such as the yabbie farm, the caravan park and the three-day event in relation to which the Government seems to have made a great blunder—but I will not go into specific details.

I would like to applaud a few things that were mentioned in the Governor's speech, the first being the submarine contract that has been let to South Australia. The only thing I am not quite certain of is to what extent we have the majority of that contract—whether it is 50 per cent or more, or around 20 per cent. I guess we will find out more details in due course. I hope that we get the lion's share, because South Australia certainly needs the lion's share. In fact, we can look back and see quite clearly that it was the Liberal Party in government, particularly in Sir Thomas Playford's time, that built industry from virtually nothing to everything in this State. Since then, Labor has let industry slowly decline and slip away.

It has been aided once or twice by Federal intervention, particularly when Gough Whitlam came in and made sure that prices and wages for the average employee went up at such an astronomical rate that many businesses had to close their doors. That did not help South Australia at all.

At the opening by Senator Button of the manufacturing centre at Woodville during the recent Federal election campaign, I felt that I had gone to the wrong meeting and that I was at the opening of the ALP campaign. Senator Button got up and said how his Government would improve manufacturing. When he tried to tell the gathering that the Labor Government was the first Government to try to improve manufacturing in this country and get it going, I noticed that a few of the people present smiled at each other with an incredulous look, as if to say, 'The poor fellow on the stage, he should learn.'

I applaud that statement. However, he was wrong in that it was the Liberal Party that brought manufacturing to where it was, and it is the Labor Party that has helped to crucify manufacturing. However, it is pleasing that Labor Party members realise that they have to get their priorities worked out, because our State and country has looked very dismal. I do not have to highlight the fact that the dollar is very low, especially when compared with the yen, the deutschmark and even the British pound, and that our foreign debt has reached astronomical proportions. After four years the debt rose from \$30 billion when the Liberals lost office to \$110 billion. Those figures are very worrying.

I also mention the record number of bankruptcies in this country and our record interest rates, which, year after year, the Prime Minister and the Treasurer have been promising would come down. Thankfully, in the past few months a decrease of about ½ to 1 per cent has been seen. However, the decreases need to be of about 6 to 7 per cent for this country to get back on its feet. Diverting to the Federal election campaign, I must say that I was amazed to hear the Government say that our interest rates are tied to overseas rates. Sure they are; but what are the interest rates of America and the United Kingdom? They are in the vicinity of 6 per cent to 9 per cent, compared with ours at about 17 per cent. If Australia is tied to those rates, I wish that our interest rates could be halved now.

I applaud the mention made in the Governor's speech about Roxby Downs or, as he referred to it, Olympic Dam. It is very pleasing that the mirage in the desert is being hailed as something positive by this Government. It reinforces a change in attitude by the Bannon Government. When in Opposition all that members opposite would do was knock, knock, knock the Tonkin Government about any new industry. Roxby Downs was a key issue, but they knocked it for six and did everything they could to stop it going ahead. Now they realise that it is one of the great jewels in the State. It shows that perhaps the Labor Government is learning from lessons of the past.

One needs to be very careful about the identification of so-called nuclear free zones in this State. I notice that various councils have put up signs stating that they are nuclear free zones. I wish that could be specified. If it is meant in terms of nuclear weapon free zones, I can only say that the whole of Australia, to my knowledge, is a nuclear weapon free zone. If it means that councils do not want any nuclear particles in the area, they have a big problem because, for a start, there is the natural radioactivity from the ground.

However, more importantly and more specifically, people seem to ignore the great help that nuclear material provides for our State. I refer to the nuclear medicine wing in our major hospitals. I know of such a wing in the Adelaide Children's Hospital, and it is probably one of the greatest advances for that hospital in the past few years. I also know that it has helped to save the lives of many children. I do not know whether it is in terms of tens or hundreds of lives, but I certainly applaud the nuclear medicine wing at that hospital and other similar units of which I am not aware at some of the other major hospitals.

I remember talking to someone who suggested that nuclear energy was not a good thing to have around and that we should get rid of it. I said that I was fully in agreement with that suggestion regarding nuclear weapons, but the person with whom I was speaking said that he was referring to nuclear material generally. But, I asked, 'What about its use in medicine?'

He said, 'I don't think there's any nuclear input in the area of medicine.' He was unaware of that. When I told him that it was saving hundreds of lives he did not have an answer. The State Government needs to be clear not to knock the concept of nuclear energy but to consider where it is useful. That thinking was well advanced during the previous Liberal Government's time, some years ago now.

The Hon. H. Allison: A third of the world derives its energy from nuclear power.

Mr MEIER: As the member for Mount Gambier interjects: a third of the world's energy is nuclear generated.

Mr D.S. Baker: Unfortunately, our submarines will not be.

Mr MEIER: That is rather a disadvantage. I was pleased to see that the Governor mentioned in his speech the completion of the Wallaroo and Modbury Hospitals. I am pleased about the Wallaroo development because it has been a long saga and there have been some difficulties over the years, and it was not until the last election that the Minister of Health came up to the area and decided that things would definitely go ahead. Even then people were worried that the situation at Finger Point might be repeated, where the bulldozers were withdrawn. Thankfully, at Wallaroo the earthmoving was done, the foundations went ahead and the buildings are now close to completion. I am looking forward to the opening of the new Wallaroo Hospital, which will be a great asset for northern Yorke Peninsula and Yorke Peninsula as a whole. Wallaroo is a major centre for the various services offered.

Also, I hope that the area health scheme, which will incorporate Kadina, Moonta and Wallaroo, will progress. I know that discussions have been and are currently under way to sort out the fine details on that. For people wanting to visit the copper triangle area those hospital services will be much more efficient now than they have been in the past, and that will be certainly so once the hospital is completed.

Mention was also made in the Governor's speech about road deaths. Every member would appreciate the tragic aspect of such deaths, and I compliment the member for Briggs on many of the points he made last night in this House about road safety. I would have to take some issue with him about speed limits because, as a person who travels about 50 000 kilometres a year, I believe that speed on open country roads is not necessarily dangerous in itself. Perhaps what is required is more to do with a variation in speed limits and driver education. The member for Briggs also mentioned driver education.

I express some disappointment that a suggestion that I put forward, which again was an overseas innovation that I saw in America some 18 months ago, where there are passing lanes on major roads, has not been adopted. On single lane highways I believe that many accidents are caused by frustration resulting in people passing when they should not be passing. In America, and certainly in the State of Washington, they have a system of passing lanes on major roads. If a driver builds up five or more cars behind him, he is obliged to pull over into the next passing lane. He can still keep travelling at about the same speed—55 miles an hour—but the cars behind can pass.

This would be a very inexpensive way to upgrade our major arterial roads in country areas to ensure that traffic flows much more smoothly. I took up this matter with the Minister in writing last year, but unfortunately he tended to pour cold water on it.

The Hon. H. Allison: He passed it into the too hard lane.

Mr MEIER: Yes, a very good description. It is unfortunate that the failure to implement this scheme has contributed to more deaths. Perhaps it reflects on the vote of no confidence moved against the Minister yesterday. Perhaps the Premier is looking seriously at replacing the Minister of Transport because it is clear that he is not handling his portfolio at all well.

The Hon. H. Allison: Who could they find?

Mr MEIER: That is a very good point. We on this side know, and I want to deal a little later with the ineptitude of so many Government members. I am also interested in the use of impact drums in the area of road safety. Impact drums are used in the US where major roadworks are being undertaken and where the roadworks often mean that variations have occurred in the road, and the average driver may not realise there is some danger. Perhaps a stobie pole has been exposed closer to the road than it normally would be; maybe there are some new concrete barriers being put down the centre.

These impact drums look like 44 gallon drums but are made out of plastic and contain water, so that a motorist who goes off the road and would normally hit a concrete barrier or stobie pole instead hits the plastic impact drum filled with water and, obviously, the damage would be minimal. Apparently, that has been a great safety factor near roadworks. Also, there are the magnificent illuminated arrows on huge boards indicating that there are roadworks ahead. Our signs sometimes leave a lot to be desired. I must admit that the recent campaign to bring to people's attention the fact that they need to slow down when approaching roadworks has had an impact on me. We must respect the

lives of all people, and the Highways Department workers put their lives at greater risk than do many other workers.

I would also like to make a suggestion as to how we can improve the flow of traffic in the metropolitan area. Unfortunately, our freeway system here is abysmal, and I always delight in going to other cities where a freeway system extends from one side of the city to another and where one can be from one side of the city to the other within 20 minutes, but we do not have that here. I certainly blame the Labor Government for that, but I will not go into that in detail.

We can improve the flow of traffic in Adelaide if we allow people to turn left at traffic lights even when the traffic light is red. I will explain that a little further. Where one comes to a traffic light which is red and one wants to turn left, at present one has to wait until the light turns green, unless there is a 'turn left any time with care' sign (and that is the exception rather than the rule). In certain overseas countries one stops when the traffic light is red—being in the left-hand lane waiting to turn left—and, if there is no traffic coming from the right, one may go against that red light, turn left and continue.

At first I thought, 'This is only going to cause accidents,' but I spoke to a few people who had been driving for many years and they said, 'Look, it works perfectly. The main thing is to stop, with the red light, but once you see there is no traffic coming from the right you may turn to the left and continue.' They said that there were no accidents: it was safe. One obviously has to watch whether traffic is coming.

I believe that on many of our suburban roads where there are traffic lights it would get the traffic moving much more quickly. Further, it would eliminate another area of frustration for the driver which perhaps causes him to exceed the 60 kilometre per hour speed limit in built-up areas. If he is allowed to have a freer run through the left turn, anyway, it could be of assistance.

It was also pleasing to see in the Governor's speech that the Community Service Order scheme is to be expanded. Most of us will remember that, again, it was a Liberal initiative which brought the Community Service Order scheme into operation. In fact, it was the present Leader of the Opposition who introduced the scheme. I am pleased to see it being expanded, because I have some real problems in a section of my electorate. In the Point Pearce area, certain residents seem to get themselves into trouble regularly, and the community in that area is sick and tired of them, as is the community outside the area. These troublemakers are usually thrown into gaol for some time, and when they come out they seem to come out as tougher criminals.

The Community Service Order scheme will allow these people to do work, and I believe that if it is applied correctly they can actually help their townships. Such people will then realise that if they commit offences they will have to do a lot of work in their townships to make up for it.

They will not be seen as toughies; they will not be seen as guys who can get into gaol. They will be seen as people who perhaps should think a little more carefully next time, otherwise they may be working for twice as long on a community scheme. Additionally, it can help provide services to the community that perhaps the CEP schemes have helped up until 30 June this year.

The Governor also referred to water and how the Government will keep developing ongoing provisions for water supply and water storage management. That is fine, and I can only applaud that action, but what about the proposed new costs for having water put on to subdivisions that do

not already have it? At present in most cases it costs nothing. The new regulations propose a fee of \$1 200. A constituent rang me three days ago from a small country town where a portion of his land is valued at \$500, and he had a buyer for that particular block. He then made some investigations, and the E&WS Department informed him that under the new regulations soon to be implemented, it would cost \$1 200 to have the water connected. So, the \$500 block suddenly becomes a \$1 700 block, plus another fee varying between \$350 and \$450 for the E&WS Department, so we are looking at nearer \$2 000 for the block.

A \$1 200 fee on a metropolitan block of say \$25 000 or \$30 000 is a relatively small fee, but a fee of \$1 200 on a \$500 block is an enormous fee. The Government needs to reconsider this regulation; it could possibly be on a sliding scale and be a percentage of the value of the block. Otherwise, many blocks will remain vacant in country towns, because people will not be prepared to spend the money there when they can perhaps move out further for a cheaper block price. It is another instance where the Government has forgotten the implications that its regulations could have on country residents.

The Government has a lot of solid and serious thinking to do. I hope that it starts getting its act together. We have been waiting four to five years for that to happen. Maybe the coming year will show some positive results.

The Hon. T.M. McRAE (Playford): I support the motion, and I thank the Governor (Sir Donald Dunstan) for his address and acknowledge his service to the State and the support of Lady Dunstan. I join with him in expressing sympathy to the families of the late Ron Loveday and Don Simmons in their sad losses. Each of them was a fine member and a fine man.

I want to briefly discuss the question of public funding of elections. Before that, I want to refer to some practices and methods in the electoral system that in my view should be reformed. I will begin with placards and posters. These items cost peanuts compared to other various forms of political advertising such as television, press, and the like, but nonetheless they are expensive. They add to the already too expensive system.

Next, they are troublesome. We all know that in some cases people throw rocks at them or deface them in one way or another, and it has been alleged to me that some candidates do their own defacing and then lay complaints so that they can hold press conferences to catch a few headlines. Most certainly, I think we all agree that whatever the circumstances, they are troublesome.

Further, they are environmentally quite negative. I am pleased to say that over the past 10 years in Playford, in both State and Federal elections, we have not had these objects displayed. That has been achieved by agreement between me and the other candidates in the area. The environmental lobby in my area is very strong, and I have considerable support for it. I was unimpressed to find out at the recent federal election that due to pressure and competition between the candidates, these unpleasant objects were once again displayed all over the place. In my view, there are two options to deal with these things. They are pointless, useless, and expensive, and none of us need them. They are just an insult to the elector.

There are two options, one being to simply regulate them out. Again, like most other people I am sick and tired of more and more regulations. Why cannot the major political Parties simply reach agreement? Nothing is to be gained by these things—they are simply put there by operators at political Party offices to ensure that nobody, including any

of the candidates, can say that they have been let down. I hope that serious thought will be given to this matter.

The next useless objects I will refer to are how-to-vote cards. They also are expensive, troublesome and pointless. They are also a reflection on the capacity of the electorate to think. They are really a relic from the illiterate past that we have long since left behind. Not only that, many people feel harassed and annoyed, upon reaching the polling booth to cast their vote, to find themselves surrounded by numerous people—

Mr TYLER: On a point of order, although I do not wish to interrupt the excellent Address in Reply speech being made by the member for Playford, I point out that the time clock is stuck on 30 minutes.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That matter will be rectified.

The Hon. T.M. McRAE: There is a remark that begins 'With friends like that . . .'. I was dealing with how-to-vote cards. I take the view again that surely the political Parties are grown up enough to meet together and eradicate such things from the system. They really are pointless, unnecessary, and a hassle. The only people who benefit from the how-to-vote cards these days are those in the printing industry. That is one way of overcoming it.

Each of those two points begs the basic question of the practice and procedure itself. Our practice and procedure in electoral systems is still stuck in the 1890s groove. We today have access to electronic voting methods—why are we not using them? If the answer is that there is a small percentage of the population, be it 2 per cent or 5 per cent, which at election time feels anxious, harassed, or confused, then why are not electoral officers assisting these people to achieve their intentions in a proper way? In the 1970s we got out of the old systems in place then whereby we used to go to hospitals and other places where people were spending time involuntarily, and attempt to help them cast their vote. It was agreed by us all that it put us in a bad light. Many patients thought that they were being harassed, and it was perfectly proper that electoral visitors attended those institutions to help people record their vote.

We can take our guidance electorally from the common stance of business people. People in the profit-making institutions are well aware that sections of the community have basic difficulty in understanding or have difficulty that may not be so basic but may come about because of circumstances. The plain fact is that no more than 2 to 3 per cent of people ever find themselves in these sort of difficulties. Business understands that and lives with it, and so should we. I hope that in the near future action will be taken to install electronic voting in this State. There will be an initial expense, but no expense is too much when it comes to the proper functioning of the democratic process. That is what we are here about. We are not here for political gain but for freedom.

I refer to the regulation of expenditure and public funding of elections: the two go together. Over the past 20 years election expenditure in this country has got well out of hand. Public perception of what is going on is starting to get very poor indeed. It is well known that the major political Parties in this country and their State branches which, for all practical purposes they operate in financial terms, are in large financial difficulties.

They are all in financial difficulties. Any that are not in financial difficulties have a reason for being in that happy state, and this causes the perception of the problem. Why, for example, are some State branches heavily in debt but others not? The public perception is that those that are well off are being privately and corruptly funded by someone. That perception may be wrong and perhaps dollars are not

being exchanged for benefits. Perhaps it is all altruistic, but the public perception is otherwise, and it should be eliminated.

Again, one reason that starts this chain of activities is the desire of the political Party operators to protect their flanks. They want to be able to say to their members, their candidates and their Party machines that they have done everything in their power that is necessary so, when the crunch comes, if any possible step can be taken, whatever the cost, they will take it. If it means another full page advertisement or another two minutes on television, they will stand over the financial institutions to get the money so that on election night they can say that they have done everything possible regardless of cost—and indeed they have.

There are two avenues that we can explore. The hardest one is the regulation of campaign expenditure. This was tried in our own country and I believe that we have virtually abandoned the attempt. The fact is that one can easily monitor the candidate but it is almost impossibly difficult to monitor the activities of his political Party, his private sponsors, or whoever it may be. Certainly, in this country we have tended traditionally—

Mr Gunn: Your ex-friends in the South Australian Institute of Teachers and your public servant mates engaged in an untruthful campaign. Could you monitor them?

The Hon. T.M. McRAE: All political Parties, by definition, run untruthful campaigns, and I am under no illusion about that. The regulation of expenditure on election campaigns is almost impossible to be effective. In this country we tend to follow, if not the philosophies, in many ways the financial practices of the United States, and the situation in that country over the past 10 years has got completely out of hand. An ordinary seat in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress currently costs the candidate a minimum of \$500 000. In the Senate the minimum cost is \$4 million, and it is mounting every year.

The cost of the most recent Federal election is not known to me, but it must have been staggering to the political Parties and to the candidates. Certainly, I was not privy to the expenditure of candidates in the north-eastern region of Adelaide, but I have some idea of what they must have spent and I am sure that from now on in at least a marginal Federal seat, unless a person is relatively well to do, that person will be unable to participate. It will be as simple as that. Soon it will be more than that: a person will be unable to participate unless that person is wealthy. Then the position will be the same as it is in the United States today: unless a person is very wealthy and is sponsored privately, that person will be unable to participate.

An honourable member: It's being encouraged.

The Hon. T.M. McRAE: All political Parties are encouraging this state of affairs by maintaining their unrealistic attitude. I am trying to bring that to an end, and today I hope will be the start of public thinking on this process. My second point concerns public funding. We will not get public funding in this State unless the major political Parties agree. That is the way we must go about it, but the Parties will not agree unless the public perception is that the only democratic, decent, free and honest way to go is just that. I assure you, Mr Speaker, that every fair and decent commentator the world over has taken this view in recent times. For example, I refer the House to an excellent article—one of many—by Senator Charles Mathias, appearing at page 64 of the July 1986 *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. He presented a paper 'Should There be Public Financing of Congressional Campaigns?' and at page 71 where he canvasses some of the reasons why public finance should be provided, he states:

Partial public funding with realistic expenditure ceilings would enable candidates to run competitive campaigns in which private funding would continue to play an important but not a dominant role. A grant of public funds would free candidates from the incessant demands of fund-raising and offers the hope of shortening the seemingly endless campaign season. A system of public finance that includes a limit on the amount candidates may contribute to their own campaigns would eliminate the unfair advantage enjoyed by those with great personal wealth. And most important, public financing in congressional campaigns would restore a missing equilibrium between the resources of campaign funding and give office holders a greater measure of freedom to address issues in the broad national interest. Such results would go a long way toward renewing public belief in the integrity of the electoral process.

He is perfectly right, and I could provide a great deal more evidence than that. I do not expect that today is anything more than the start of some discussion on the matter. In South Australia we need some first step to be taken, perhaps to establish a joint select committee of this Parliament to investigate the matter, which needs to be looked at now thoroughly, reasonably and fairly by an all-Party committee from both Houses. There is no point doing it in a year's time, because the election campaign will have then started. That is where we are at politically. The election campaign begins shortly before the halfway mark of the term. I suggest that we need to do this now.

There are all sorts of good reasons, but I want to end with my personal reason for supporting this procedure, and it has everything to do with my comment about the exclusion of the otherwise worthy candidate who does not have personal wealth. It took this State over a century to establish the principle that anybody was worthy of coming to this House, including people of all occupations, regardless of their age, sex, creed, colour, or background. We have enjoyed that principle for the past 20 years. It may be a bore to have to listen to that galaxy of people, but really it is a very great privilege. We have a very messy, inefficient and costly system, but it is the best, and people all around the world know and acknowledge that fact. I do not want to lose that privilege and I do not want to return to the situation of the 30s, 40s and 50s where only people of privilege came to this Parliament, whether they were farmers, bankers, or people in the Adelaide establishment. The way things are going, we will return to that situation. It might be a different establishment, but it will be an establishment of one sort or another.

Moreover, the way things are going it will lead inevitably to direct corruption and there is no question about that. One only has to look at the pattern in the United States and in Europe to verify that statement. That was the path they trod, and they have tried to turn back too late. I do not want to see that situation arising in this State or in Australia. I ask that not only the Government but all members and all political Parties listen to my remarks today, and I hope that all citizens will do the same, for the good of us all.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I agree with the sentiments of the member for Playford, and it is great to see him back in full flight. Having first contested a seat in 1970, and having been given a donation of \$10 by my Party to open a bank account and having won that seat by 135 votes, I know what he is talking about. That is the only donation that I have ever had.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BECKER: Yes, six months after I was elected I got a bill for \$10, so I know what the member for Playford is talking about. It is the only donation that I have ever had from the head office of the Party. I wish the honourable member luck in his endeavours. My interpretation of the

public funding of Federal elections is that nothing has changed, except that election campaigns on our side of town have been far more expensive. For example, in my area the Labor Party outspends the Liberals by about four to one. That certainly occurs for State elections. Of course, for the Federal seat of Hindmarsh the Labor Party could run a one-legged dog.

Mr Gunn: It does!

Mr BECKER: Well, he is pretty lame, and pretty arrogant, as you would well know, Mr Deputy Speaker, from the many constituents who come to us complaining about the poor way that they have been treated. However, it is worth looking at the public funding of elections, provided that there are strict limitations on the spending and the type of spending. I do not expect that I will see that in my lifetime.

I thank His Excellency for the delivery of his speech to open this the third session of the forty-sixth Parliament. Like all members, I express my sympathy to the relatives of the Hon. Don Simmons and the Hon. Ron Loveday. I always found Mr Loveday to be one of the true gentlemen of the Labor Party, a person whom I respected and admired for what he endeavoured to achieve in the portfolio that he held during the term of the Labor Government. Don Simmons and I, of course, clashed on many occasions. There was never any love lost between the two of us. He did all that he could to stop me from being elected as President of the Bank Officials Association of South Australia and, after I had beaten him for that job, he did everything he could to stop me being elected as a member of Parliament—and I beat him again. But we had admiration for one another, for what we believed in and what we did.

As to the contents of the Governor's speech—and we all realise that it is written for the Governor by the Government and the various Ministers—I want to highlight some parts of it. The Governor stated:

As a result of significant reductions in Federal funding, there inevitably will be difficult and sometimes unpopular decisions in the allocation of State funding, but this is a challenge my Government has accepted, and will address in its deliberations leading to the framing of the forthcoming State budget.

For some months now we have been prepared for the Government's making some hard decisions. As far as I am concerned, the phrase 'hard decisions' is meaningless. The Government has to make some proper, responsible decisions, and it should have made those decisions years ago and not now. Those people who have been led into a false sense of security in this State and nation by irresponsible socialist Governments will now have to pay the price for enjoying some of the benefits, some of the fruits, offered by the Government in its endeavour to be re-elected.

Pragmatic governments are costly as far as taxpayers are concerned. However, nobody seems to wake up to that side of the issue. My reminder to the Premier of his responsibility in framing the forthcoming State budget will centre on two areas for which I am responsible, namely, correctional services and housing. I remind the Premier that he has an obligation to remove land tax on retirement villages. I am referring to people whose only residence is the unit that they have bought in a retirement village but who are now paying land tax of some \$400 per annum. The Premier undertook to remove that tax this financial year, and we will hold him to that undertaking. If he does not do that, his priorities will certainly be out of order and the wrath of these people will be demonstrated very clearly in this House. In his speech, the Governor further stated:

As my Government continues to initiate and assist in programs to best utilise our State's natural resources, I am pleased to note that the Olympic Dam copper, gold and uranium project is moving rapidly towards production by mid 1988.

Almost 1 000 construction workers are currently involved in the Roxby Downs development and this number will increase to approximately 3 000 next year as the joint venturers enter the second stage of developing the Roxby Downs township.

That was one of the great initiatives encouraged in the late 1970s and the early 1980s by the Tonkin Liberal Government. The development of the new township will be of great benefit to South Australians. Those persons in the housing industry and the construction industry who are responsible for building transportable houses are not impressed with the record of the current Government, which has done nothing but fleece the construction industry.

Several hundred transportable houses have been provided for the workers at Roxby Downs. What has the Government done? As from 1 December 1986 the Government significantly increased the cost per hour of escorting these transportable houses to Roxby Downs and to other parts of South Australia. That has added several hundred dollars to the cost of transporting houses to Roxby Downs. The cost of an escort from 1 December 1986 has been \$21.60 per hour for the first eight hours; \$29.70 per hour for the next three hours; and \$39 per hour, or part thereof, for all subsequent hours. Of course, you cannot go there and back in a day, so the escorts must have accommodation.

Escorts undertaken on Saturdays and Sundays have attracted the rate of \$29.70 per hour for the first three hours; and \$39.90 per hour, or part thereof, for any subsequent hours, plus other expenses. The rate for departmental vehicles of four cylinders or less has been 34.8 cents per kilometre, and for vehicles with more than four cylinders or with a rotary engine the rate has been 40.9 cents per kilometre.

The Government has announced that from 1 September 1987 those rates will be increased by 10 per cent. So much for the CPI, and so much for the inflation rate—it is a flat 10 per cent increase. This increase will be an additional cost to manufacturers, developers and others. It is an extra cost, and it is inflationary as far as the construction industry and the development of Roxby Downs is concerned.

The Government should be doing all it can to contain prices. We blindly accept that the CPI is the benchmark and think that everybody is happy with these increases. To start with, 10 per cent is not within the CPI, and it is also unfair. Less than 10 months after it was introduced we are faced with this 10 per cent increase on Police Department charges for escorting transportable homes to Roxby Downs and to other parts of the State. It is an absolutely intolerable situation.

In his speech the Governor referred to the activities of the Government, as follows:

My Government will continue its strong commitment to ensure all South Australians have access to a wide range of housing services. Some 2 500 families will be helped by the Home Ownership Made Easier program conducted through the State Bank, while the South Australian Housing Trust will continue its valuable building program.

Let us look at the valuable building program and the Government's contribution to the housing industry over the past few years. But first, let us look at the Premier's statement on housing policy prior to the 1985 election. The Premier said:

South Australians now have the confidence to buy a home and builders are meeting these needs. Building firms have their books full. Building workers are fully employed. Land is being developed rapidly. Confidence is high.

Further on in the statement the Premier said:

The Bannon Government has aimed at easing the pent up demand for housing and establishing a stable housing industry.

The Premier went on further to say:

It is now anticipated to settle to an optimum level of around 10 000 to 11 000 dwellings a year. This year's prediction is for about 10 000 commencements.

In fact, in the two financial years since that statement was made the number of new houses built in South Australia has dropped by 39.4 per cent. The number of new houses built by the Government has fallen by 23 per cent, and in the private sector the figure has fallen by some 35 per cent. There has been a disastrous downturn in the building of new houses in South Australia. The Premier's statement about 'pent up demand' and his talking up of the economy was totally false. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]

QUESTION TIME

ONE AND ALL

Mr OLSEN: My question is directed to the Premier. In view of the financial difficulties now faced by the First Fleet Re-enactment, has the Premier had any discussions with the board of the *One and All* about the security of Government loans to the project and is he concerned about the ability of the *One and All* to repay those loans, now totalling \$795 000?

The Government provided an initial loan of \$250 000 to the *One and All* and guaranteed a \$250 000 loan from the State Bank, followed by a further guarantee of \$150 000. Early this year, the Premier announced that his Government would provide another \$145 000 in loan money to bale out the vessel. That means that Government loans, or guarantees on loans, now total \$795 000.

In announcing the last amount of loan money, the Premier said that it had been provided subject to certain conditions being met, one being that the loan be repaid in instalments to be completed by 30 June next year, so it is assumed that at least some of this may have been due for repayment by now.

It is common knowledge that the financial difficulties faced by the First Fleet Re-enactment have resulted in part from the inability of the project to sell berths on the participating vessels. For example, I understand that the *One and All* has been able to sell only seven of its berths, suggesting that the projected financial returns upon which the Government's loans were made may not be fulfilled.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is great that, on day 4, at last I get a question from the Leader of the Opposition or from any member of the Opposition. I thank him for his question. I know that he and his Party are very strong supporters of the *One and All* and have endorsed the Government support that has been given. Indeed, the Opposition was very vocal, as I recall, in its support for Government assistance to this community project. I understand that the Leader of the Opposition is trying to ensure that Government support is being maintained and that if we have to increase our support he will be strongly behind it.

I appreciate the honourable member's support for this, and the Government, while not adopting the approach of the Leader of the Opposition, is prepared to support the *One and All*. However, we do so, as members might recall, against a background of financial mismanagement and cost overruns which were quite inexcusable. If the Government, the Port Adelaide council and another private donor had not come to the party, the *One and All* would have sunk long since. However, the Opposition definitely encouraged us to maintain that support, and indeed we did. I will not

provide an open cheque or an unconditional guarantee in these circumstances, and I make that quite clear, whatever members of the Opposition may wish us to say.

The total exposure at the moment to the State in terms of loan guarantees, and so on, is \$645 000. I do not know where the Leader got his figure. That is in terms of our liability. The security for our guarantees is the vessel itself, and a recent valuation obtained by the board values it at more than \$2 million. Providing no mishap occurs to the *One and All*, the guarantees are well secured. I repeat that, despite protests from anyone, including members of the Opposition, if the need arises to sell the vessel in order to recoup our finance that will be done. However, the *One and All* board has embarked on the preparation of a business plan which includes the 'sail adventure' operations of the *One and All*, the possibility of an arrangement with the other sail training ship *Failie*, and the establishment of operational methods which will ensure that it has a future in South Australia. If that occurs, well and good: if it does not, the vessel will be sold and we will recoup our money.

In the meantime, turning to participation in the First Fleet Re-enactment, the liabilities incurred in that exercise are being set against the First Fleet Re-enactment participation. At this stage I have not been advised of any major problems anticipated by the *One and All* board. Naturally, if they arise I would like to know about them. I thank the Leader for his endorsement of the project and assure him that, within the limits of financial probity and strict accounting, we will attempt to ensure that the *One and All* is successful.

RADAR DETECTORS

Mr RANN: Will the Minister of Transport consider introducing legislation to outlaw the sale and use of radar detection and radar jamming devices designed to allow speeding motorists to evade or break the law while continuing to place others at risk?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. In December 1986 a report prepared by the Commissioner of Police was forwarded to the Road Safety Division recommending a ban on the use and possession of radar detectors. Reference was also made to radar jammers with the suggestion that there is legislation prohibiting the use of such devices under the Commonwealth Radiocommunications Act 1983. However, the law is virtually unenforceable, as the offence related only to the operation of such devices; hence a person can only be charged if caught in the act.

Detectors operate by detecting the presence of a traffic radar unit and, given an early warning by visual and audible means, the driver adjusts the vehicle speed according to the legal limit. Jammers operate by sending out impulses which jam the radar unit and prevent a reading of the speed of the vehicle or the jammer can be programmed to give a lower speed reading than that of the offending vehicle. Victoria passed legislation to ban the sale, use and possession of these devices, but it is not yet operative. Cincinnati Microwave, the manufacturer, we understood was to mount a challenge to that legislation which I understand has not eventuated. The South Australian Government deferred consideration of proposals to introduce legislation pending the result of that challenge.

The way does appear to be open for the Government to consider legislation relating to these devices. I will take up the matter with my colleague the Chief Secretary so that further advice on the operating procedures that the police

wish to see incorporated in legislation is available to me, as Minister, and so that I can take a proposal to Cabinet for consideration. I assure the honourable member that my department will now move as quickly as practicable to ensure that these devices are looked at closely by the Government.

ONE AND ALL

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier say whether there are any circumstances under which he would agree to converting the Government's loans and guarantees of \$795 000 to the *One and All* board to a grant, as he did with the loan to the America's Cup syndicate?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am certainly not suggesting that, but I am suggesting that the Premier get his facts straight. Before the last measure of Government support was announced by the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition said:

The Liberal Party recognises that the Government cannot afford to go on pouring taxpayers' money into this project.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Premier has misled the House in his answer in seeking to gain comfort from the fact that we are in bed with him. In fact, the Opposition made it perfectly plain before the Premier made public funds available the last time that we were not supporting it.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That just makes me very puzzled, because the Opposition was, in fact, 100 per cent behind it. I am pleased that the Deputy Leader spelled out the qualification the Leader of the Opposition made, because it certainly was not made very apparent at the time the Opposition was urging us to put in more funds. But I agree with that completely: I am glad that he agrees with the Government, which is the attitude we took all along with the *One and All*. I am not sure where the \$790 000-odd comes from—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: All right. Well, the figure that has been provided to me is \$645 000; so, in fact, if the State Government is liable for more than that, it will be interesting. I repeat: a valuation has been done on the boat which exceeds the liabilities. A business plan has been prepared. If the business plan and the performance of the vessel do not stack up, the vessel will be sold and the Government will recoup its money.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is the answer.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! In Question Time the procedure is that we have a question followed by an answer, not a dialogue between members on opposite sides of the House.

CIRCUIT BREAKING EQUIPMENT

Mr ROBERTSON: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy investigate the possibility of framing legislation to make the installation of earth leakage circuit breakers compulsory in the construction of new dwellings in South Australia? Further, will the Minister provide a report to the House on the difficulty which has arisen in the past when plumbers who detached earthing systems from water pipes in the course

of their repairs were either unable or unqualified to provide an alternative earthing system?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I thank the honourable member for the question, which contains two important matters in relation to electrical safety in and around the home. The situation with earth leakage circuit breakers is that there has been a considerable amount of interest and promotion as to the desirability of having an installation of this nature. ETSA recognised this some time ago and assisted in arranging a seminar at which all sections of the community were represented—distributors, manufacturers, users or potential users, and so on.

The result of that seminar's deliberations was that it was not thought sensible—at that stage, anyway—to make it a mandatory requirement that earth leakage circuit breakers be used. The answer to the first part of the honourable member's question, therefore, is that I will certainly have another look at the question of legislation in this area and consult with the trust and any other expert body of opinion we can obtain, but it would seem on the face of it that it would not be desirable to proceed at this stage. That is not to say that I am suggesting that people who wish to purchase, install and use these devices ought not to do so: I am not suggesting that at all, but making it mandatory is the aspect I am addressing.

In respect of the second part of the question, relating to the possible loss of earthing protection in the household where a plumber or some other person is making alterations to the water pipe system, which is the common form of earthing protection provided when a connection has been made correctly to it, the honourable member pointed out, I think, that where plastic piping is involved earthing protection would not necessarily exist any longer.

I reassure many people in the community that in the mid-1970s the trust recognised that the old iron water pipe system and the earthing that went with it was gradually being discontinued by the various practices that I have outlined and, accordingly, introduced its own new system known as multiple earth neutral—the MEN system—which means that the earthing points in a household are connected by the trust to the steel pole conductor buried in the earth in the distribution system for the streets concerned.

That is protection (although it may not be apparent) to the household, provided that connection is not breached. In addition, there was the possibility of a backup, where the old system could still be connected to existing water pipe systems. As a further safety measure—and reassurance to consumers—in 1976 the Standards Association added to the wiring rules the requirement that, where new installations or major alterations are carried out, a separate and new earthing point must be provided.

The other point mentioned involves the situation where the plumbers are qualified to make the necessary electrical alteration. As a member of a Labor Government, I do not want to talk about possible demarcation areas. Plumbers can become licensed and get a restricted electrician's licence to do that sort of work to which the honourable member has referred. It involves a knowledge of five units in a course available at the Regency Park Technical College. Some 126 plumbers have already qualified in this way. It would seem, therefore, that the various safety assurances to which I have referred will be adequate. However, I urge any consumer of electricity who has any doubts to contact the trust officers, who are always very helpful in these matters.

ONE AND ALL

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: As the Premier's decision in January this year to provide a further loan of \$145 000 in relation to the *One and All* was based on the ability of the project to earn revenue from the First Fleet Re-enactment, what action did the Government first take to assess the financial viability of the re-enactment and, in particular, was the Government in possession of details of a financial study given to the Australian Bicentennial Authority which showed that the re-enactment was not feasible? Will the Premier also indicate who provided the valuation on the *One and All*, which he says is \$2 million, and will he provide documentary evidence of such valuation?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We have a \$3 000 million budget in this State. The jurisdiction covers health, education, welfare, roads, housing and transport, involving monumental programs. Finally, the Opposition, which said that there would be a hard edge economic attack on the Government this session, has decided to ask me three questions in a row about a project involving around \$600 000 or so of Government money tied up on loan. I find it staggering that that is the extent of the Opposition's inquiries. I repeat that the position of the Government's security in relation to the *One and All* does not depend on its success or otherwise in the First Fleet Re-enactment. Of course it improves, perhaps to the extent of half a million dollars, the finances of the *One and All*—there is no doubt about that. But the basic security is the vessel itself. The *One and All* Board has advised me—and I have no reason to doubt its integrity, nor have I demanded a copy of the document, a sighted assessment, or anything else—that the valuation of the vessel is well in excess of the sum over which the Government is at risk.

Indeed, it exceeds all the creditors of the vessel and no doubt, if it were decided that the vessel must be sold, it would be the Opposition, as it has done in the past, that would condemn the Government for letting this precious asset be lost from the community. The member who asked me today's question asked the Minister of Transport, either yesterday or the day before, why the Minister had put at risk a \$405 000 offer of hard cash for a Government asset (it happened to be a boat as well, I remind the honourable member) in favour of \$25 000 less on the never-never, which was an uncertain, unsubstantiated offer. He said that it was outrageous because a South Australian consortium was involved.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call Opposition members to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I suggest that, instead of reading prepared nonsense from the Leader's office, the member for Light at least check what he was asked to do two days ago with what he is doing today in order to see whether there may be some basic inconsistency in that.

ADELAIDE CHILD-CARE CENTRE

Mr DUIGAN: Can the Minister of Children's Services say what progress is being made on the establishment of an extended hours child-care centre in the city of Adelaide for those people who work in the city and near city areas—and who, because of their employment, work outside usual business hours? How will the provision of this centre supplement the existing programs for preschool children whose parents work in the hospitality, tourism and health industries?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I am pleased to provide some information for the honourable member in this regard. Progress is in fact well down the track in providing an extended hours child-care centre in the city of Adelaide. Indeed, it is the first such centre to be established, and it recently began operating in Gilbert Street. It will provide care over a 24-hour period for those parents whose employment means working shifts in industries such as banking, entertainment, the casino, hospitality, manufacturing, health services, and the like.

The centre, erected at a cost of \$483 000, will provide 55 places for children and will move towards providing a 24-hour service in recognition of the changing nature of employment and work patterns and of the high demand in the community at present for high quality child-care. The Children's Services Office and the Commonwealth Government jointly sponsored this proposal, which has received the backing of a number of trade unions in order that the project would be realised. The centre joins a number of other related child-care services in the city of Adelaide, where there are six child-care centres of one form or another and two preschool centres. There are also two valuable out of school hours care and vacation care programs. So, that package provides a whole range of services for the people to whom the honourable member has referred.

WAGE INCREASE

Mr S.J. BAKER: Will the Premier give a guarantee that the cost to taxpayers of any payment of the 4 per cent second tier wage increase to the State public sector will be offset in full by savings achieved through increased productivity? As South Australia's largest employer, the attitude of the State Government to the national wage case guidelines for granting second tier increases is particularly important. Those guidelines direct that such increases should be granted only for productivity improvements achieved through increased efficiency and reductions in restrictive work practices.

Press reports this week have referred to negotiations with the United Trades and Labor Council and various unions representing ETSA, but it is not clear yet whether the concessions being offered by the union movement will fully offset the cost of the increase or whether the Government is insisting that this must occur. If there were no offsets, the annual cost of a 4 per cent increase to the State budget would be more than \$50 million, while it would also add at least 1 per cent to the next increase in electricity tariffs.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Obviously, the member bases his question on a report pertaining to the agreement made this morning between certain ETSA clerical officers, I think they were, and ETSA over this question, which, as I understand it, must go before the commission. I do not have the details of that agreement, but the principle espoused and made quite clear was that the negotiations were conducted on the basis that there would be offsetting savings for the increased amount.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Four per cent offsets. That is the principle laid down by the Arbitration Commission in any such negotiations. It is no secret that public sector unions have formulated claims. They are drawing up various offsetting proposals, which obviously will be looked at. My colleague the Minister of Labour is happy to meet with them and to discuss those proposals. Of course, in the final analysis it must be properly tested. Overriding that is any decision that the Industrial Commission may make if con-

fronted with a particular claim or assessment. As far as our policy is concerned, the answer is 'Yes': the 4 per cent tier is dependent on offsetting productivity savings. No provision will be made in the budget for the cost of the second tier, because that is the basis on which negotiations must proceed.

TAFE LECTURERS

Mr FERGUSON: I direct my question to the Minister of State Development and Technology. Why is the Government apparently not going to arbitrate over TAFE working conditions? Certain members of the Opposition have made claims by way of the daily newspapers that they will oppose regulations relating to set teaching hours and other management issues. They have stated also that they will support SAIT in having these issues decided by the Industrial Commission.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for asking that question and, indeed, I thank him for using the word 'apparently'. Many of the conditions approved by Cabinet in relation to new terms and conditions for the employment of TAFE lecturers will go before arbitration; they will go before the Teachers Salaries Board, as was already planned and announced to the South Australian Institute of Teachers and to other people. In a moment I will deal with other matters which, on our motion, will not go before those bodies.

I am bemused by the situation that now applies with respect to the proceedings in both Houses of Parliament. First, I am bemused by the fact that it has taken the member for Henley Beach—a Government member—to ask this question rather than a member opposite. I would have thought that, since members opposite have made so many comments in the press about it, the matter would have been of some concern to them. I would have thought that, of the 186 questions on notice and the 31 questions without notice asked since last Thursday by members of the Opposition in this place and in another place, at least one question might have been directed towards this issue upon which they are prepared to pontificate publicly, but about which they are not prepared to ask questions in this place. Instead of actually asking questions to find out the facts of the matter, they choose to move motions of disallowance.

I suggest that they do not want to ask questions about the facts because they do not want to know the facts; they would rather not let the facts spoil a good story. I say that, because it is very interesting to see the degree of equivocation that applies on the Opposition side with respect to the actions of the Government at this stage. I ask members to cast their minds back to the Estimates Committees of last year and the contributions made by the member for Mitcham and the member for Mount Gambier on the issue of the hours of lecturing staff within TAFE. Both members asked, 'What is the Government doing about this? This is something that should have been addressed.' I give full credit to the member for Mount Gambier, because he acknowledged that this issue has not been addressed for some years, and he went on to question what was happening now.

What the Government is now doing is the answer to that question. Last year members opposite asked why we were not doing something; this year they are trying to stop us doing something. I believe that this is the real reason why, out of their 187 questions without notice or their 31 questions so far on notice or without notice, they have not yet decided to ask me for the facts. As I mentioned at the

outset, the facts that are significant parts of the package that have been agreed will in fact go to the arbitration process; they will go before the Teachers Salaries Board. That was acknowledged the moment that Cabinet made its decision. It was part of the Cabinet decision. However, there are other matters that will not, and they will not because traditionally it is the prerogative of management to decide what happens in relation to those matters.

It may be that the member for Mitcham and the Hon. Mr Lucas in another place want to change the way that tradition has operated in these matters or they may wish to claim that members of the institute, their new-found friends, have never understood what was going on. I want to relay to the House some information that I conveyed to the Institute of Teachers prior to the second stage of the negotiations on this very important issue. Turning to the second stage of the negotiations, namely those from March to May this year, when a significant attempt was made to reach an agreed position, I invited the President of the institute to take part in those negotiations, and in my letter of invitation I said, among other things:

Those negotiations would attempt to lead to an agreement between the parties—

and I shall now read an important part of that letter—

but with a brief which would permit a final position to be reached, which does not necessarily include the registration of a formal award or agreement with the South Australian Industrial Commission.

That was my letter of invitation to the institute. That was what it accepted; that they were entering into negotiations that would have elements that would be subject to an award and elements that would not necessarily be subject to an award. That is in fact what happened.

During the negotiations that then proceeded, both sides gave significant ground in those decisions. The Government certainly gave ground significantly in the discussions. They were not inflexible and they gave ground significantly. In fact, some people in the community said that we gave too much ground. Our starting position was that there should be 20 days recreation leave for TAFE lecturers. Our end point, that which was agreed by both parties to be put to institute members and to the Government, was that there would be 30 days recreation leave for principals and 39 days recreation leave for lecturers. People have said that we have been inflexible, that we gave no ground. However, that one point alone—and there were other points on which we gave ground—indicates the significant ground that we gave. It certainly belies any claims that negotiations did not take place.

I come back to the point about whether or not the entire process should be subject to arbitration. We have acknowledged that certain elements have to be subject to negotiation before the arbitration process, that is, involving the Teachers Salaries Board. However, other points are clearly points of management. Surely, having determined that a lecturer will work 37 hours a week (and there has been no change in that position by the Government; we have not asked that they now work 40 hours or 45 hours a week but we are saying 37, which applied before and which applies now), the Government has the right of management to determine how that 37 hours is allocated. Last year the Opposition said that yes, the Government did have that right, while this year it says that we do not.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Anything for a vote.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Anything for a vote, as the Minister of Housing and Construction says. I warn members opposite of the precedent effect of this, and what this means for management in government generally. Does this mean, for example, that issues of non-contact time for primary

teachers or secondary teachers should also not be the prerogative of government in relation to making management decisions? Indeed, this Government and the former Government have made management decisions on these issues.

I remember that, as Minister of Education, I made a management decision to increase the non-contact time of primary teachers. The honourable member is now saying that this should not have been done by management, that this should have been done by means of the arbitration process. We cannot allow this selling out of these important rights of management decision-making to leave our area. In fact, the Government is opposing before the Industrial Commission the claim that all the changes to terms and conditions should be subject to arbitration. We are arguing a case that, yes, some should be but that in relation to others it is the right of management to determine the allocation of duties.

It is in that context that I indicate my concern at the stance that the Opposition, and the Democrats in another place, have taken. It has clearly vindicated claims that they are opportunist and that they will go for whatever seems to be the flavour of the month. Why say one thing last year and then this year want to hop on the nearest thing that might get them a bit of credibility around the place?

The facts are that the Government, which has given in real terms increases to TAFE every year that I have been Minister, this year recognises that it has to get extra returns from the dollar that the community is giving to the TAFE system. Unlike other Governments of Australia—and there were other Governments that did this without any negotiation—for many months we attempted to talk this issue through to see whether we could reach an agreed position.

Finally, if one cannot prove that negotiations will achieve any more, the Government has to bite the bullet. We have done that, and I am disappointed that the Opposition, which on the one hand calls us to do something, is now on the other hand so cowardly about the matter and is choosing to run away from it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Heyssen.

HERITAGE ITEMS

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Planning. What action does the Government intend taking to determine local government responsibility regarding the preservation of items that are recognised as being of local heritage significance? More than 12 months ago, following some nasty situations surrounding the demolition of buildings in Unley and Mount Barker (to name just two), the Minister released a discussion paper providing the opportunity for local government to have an input into determining necessary changes to ensure the preservation of certain buildings which are not on the State heritage list but which are recognised by local councils as being worthy of preservation.

One suggestion put forward is that demolition should become a form of development under the Planning Act. Local councils have become extremely frustrated following the lack of positive action on the part of the Government. Therefore, I seek from the Minister details of action taken or proposed by the Government which will clarify the problems currently being faced by local councils in the preservation of items of local heritage significance.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Government did exactly what local government was asking of it: that is, it prepared

a proposition, it circularised it to local government, and invited local government to make submissions on it. Those submissions have, I think, largely come in and they are being evaluated. When the decision is to be taken that evaluation will take into account the responses received from local government.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH STUDY

Mr De LAINE: My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Planning. Following the recent environmental health study of people living on the northern Le Fevre Peninsula, will the Minister consider undertaking a similar study to cover the complete industrial area of Port Adelaide?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I think that the suggestion has merit. I will take up the matter with my colleagues the Minister of Health and the Minister of Labour, who would also be interested in this from their portfolio viewpoints, and bring down a considered reply for the honourable member. Generally, I would favour expanding the ambit of the work that has already been done, particularly to the Wingfield industrial area of the city.

GRAND PRIX BALL

Mr LEWIS: I want to ask the Premier a question about the way in which he spends taxpayers' money and whether or not they get access to it. Will he ask the Grand Prix Board to review its decision to deny the South Australian public the opportunity to attend the Grand Prix Ball in the Adelaide Convention Centre?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Murray-Mallee has the floor. He does not need to be accompanied on the floor by the honourable member for Mawson. The honourable member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: The Grand Prix is an event to which taxpayers have given significant financial support to the tune of at least \$8.4 million in the form of various Commonwealth and State grants. The ball is to be staged in the Adelaide Convention Centre, the rent on which is paid by South Australian taxpayers. These are reasons some members of the public have given in complaining to the Opposition that they are to be denied the opportunity even to apply for an invitation to this year's ball. One complainant has taken this morning's statements in the *Advertiser* by the Grand Prix organisers as tantamount to treating the South Australian public as second class citizens, plebs who should be content to attend the Clayton's Grand Prix Ball rather than the official event. He asks whether the Premier is condoning an elitist society in Adelaide.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No taxpayers' funds are involved in the official Grand Prix Ball. In fact, at \$250 a head, I would be amazed—

Mr Olsen: No, \$225.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is \$225, is it? The Leader is well aware of the cost. At that price I sincerely hope there is no taxpayers' subsidy. So, point one: the Government is not organising that ball; and point two: there are no taxpayers' funds involved. Indeed, there is a very high cost per head for those attending, and it is up to the Grand Prix organisation as to what it wants to do with that particular promotional vehicle.

I point out that the reason why the Government is involved in the Grand Prix through an authority has nothing

to do with the Government suddenly discovering its role as a sports promoter for the South Australian community: it is in order to attract interstate and international dollars into South Australia to aid our State's development and employment opportunities. So, if every person who is paying \$225 a head to go to this ball comes from outside South Australia and is putting their money in here, and no South Australian is attending, I will be very happy indeed; that would be great.

I also resent the honourable member for Murray-Mallee's idea that any other function is somehow downmarket and not worth attending, or is a 'Clayton's ball'. I rather suspect that if some people, whether for status, prestige, or whatever else, are pleased to go to the official ball, there will be a lot more people who will enjoy themselves a lot more thoroughly at some of the cheaper and more open slather entertainments that will take place at the Old Lion Hotel and at various other venues. I hope that the honourable member is one of them, if he does not crack an invitation to the ball, which is obviously his chief concern.

To try to despise those other events and to suggest that in some way something is wrong with this sort of organisation, I find quite extraordinary. So far as the Government is concerned, the Grand Prix is about making dollars for this State, and about creating employment and jobs in this State. The honourable member referred to public money sunk into this event: I refer him to the report I tabled yesterday which will show that the \$1.5 million underwriting loan taken out for the Grand Prix can be more than set off against payroll tax, payments to Government authorities for work done, some \$200 000 or \$300 000 spent on upgrading the parklands and road resurfacing just for that event alone. Anyone who believes (the honourable member is obviously one such person and there are a few correspondents to the papers every now and again who believe this) that this outlay of public funds through these loans to the Grand Prix authority is not returning more than 10, 50 or 100-fold to the State ought to sit down and look at the accounts.

STA BUILDING

Mr GREGORY: Can the Minister of Transport advise the House who owns the building on North Terrace into which the State Transport Authority recently moved? Press reports have recently carried statements about the cost of constructing that building and how that cost has contributed to the State Transport Authority's deficit. I have been advised that these reports are incorrect and that the State Transport Authority is making money out of this move.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question, because this happens to be one of those inaccurate rumours circulating around Adelaide that I can only judge are designed to reflect on a very good transport system indeed. Of course, members opposite do not want the truth about the STA building to be put on the record: they do not want to hear the truth about the STA building because, as my colleague said earlier, the truth always spoils a good story.

If members cast their minds back, they will understand that when the decision was made to construct the Casino in the Adelaide Railway Station building the management of the STA needed to find alternative accommodation. It did this in three rental premises around Adelaide: the Norwich Centre in North Adelaide, the old TAA Building (now the Australian Airlines Building), and another building on North Terrace which I think used to be called the IBM building, in which the STA computer was housed. This

arrangement was both inefficient and costly. It was fortunate that the Chairman of the STA was able to initiate a development which has resulted in benefits not only to the STA but to South Australia.

The South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust and the Police Pension Fund agreed to construct the building on the corner of North Terrace and Bank Street. It is strata titled; the authority leases the upper floors and the Karidis group owns the ground and basement. The authority will sublease all accommodation in excess of its requirements. SASFIT and the Police Pension Fund also funded the underpass development, which I understand is on a peppercorn rental from the Adelaide City Council. The authority leases the commercial premises and the underpass, then subleases them to commercial tenants.

In addition, the STA receives rental from its tenants in the Adelaide Railway Station building. The STA has not made any contribution at all towards the construction of the building on the corner of Bank Street and North Terrace, and when both the commercial and office premises are fully leased the STA will make an annual profit from the operation. So, it is a very good deal indeed, yet this sort of financial arrangement in which the STA is involved results in criticism from members opposite and from the press.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The shadow Minister of Transport says that he understands all this. If he does, why does he not tell his colleagues not to be running down these false trails which, as I said, can only be judged as an attempt to besmirch the reputation of a very good transport system? It is a very good deal for South Australia—I believe one of the best which has been arranged in recent times. Instead of members opposite applauding it and congratulating the STA and the Government on this deal, here we have this carping criticism. More particularly, I make this point so that those political columnists such as the well known political commentator in the *News* understand the truth; then in future, when he wants to comment on the STA, he can forget that little story he likes to run about the STA building.

TAFE BUDGET

The Hon. H. ALLISON: My question is to the Minister of Employment and Further Education and relates to a commitment already made by the Minister. Will the Minister give a guarantee that his promised cut of up to \$1.5 million in the TAFE central office budget will be a cut in staff positions at the central office and not a cut to other budget lines, because we believe that that would be tantamount to indirect cuts in college budgets, and that is something we are all hoping to avoid?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the member for Mount Gambier for his question and certainly appreciate receiving what is a very important question to be answered in this House. Last week I gave some information on this matter and indicated that whatever the cut was in the central office it would be greater in a percentage term than any cuts to college operations. The honourable member is asking for further clarification of that, and saying, 'Let it not be by the back door: let it be really in the central office.' He makes the point of two possibilities. The first is whether or not it would be a cut to staff or a cut to other budget lines, with a direct implication for college operations.

There is a middle category—non-staff central office expenses—which has indirect relevance to college operations. The cost cutting to central office will apply to either staff in the central office or to those non-staff expenditure

items that do not directly relate to college operations. In my answer last week I indicated also that the cuts will comprise a number of components. One is an absolute cut to expenditure as part of the Government's belt tightening as a result of stringent financial circumstances.

Another aspect will be a transfer of responsibilities from the central office to colleges with the concomitant transfer of resources to colleges for that to happen. I argue that it would have been possible some time ago to have the colleges conducting these operations quite ably, acting for each other in the system rather than simply having it in the central office area. I thank the honourable member for his question, which is quite important. I repeat the assurance that I gave to the House last week: budget cuts in the central office will be greater in percentage terms than cuts to college operations.

STA TICKETING SYSTEM

Mr TYLER: Does the Minister of Transport consider that the Crouzet ticketing system that is to shortly operate on STA buses, trains and trams is reliable, despite remarks made by the member for Bragg in this House yesterday? Yesterday the member for Bragg quoted from a document that he said had been written by Mr Bruce Walton, of the bus drivers union. I have been told that Mr Walton was one of the members of the STA officers and employees delegation that visited France to inspect the new ticketing system. Mr Walton's alleged comments, as portrayed in this House by the member for Bragg, cast the system in an unflattering light.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. I was surprised to read the comments of the member for Bragg (the shadow Minister), as I think that he would concede that I have given him ample opportunity to be informed on transport matters. In fairness to him, he has always honoured, to the best of my knowledge, the confidentiality of information given to him, as did the member for Light when I was Minister of Local Government. It is great to be able to deal with people of whose confidentiality one can be assured—that is how it ought to be. I was surprised to read the honourable member's comments.

Apart from the little flights of fancy about 'springtime in Paris'—I believe it was April and not Paris, and the honourable member knows that—the delegation also went to London to see the equipment being used on British Rail. It also went to Valence and Marseilles. I think it was Marseilles to which the honourable member was referring in quoting Mr Walton. The case cited by Mr Walton in that report is one in which we should take a considerable deal of interest, because in Marseilles the Crouzet system was introduced without a publicity campaign. One day they had the old system and the next day they had the new, and the result was chaos. In South Australia we are definitely not going to do that. The shadow Minister is already on the record as saying that we should have a good advertising campaign for the STA and the Crouzet ticketing system. So on the one hand he advocates an advertising campaign; and on the other hand he tries to criticise the STA by using an example which in fact substantiates the recommendation he made to us about publicity. He cannot have it both ways. It is another example of members opposite refusing to check the facts before going off half-cocked.

SCHOOL SECURITY

Mr S.G. EVANS: Will the Minister of Education liaise with the Minister of Housing and Construction to have the

Housing Trust establish, at schools, homes that could be occupied by people who could act as caretakers to help protect school property from vandalism and, where no land is available, to acquire, if possible, an adjoining property that already has an established home? In asking this question, I do not suggest that the Minister should employ caretakers. However, people have told me that many pensioners have low rental housing available to them and that, if they lived on the school site and were provided with a house free just for keeping an eye out for people who might be there after school hours, the cost to the State would be low compared to the cost of fires and other acts of vandalism. Will the Minister discuss this matter with his colleague with a view to taking this action?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his interest in the security of school properties, which is a matter of community concern. Indeed, I addressed this matter in reply to a question in this House last week. However, the path down which the honourable member wishes us to move may not be the best approach in this regard. This matter has been considered by our respective departments, but I will have it referred to my colleague again to see what consideration can be given to it. The purchase of houses and the payment of salaries in respect of the 728 schools in this State would be expensive. Indeed, I suggest that at the outset \$50 million would be required even for the houses. In addition, the role that a caretaker might play might be found to be outdated as regards the surveillance and security of school properties, given the nature of offences currently committed against schools of this type in the community. However, I will have the matter examined and obtain a report for the honourable member.

BUILDERS LICENSING ACT

Ms GAYLER: Is the Minister of Employment and Further Education aware that problems may be experienced with the new Builders Licensing Act and, in particular, its effects on certain Government programs funded by the Office of Employment and Training which involve building work of even a minor nature: namely, the home assistance scheme, adult unemployment support programs, job seeker projects, and some CEP projects? Can the Minister say what action is being taken to solve the problems that have emerged in this regard?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for her question. Certainly, I am aware of the changes to the Act and of some concerns that they may have implications for programs offered by the Office of Employment and Training. Discussions are under way between the Office of Employment and Training, the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs, and the Crown Solicitor concerning any possible implications that there may be. Those discussions are aimed at identifying whether, in fact, there are legal inhibitions to employment and training programs as they currently operate and, if there are such inhibitions, what remedial action is necessary to ensure that these valuable employment and training programs can still be delivered to disadvantaged persons whilst at the same time ensuring that the essential elements, the objectives of the changes to the Builders Licensing Act in preventing poor workmanship from being carried out, can still be achieved. So, I understand the concern in this matter. We are following it through and, if changes are required, they will come before this place in due course.

PETROL PRICES

Mr MEIER: Can the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs, say why, after almost five years in office, his Government has not acted to remedy the massive price differential between the prices of petrol and liquid petroleum gas in the city and those applying in country areas?

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: I wish that some members would learn to behave—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MEIER:—during the session rather than interjecting. Yet again, during the past two weeks price differences of 20c per litre (or 90c per gallon under the former system of measurement) occurred between city and country petrol prices. Similar variations have occurred in the price of LP gas. Country residents and tourists are becoming fed up with the situation. Because of such price differences, country motorists who travel 20 000 kilometres a year have to pay at least \$350 extra per year for their fuel. Farmers often have to face costs of \$1 000 or more per year for their farm fuel bills than would be the case if they could buy their petrol at city prices. In the rural areas of South Australia tourism is suffering a setback because of these price differences. The present Government, when it was in Opposition some five years ago, gave assurances that petrol prices and variations in petrol pricing would be addressed when it came to government. Why has it not acted to this date?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question and certainly I will refer it to my colleague in another place for a considered reply, but I point out that in comparison with other capital cities in Australia, the residents of Adelaide consistently enjoy the cheapest petrol prices of any capital city. This is a matter for determination by the Prices Surveillance Authority; it is not a matter for determination by the South Australian Prices Commissioner. I will obtain a report on the matters to which the honourable member referred.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act for the appropriation of moneys from the Consolidated Account for the financial year ending 30 June 1988. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides \$875 million to enable the Public Service to carry out its normal functions until assent is received to the Appropriation Bill. Members will recall that it is usual for the Government to introduce two Supply Bills each year. The earlier Bill (which was passed on 16 April 1987) was for \$645 million and was designed to cover expenditure for the first two months of the financial year. The Bill now before the House is for \$875 million, which is expected to be sufficient to cover expenditure until early November, by which time debate on the Appropriation Bill is expected to be complete and assent received.

Members will notice that the amount of this Bill represents an increase of \$225 million on the second Supply Bill for 1986-87. Approximately \$165 million of the increase is

to cover the passing of a number of Commonwealth grants through the Consolidated Account for the first time. It is a requirement of the Public Finance and Audit Act, which became operational on 1 July 1987, that all Commonwealth funds be taken through Consolidated Account. This is a new procedure, which will make comparison on a year to year basis somewhat more difficult unless one makes adjustment for the Commonwealth payments that are being taken in this way for the first time. Members will recall that a similar provision was made in the first Supply Bill this year. The Bill provides no authority to pay wage and salary increases. Standing authority for this purpose is contained in the Public Finance and Audit Act.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of up to \$875 million.

Mr OLSEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings, for the Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Agriculture), obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Marketing of Eggs Act 1941. Read a first time.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMING: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Marketing of Eggs Act which was proclaimed as a wartime measure in 1941 provides for the establishment of the South Australian Egg Board and all eggs from commercial farms in South Australia are vested in the board. The board has powers to control egg marketing, set egg prices, administer egg weight and quality regulations and carry out promotional activities. The board generally does not handle eggs other than to manufacture egg pulp; the majority of shell eggs are graded, packed and distributed by packers and producers registered with the board. The board operates the only egg pulping facility in South Australia and all eggs surplus to local shell requirements are pulped and either sold on the local market or exported.

At the present time the Marketing of Eggs Act applies to all egg producers with more than 20 laying hens and there are about 380 such producers in South Australia.

The South Australian Egg Board currently consists of seven members, four appointed by the Minister and three elected by 120 licensed egg producers who keep more than 500 laying hens. The board currently has a full-time chairman.

The United Farmers and Stockowners of South Australia developed proposals for changes to the structure and function of the board which they asked the Minister to consider.

These included the proposal that all members of the board should be appointed by the Minister, including the producer members who are currently elected by producers who keep more than 500 hens. Also that the board should exercise greater flexibility in its control of the production, grading, packing and distribution of eggs.

The Auditor-General has also expressed concerns about his reporting responsibilities under the current Act. He is concerned that he is required to report on aspects of the board's operations about which he has insufficient information and which also require subjective assessments.

The amendments provide for a reduction in the size of the board from seven to five members. Membership will include two producer members and a part-time chairman. All members will be appointed by the Minister, with the producer members being appointed from a panel of names put forward by the United Farmers and Stockowners of South Australia Incorporated. It is my intention to appoint non-producer members with skills in financial management and marketing to complement the industry knowledge and expertise of the producer members.

In view of the relatively small numbers of producers who actually elect producer representatives at the present time I feel that it is appropriate that producer members are nominated by the United Farmers and Stockowners who represent the majority of egg producers. This measure will also save the expense of holding elections for Egg Board members every year.

The newly constituted board will continue to play the major role in managing the egg industry and must have members who will be responsive to the needs of both the egg industry and consumers.

The amendments also meet the reporting requirements indicated by the Auditor-General and bring the South Australian Egg Board into line with the reporting procedures required from other statutory bodies and Government agencies.

The amended legislation will apply to all egg producers keeping more than 50 laying hens.

The board will continue to exercise overall control of egg production and marketing and will continue to administer egg quality and weight grade regulations and to manufacture egg pulp. It is my intention to appoint members who will encourage producers and packers to develop the necessary flexibility in the production, grading, packing and marketing of eggs to ensure that egg producers and consumers benefit from a more efficient egg industry in South Australia.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 removes some redundant provisions and brings the definition of 'hen' into line with the Egg Industry Stabilisation Act 1973.

Clause 4 removes another redundant provision.

Clause 5 removes section 3, the substance of which is now provided by section 22a of the Acts Interpretation Act 1915.

Clause 6 replaces sections 4 to 18 of the principal Act with standard provisions.

Clause 7 removes reference to the penalty in section 21a of the principal Act. Section 32, which is a general penalty provision, will apply to the provision.

Clauses 8 to 10 remove redundant provisions from the Act.

Mr GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

EGG INDUSTRY STABILISATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings, for the Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Agriculture), obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Egg Industry Stabilisation Act 1973. Read a first time.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMING: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Egg Industry Stabilisation Act was proclaimed in 1973 to control egg production by means of hen quotas.

Hen quota legislation currently applies to flocks with more than 20 hens and is administered by the Poultry Farmer Licensing Committee which is a subcommittee of the South Australian Egg Board made up of the Government appointed members. The costs associated with the Poultry Farmer Licensing Committee are currently met by the board and personnel employed by the board carry out duties associated with controlling hen quotas.

The United Farmers and Stockowners of South Australia developed proposals for changes to the structure and functions of the South Australian Egg Board and suggested that hen quotas should be managed directly by the board and that the Poultry Farmers Licensing Committee should be abolished.

The amendments will abolish the Poultry Farmers Licensing Committee and hen quotas will be managed directly by the board. This will simplify the administration of hen quotas and will result in some cost savings. The proposed amendments will exempt laying flocks with 50 hens and less from hen quota legislation. This provision will enable primary producers in remote and sparsely populated areas to produce eggs to meet local demand and will also cater for those who wish to keep poultry for show purposes rather than commercial production.

The amendments will also provide for more flexible management of hen quotas to enable the board to effectively control egg supplies and to reduce the costs associated with the storage and processing of eggs surplus to local requirements for shell eggs and egg pulp.

The provisions in the Act which restrict the maximum number of hen quotas which can be held by one producer to 50 000 hens have been strengthened. At the present time there is one producer with about 93 000 quotas, and while it is not envisaged that the producer's quota holding will be reduced the board will have the power to ensure that, in future, no other producer will be allowed to acquire hen quotas in excess of 50 000. However, the amendments will still allow groups of producers to form appropriate cooperative ventures if they consider that such action will increase the efficiency of the production or marketing of eggs.

The amendments will ensure all producers are entitled to vote in any future poll held on the question of whether the Egg Industry Stabilisation Act should continue. Under the existing legislation only the 120 or so producers with more than 500 laying hens can vote. This excludes about two thirds of licensed egg producers in the State.

The amendments also remove sections of the legislation relating to categories of poultry farmers, the original determination of hen quotas, quota transfers between zones and a poll on the commencement of the Act. These sections are redundant.

Clause 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 makes consequential amendments.

Clause 4 removes definitions from the Act that are redundant.

Clause 5 brings up to date certain provisions of section 5 of the Act dealing with exemptions. The scope of the power to exempt is extended beyond the Crown and its instrumentalities and educational institutions. Paragraph (a) rewrites subsection (1) and in the process removes reference to 'commercial purposes'. The extended exemptions provisions will be available to exempt those who wish to keep more than 50 hens for non-commercial purposes.

Clause 6 repeals Part II of the Act.

Clause 7 makes a consequential amendment.

Clause 8 repeals Division I of Part IV.

Clause 9 replaces sections 14 and 15 of the principal Act with simplified provisions.

Clause 10 enacts new section 16 which sets out the conditions to which a licence will be subject.

Clauses 11 and 12 make consequential amendments.

Clause 13 repeals Division III of Part IV.

Clause 14 replaces Division IV of Part IV. After this amendment the board will be able to vary the State hen quota and because the State hen quota is the aggregate of the quotas of individual licences, their quotas will vary accordingly. Subsections (8), (9) and (10) of new section 22 place a limit of 50 000 on the hen quota, or the aggregate of the hen quotas in which one person or company can be interested.

Clauses 15 and 16 remove redundant provisions.

Clause 17 makes consequential amendments and reduces penalties set out in subsection (6).

Clauses 18 to 22 make consequential changes.

Clause 23 repeals sections 41 and 42 of the Act.

Clause 24 makes consequential changes.

Clause 25 removes a redundant provision.

Clause 26 inserts an exemption provision designed to allow poultry farmers to take advantage of temporary markets for the sale of eggs.

Clause 27 makes a consequential change.

Clause 28 removes Division I of Part IX which is now redundant.

Clause 29 reconstitutes parts of section 50 in modern form and opens the poll under this section to all licensees.

Clause 30 removes the schedules to the Act.

Mr GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

FISHERIES (SOUTHERN ZONE ROCK LOBSTER FISHERY RATIONALISATION) BILL

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings, for the Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Fisheries), obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the rationalisation of rock lobster fishing in the Southern Zone; and for other purposes. Bill read a first time.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation of the Bill inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill provides for the rationalisation of the number of rock lobster licence holders in the Southern Zone fishery, the establishment of a primarily industry based Rationalisation Authority to oversee the rationalisation, for payment of compensation to those licensees who voluntarily leave the industry, and for repayment of compensation moneys by remaining licensees.

By way of background, the South Australian rock lobster fishery is currently fully exploited with greater fishing capacity than is required to take the available catch. In addition, the continual introduction of new technology and new techniques results in further increases in this excess effort. Assessment of the industry has clearly indicated that due to this excess, the economic returns to the fishery are significantly less than could be obtained as well as there being

the potential for a slow run-down of the stock due to the need to fish harder to maintain a share of the catch.

Numerous reports, since 1978, have indicated that the viability of the fishery would be significantly increased by reducing the number of participants in the fishery. The long-term yield from the fishery would remain the same.

Following the introduction of a number of less effective measures aimed at reducing the effort in the fishery and improving the viability, the Department of Fisheries and industry conducted a two-day workshop in June 1986 at Millicent to assess the effectiveness of the past measures and identify future options. This meeting supported the rationalisation option. During May 1987, a referendum of all licence holders in the Southern Zone rock lobster fishery was conducted by the South Australian Fishing Industry Council and the South-East Professional Fishermen's Association to determine support for the rationalisation scheme. The majority of licence holders (51.5 per cent) supported implementation of the scheme. During the period May to July 1987, a series of meetings were held between officers of the Department of Fisheries and delegates of the Southern Zone Ports to discuss and finalise the details of the scheme.

It is proposed that the number of licence holders in the Southern Zone rock lobster fishery be reduced by the equivalent of 40 average licences (that is approximately 2 400 pots) through voluntary surrender of pot entitlements and licences to a Rationalisation Authority. The Rationalisation Authority would consist of an independent chairman, 14 representatives of the Southern Zone rock lobster fishery, two each elected by the properly constituted Fishermen's Associations in Kingston, Robe, Beachport, Southend and Carpenter Rocks, and four elected by the properly constituted Fishermen's Association at Port MacDonnell, the Executive Officer of the South Australian Fishing Industry Council, a representative of the South Australian Department of Fisheries and a representative of the South Australian Government Financing Authority.

It is proposed to compensate licensees for the voluntary surrender of their pot entitlements and licences and for the remaining licensees, who will benefit from improved viability in the fishery, to contribute, according to the pot entitlements held, to the cost of providing that compensation. Vessels will be disposed of separately on the commercial market by those licence holders voluntarily surrendering their licences and pot entitlements to the Rationalisation Authority. Under the proposal, the Minister of Fisheries will borrow up to \$6.5 million for distribution through the Rationalisation Authority to those fishermen who voluntarily surrender their licences. Funding is to be provided by the South Australian Government Financing Authority. In addition, an application has been made for contributory funding from the National Fishing Industry Adjustment Committee, a committee formed by the Commonwealth Government to provide funds to assist Australian fishing industries seeking rationalisation.

The documentation distributed to industry during discussion on this scheme provided indicative estimates of the value to be paid for the surrender of a pot. The actual value that will be paid will be determined by the Authority at its first meeting. The price to be paid per pot will remain constant throughout the rationalisation period. The rationalisation period is defined as the time required to remove the 2 400 pots or two years, whichever is the lesser. To avoid speculation in licences prior to the introduction of the proposed scheme, the transfer provisions in the 'Scheme of Management (Southern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery) Regulations 1984' have been removed with industry concur-

rence. It is proposed that transfer provisions only be provided during the rationalisation period within the family or to the Rationalisation Authority. It is further proposed that if the rationalisation period extends for the full two years, that transfer provisions will not be returned to the fishery until nine months after that period has elapsed. This is to provide a disincentive for licence holders not to sell to the Rationalisation Authority towards the end of the rationalisation period.

The funds borrowed to compensate fishermen who voluntarily surrender their licences will be recouped by licence surcharge over a 10 year period. The surcharge will be payable quarterly from the date of implementation of the scheme and is expected to be of the order of \$100 per pot. The Act only allows the implementation of the surcharge for defraying the net liabilities of the scheme.

To ensure some proportionality in removal of licences along the south-eastern coastline, the Act provides for acceptance of licences voluntarily surrendered in the first 18 months to be based on the distribution of pots between Southern Zone ports at the commencement of the scheme.

To reduce the costs of the scheme to the authority and therefore industry, the Department of Fisheries will be responsible for receiving and processing applications (submitted by certified mail) at the direction of the authority. The authority itself will not see any personal details of applicants such as licence number, boat name, licence holder's name, etc.; the only information made available will be the port name and the pot allocation. This will avoid nepotism (favour to relatives), or patronage (beneficial treatment), towards any applicant who voluntarily surrenders his/her licence and pot entitlement.

All Southern Zone rock lobster fishery licence holders will be advised in writing of the procedures associated with the scheme (including the requirement for lodgment of applications by certified mail) prior to its implementation.

Licence holders will not be able to split their licences—this applies particularly to holders of State and Commonwealth licences, and also to the holders of Victorian and South Australian rock lobster licences. An application for voluntary surrender of a licence and pot entitlement from either of the above two categories of licence holders will not be considered by the Rationalisation Authority.

It is the Department of Fisheries intention (resources permitting) to provide for monitoring of the Southern Zone rock lobster fishery during the course of the rationalisation scheme. This will include monitoring of the stock/recruitment relationship and the economic condition of the fishery. It is not intended to introduce any further restrictions in the fishery other than those required for resource conservation purposes.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for commencement on a proclaimed day.

Clause 3 defines certain words and expressions used in the Bill. In particular, 'the rationalisation period' means a period of two years or that required to remove the equivalent of 40 average vessels (that is, 2 400 pots) from the fishery, whichever is the lesser.

Clause 4 provides for the formation of the Southern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery Rationalisation Authority, which comprises 18 members appointed by the Minister of Fisheries. Representation consists of a presiding member (approved by the Minister of Fisheries), four appointed on nomination of the Port MacDonnell Professional Fishermen's Association, two are appointed on nomination of the Fishermen's Associations of Kingston, Robe, Beachport, Southend and Carpenter Rocks, one appointed on nomi-

nation of the South Australian Fishing Industry Council, one employee of the South Australian Department of Fisheries and one appointed on nomination of the South Australian Government Financing Authority. The clause also provides for the authority to conduct business in the absence of the Chairman or a member and outlines provisions for the replacement or removal of a member. In addition, it provides for immunity of members from liability.

Clause 5 provides for the procedures of the Rationalisation Authority meetings. In particular, 10 members constitute a quorum and a decision in which a majority of the members present at a meeting concur is a decision of the authority.

Clause 6 provides for the functions of the authority, namely the assessment and acceptance of voluntary offers of surrender of licence.

Clause 7 provides that the authority has access, with the approval of the Minister, to the services of employees and/or facilities of Government departments.

Clause 8 provides for the transfer provisions that will apply during the rationalisation period, namely to a member of a licensee's family only. If the rationalisation period is two years, transfer provisions will not be reintroduced until nine months after the period. When transfer provisions are reintroduced, a licensee cannot transfer his or her licence unless the licensee pays the accrued and future liability she or he has as a result of this Bill.

Clause 9 provides for the authority to assess and accept an application from a licensee to surrender a licence during the rationalisation period. In considering surrender applications, the authority must for the first 18 months of the rationalisation period ensure, as far as possible, that the distribution of pots between the Southern Zone ports at the commencement of the scheme is maintained. Otherwise applications must be considered in the order they are received.

Clause 10 provides for compensation for surrender of licences to be paid to former licensees. The amount to be paid per pot for surrender will be determined by the Rationalisation Authority and fixed by gazettal notice within three months of the rationalisation period. Once determined, this amount will remain for the full rationalisation period. The amount paid will be the value per pot determined by the authority multiplied by the number of pots allocated in respect to the particular licence less any amounts owing by the licensee by way of surcharge. On acceptance of a surrender application, the Minister will pay the surrender value to the licensee within 21 days.

Clause 11 provides that the net liabilities under the Act will be recouped to the Fisheries Research and Development Fund by means of a surcharge on licence fees payable by remaining Southern Zone rock lobster fishery licensees. The Minister will have the power to impose the surcharges, vary their amounts and give direction as to payment. If a licensee fails to pay the surcharge or an instalment of the surcharge, on recommendation of the Rationalisation Authority and by notice in the *Gazette*, his or her licence may be suspended or cancelled. Net liabilities of the fund under this Act relate to the aggregate of the amounts paid to former licensees for the surrender of their licences to the authority, the interest and charges in respect of loans associated with the Act, any costs in administering the Act less the amounts received by surcharge imposed under the Act.

Clause 12 provides for the Minister to borrow money for the purpose of the proposed Act, and any money so borrowed will be paid into the Fisheries Research and Development Fund.

Clause 13 provides, if the target number of pots is surrendered before two years, the rationalisation period must be declared ended by notice in the *Gazette*.

Clause 14 provides for the authority to prepare quarterly reports to be made available to the Minister of Fisheries and each Southern Zone port association.

Clause 15 enables regulations to be made.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from page 207.)

Mr BECKER (Hanson): Before the luncheon break I was quoting from the Labor Party's housing policy document, the document which carried the banner heading 'Leading the nation'. There is no doubt about the activities and actions of the Bannon Government as far as housing is concerned: it is leading the nation into one of the worst slumps that we have witnessed for many years. The Premier said:

We will use housing as a stimulus for the State's economic growth.

We know that South Australia is falling behind; we know that it is falling behind all the other States. There are so many points on the board where we are leading in relation to record bankruptcies, as well as in many other areas. There is the cost impact and we have the highest number of persons on the waiting list for Government housing.

In this respect, let us consider the record over the past two years. The number of new houses built in South Australia has fallen dramatically. In 1983-84 there were 15 053 new constructions. This figure fell by 5 934 to a low of 9 119 in the 1986-87 period. That is an absolute disaster, and one remembers the Premier's statement that we were going to use housing as a stimulus for economic growth in South Australia. In real terms, the total value of new houses fell by \$284 142 000 (in 1986 dollars), and some 17 892 jobs were lost.

Those calculations are the Labor Government's own figures: for every \$1 million spent on housing 63 jobs are created. Those statistics appeared in the Labor Party's housing policy. A total of 7 982 job opportunities have been lost, something that everybody should be worried about, particularly the current Government. These figures clearly demonstrate the impact that high interest rates and the abolition of negative gearing are having on the building industry. The State and Federal Governments must reorganise their priorities and make provision for new residential construction to alleviate the enormous increase in the Housing Trust waiting list, which I understand is approaching 50 000.

If priorities are not set in place quickly, we will see a further increase in the tragic number of people who are homeless or verging on homeless. Incentive and investment must be generated to expand services and improve accommodation prospects. An important part of this incentive will be a decision to review negative gearing which the Prime Minister promised during the Federal election campaign. For the fourth time in three weeks, I challenge the Premier to state where he stands in relation to the impact of negative gearing. Does the Premier of South Australia support the Prime Minister in reviewing the implications of negative gearing, or does he support his 1985 pre-election statement about using housing as a stimulus for economic

growth? If he still believes in that policy statement he would support the Premiers of New South Wales and Western Australia in urging the Prime Minister and the Federal Treasurer to reintroduce negative gearing. If the Premier does not, he is not genuine in wanting to do something for the housing industry in South Australia. Certainly, he is not interested in doing anything to recover some 18 000 job opportunities that have been lost in the past two years.

A loss of 18 000 job opportunities means a tremendous financial impact on the households of those people: it is money that they will not recover. We have lost \$284 million. South Australia desperately needs that type of development to stimulate growth in the housing sector. Let us look at further statements made in that policy document. The Premier said that the Bannon Government would follow through with means to further encourage private investment in rental accommodation, but nothing whatsoever has been done; nothing has been attempted to encourage investors to provide rental accommodation in the private sector.

We need negative gearing again to provide an incentive for those who have invested their money in other areas. In the Eastern States it is common knowledge that the financial experts are predicting that there will be mammoth investments in the real estate industry and particularly in the rental housing market. However, that is not prevalent in South Australia, nor does it look as though it is likely to occur for some time. That is the damage and impact created by the false statements that have been made by the current Government when talking up the economy. This has not happened overnight or over the past two years: it has been over the past five years that this Government, together with its cohorts in various parts using the private sector, has talked up the economy of South Australia, trying to goad everybody into believing that South Australia is great and is doing a good job.

When we look at the cold, hard facts and add up the dollars and cents, and when the Premier brings down his budget and finally releases the figures for the end of June 1987, we will get a different picture. Of course, he has been using most of this year to tell everybody that they must tighten their belts because of the folly carried out by his Government over the past two or three years. A pragmatic Government, it has been concerned with one area alone, its re-election.

I turn now to interest rates. The Bannon Government is concerned to secure the future of building societies as major providers of housing finance in South Australia, says the ALP policy document. It continues by stating that a strategy plan will be developed in consultation with the societies to ensure that they can continue to function effectively in the housing market. There are currently 5 000 young people in South Australia who have borrowed market rate loans from the building societies. Most of them are paying 16 per cent annual interest, and some are paying more than that. They are now wondering why their interest rates have not fallen.

Interest rates have fallen in most other areas by a quarter to a half per cent. The building societies in South Australia, until a few days ago, had been advertising new housing loans at 15½ per cent: they have been doing that for 12 months, but those people who are on market loans, these 16 per cent loans, have not seen their interest rate fall back to 15½ per cent. They have been told all sorts of stories, and so have I, that the money comes from a special fund or that there are various internal reasons for this. However, the basic reason is the incompetence of the Bannon Government in that 1985 pre-election and post-election period in refusing to allow the building societies to increase their interest rates.

Nobody likes to see housing loan interest rates increase: I do not, but there was a period when the pressure was on all financial institutions to increase their rates. The building societies in South Australia have to go cap in hand to the Government of the day to seek its support for such increases. The delays caused because of the 1985 State election, and the delays after that election, cost the building societies thousands and thousands of dollars. Goodness knows how many housing loans were lost because they could not afford to continue to finance their operations at the rates that they were having to pay to get the money.

The Minister on the bench probably does not realise the terrible situation in which he and his colleagues placed South Australian building societies, unless it was for some spurious reason or with the idea of putting the squeeze on the building societies so that they could do a Dunstan and run out with a megaphone saying, 'Everything is all right.' The *Australian* of 17 July 1987, under the heading 'Building societies squeezed reserve', contains an article written by an author in whom I place a lot of confidence, and states:

Building societies have been among the big losers in the financial community following deregulation, according to a Reserve Bank survey.

It is all very well for the Federal Labor Government to deregulate banks and financial institutions, but have a look at what they did! The article continues:

The survey shows that building societies have been the most unsuccessful in adapting to the increased competition of a deregulated market. It shows that slumps in both deposits and lending in recent years have placed building societies at a major disadvantage with their competitors and forced many of them to convert themselves into savings banks. The building societies' market share of aggregate assets held by financial institutions has slumped from 10.9 per cent in 1980, to under 6 per cent in May this year—

a 4.9 per cent fall—

but part of this drop reflects the transfer of assets to new savings banks. Similarly, during the 12 months to May, the societies' assets grew by only 7.5 per cent, compared with an average of 18.5 per cent for all intermediaries. However, the biggest blow to building societies has been the sharp slow-down in the growth of lending, particularly for housing, in recent years.

Since mid-1986, housing loans outstanding have fallen in all States except New South Wales. Repayments of existing loans have been more than sufficient to fund draw-downs of new loans. In contrast, loans to commercial concerns have risen strongly. These trends are a reflection of both the relative profitability of commercial lending and the intense competition for housing lending.

That is what annoys me—that building society funds normally earmarked for housing loans were being chewed up by the commercial sector. We have exactly the same situation in South Australia. Of course, accompanying the fall in housing industry activity, we found that the State Bank, which merged with the Savings Bank of South Australia, was not one to give the loans for housing that I believe it should have given.

The Savings Bank of South Australia, a mutual organisation using schoolchildren's deposits as well as general deposits, provided far more money for housing than any other bank in South Australia—and at extremely competitive rates which were generally a quarter per cent below the market. That bank did an excellent job during the whole of its life. It was then amalgamated with the State Bank, which also used general funds to provide low interest housing finance.

What we find now is that with the new entrepreneurial approach by the State Bank there was the \$50 million facility made available to a New Zealand organisation to buy shares in BHP and speculate on takeover investments—and it took a long time for that loan to be paid back. We then found a facility of some \$500 million provided to a

speculative company to buy shares in another Australian company, anticipating a takeover.

I am arguing that funds from South Australians, which should be used to finance and provide low interest housing loans, are going out of this country or being provided to entrepreneurs outside the State—and, in some cases, outside this country—to take over Australian companies. I do not think that that is on. The commercial market can handle those situations—the commercial banks can look after that—but in South Australia the State Bank's role is to provide low cost housing—the cheapest possible loans that can be made available to South Australians.

If we are going to stimulate the housing market, then the State, through the State Bank system, has to play its role. It is not doing enough and has not been doing enough. I do not like to see Savings Bank of South Australia or State Bank funds going into propping up shopping centres in other States, or going to entrepreneurs to roll over their funds. That is what the private sector is for, and the old trustees of the Savings Bank of South Australia would turn in their graves if they knew what was happening to the funds and to the reputation built up by their bank before it was finally merged with the State Bank of South Australia.

I am very hostile about the way the State Bank of South Australia is going, because I do not think it is doing enough to assist in the provision of housing loans. If interest rates are falling and the banks have plenty of money, they should lend it to the area of greatest need, and the greatest need—as this Government knows—is in housing. With almost 50 000 people on the Housing Trust waiting list, something has to be done to ensure that further affordable accommodation is made available to the people who need it.

The member for Gilles went on with the greatest load of drivel I have ever heard in my life. He finally got around to Housing Trust rents. Whilst he was singing the praises of the Housing Trust, most people would not deny that for over 50 years the trust has enjoyed a wonderful reputation and has performed well, although some areas need to be looked at, and looked at very closely.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BECKER: The honourable member who interjects knows that the Public Accounts Committee ought to look at this matter. What galls me is that Housing Trust rents were frozen in the period of the run up to the 1983 State election, and then on 8 July 1986 there was an 8 per cent increase in rent; in February 1987 there was a 5 per cent increase; and on 1 August, a 5 per cent increase plus 9 per cent CPI, making 14 per cent. So, in the 18 months since the 1985 State election we have found Housing Trust rents increasing 27 per cent.

On 5 February 1988 the rents will go up another 5 per cent, and, by 1 August, 5 per cent again, plus whatever the CPI will be: it could be 6 per cent, 8 per cent or higher, the way the current Federal Government is performing, but we will accept 6 per cent. If it goes over 6 per cent we ought to hang, draw and quarter the Federal Treasurer. So, I would say 11 per cent. That will make a 43 per cent increase in 2½ years following the 1985 election. That is absolutely scandalous.

It is a disgrace to think that any Government could get away with supporting those types of rental increase. Of course, this Government plays God and does what it likes. One is told, 'Take it or leave it.' Let us have a look at what happened on 11 July 1981, when a Liberal Government put up the Housing Trust rents. The Opposition spokesman on housing said:

An immense further burden was now being placed on people little able to cope. Higher interest rates were putting pressure on those buying, or wanting to buy their own homes. Now those

renting trust dwellings were being hit and hit hard, when they thought the March increase was all they had to beat this year. This Government is giving the trust less money to build houses and is making life more difficult for the 100 000 or so South Australians who live in trust rental homes.

The Tonkin Government is squeezing the trust for funds and making it increasingly difficult for it to carry out its primary objective—the provision of low-income housing and to house workers near places of employment. More and more people are being driven to seek trust accommodation because of their economic circumstances and less and less is the trust able to help them.

The person who made that statement was none other than the Minister of Housing and Construction; that dear little man who was going to look after the people of South Australia; that little man who went to Canberra with his Premier this year and negotiated what is probably one of the worst housing loan agreements we are ever going to see. They are going to cut the number of new Housing Trust dwellings by half. The Government has been hitting the poor old pensioners every six months. No sooner do they get a pension rise than whack! It jolts them around the ears.

Have a look at what has been done to the war service veterans. They have had their concessions taken away, and their rents have gone through the roof. Tenancy officers have been taken from them. The Minister is presiding over the worst situation in prices the Housing Trust has ever seen. The Housing Trust is staggering from his interference. How about leaving it alone and letting it get on with the job of providing affordable accommodation.

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): I rise to support the motion and, in so doing, I would like to place on the record my sympathies and profound regret at the death of the Hon. Don Simmons, a former member of the Chamber and my predecessor in the seat of Peake. Mr Simmons represented Peake admirably for nine years, and his passing has left a large gap in the local sub-branch. I ask that my sympathies and those of the members of the Peake District Assembly be conveyed to his wife Betty and to his family. I also convey my regrets to the family of the late Hon. Ron Loveday.

I am pleased to note the reference, in paragraph 6 of His Excellency the Governor's speech, to the rural situation, the topic on which I speak today. I am very pleased to read that there is an improvement in prices and demand for many of our farm products. I have cuttings from several papers, but I will quote from an article in the *Advertiser* of 11 August 1987, under the heading 'Wool prices soar to new levels', which states:

Wool has re-emerged as the glamour product of Australian agriculture, with prices for many categories soaring to new heights last week under the impetus of intense competition from the world's markets. Buying pressure saw the market indicator crash through the 800c kilogram mark to close at 829c/kg clean, 48c above the previous week's record opening level. Fine wools most suited to the making of high quality, light weight apparel fabrics have been in strongest demand. The Australian Wool Corporation said on Friday there had been a 'massive hike' in prices for these wools at sales last week.

Buyers, led by the Japanese operators, were buying 'at best'—they had no set limits to their bids—which triggered a stunning 147c kilogram jump in the indicator price for fine 18 micron wools. The indicator price for this description is now about 281c kilogram higher than the previous record established in 1984-85. But industry observers say the prices are not expensive for many of the world's major textile industries because of the weakness of the Australian dollar against overseas currencies.

Prices for medium and strong Merino wools—which comprise the bulk of South Australia's production—also improved on the previous week's higher levels. All but one of these categories (24 micron) are now selling at prices above the peak levels set in March-April.

Elders Pastoral's senior wool valuer, Mr Rod Miller, said last week the lift in stronger wool prices was timely, with the South

Australian clip tending stronger this season. In addition, he said the fall-off in demand between the 23.1 micron and 23.5 micron wools experienced late last season had disappeared from the market.

The remarkable buying strength this season has come despite forecasts of the current clip being the second biggest on record.

Balancing the production outlook, however, is a massive run-down in stocks held by the Australian Wool Corporation. The stock pile is now only 330 700 bales—and includes virtually no fine wools—compared to 870 000 bales a year ago, and 990 000 bales at the end of the 1984-85 season.

Wool industry observers give a number of reasons for the surging demand for wool, including changed consumer buying habits in many overseas countries, a strong empathy for wool because it is seen as a 'natural' fibre, the development of new woollen fabrics and better promotion and marketing.

That quote is from the *Advertiser* of Tuesday 11 August. I also refer to an article from the *Land* of Thursday 6 August which has a similar report on wool sales in Melbourne. The article is headed 'Japanese buyers push wool through 800c'. I refer particularly to a comment made by the Chairman of the Australian Wool Corporation, David Asimus, who stated that it was the most spectacular start to a wool season he could remember. That is good news and I am very pleased for the people farming sheep and who have wool to sell. Also in the *Land* of Thursday 6 August is an article headed, 'Live sheep trade defies predictions to set record' which states:

The live sheep trade has shrugged off grim forecasts of a serious slump by setting a new 7.7 million head export record last year.

Sales of export slaughter sheep jumped 22 per cent in 1986-87, according to preliminary figures released by the Australian Meat and Livestock Corporation.

Predictions of a nosedive in the value and size of the trade were based on fears of cutbacks in key importing countries: anticipated fierce competition from New Zealand and Eastern Bloc countries and an oversupply of sheep in Australia.

But widespread instability in the Middle East—most notably the Iran-Iraq war—and lower crude oil prices haven't quelled demand for Australian sheep nor has increased competition from other suppliers including New Zealand and Romania.

In fact, the evidence points to less competition in the trade from some Eastern Bloc countries which now appear to be running low on surplus slaughter sheep and are looking to Australia for breeding stock and husbandry expertise.

The AMLC attributes last year's record result to a growth in demand in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait (Australia's two largest customers), the reopening of the Libyan market which took 7 821 142 head and a new tender for Algeria of 500 000 sheep. Manager of AMLC livestock services, Chris Hughes, said Russia's recent Chernobyl nuclear explosion which had contaminated many flocks across Eastern Europe with radioactive fall-out and the low value of the Australian dollar had helped boost our share of the trade. Many countries, including Turkey and Tunisia, were 'jittery' about importing sheep and meat from Eastern Europe and may now buy from Australia.

Mr Hughes said another factor heavily favouring Australia was our relatively abundant supplies of good quality sheep compared to shortages in some of our competitors.

'About 12 months ago I was certain the live sheep export trade was heading for disaster. The exact opposite has happened; it's been the most buoyant year on record,' Mr Hughes said.

I do not intend to go right through the article but, in conclusion, it states:

However, Japanese imports increased by 25 per cent to 28 400 head. Breeder exports, particularly beef breeders, more than doubled with large sales of high grade commercial Brahms to the Philippines, Indonesia and Malaysia.

I have other articles that I would like to quote. A *Stock Journal* article on wheat export states:

Australia this year will export its second largest tonnage of wheat on record. The expected shipments of 15.6 million tonnes will be only 400 000 tonnes short of the record 16 million tonnes shipped between October 1985 and September 1986.

Australian Wheat Board General Manager, Mr Ron Paice, says the exports are an outstanding achievement, particularly considering the tough international environment. He said this week Australian wheatgrowers would earn more than \$2 000 million in valuable export revenue. But he said that was a long way short of the \$3 000 million earned last year. 'The decline is largely due

to the dramatic lowering of world prices by the US and EEC through the expansion of their export subsidy programs,' Mr Paice said.

He said the most pleasing aspect of this year's sales had been the record shipment of the People's Republic of China. 'We've been working closely with the Chinese for many years, and their large purchases from the AWB confirm their preference for Australian wheat,' he said. 'Our relationship is increasingly being built not just on sales but on the technical cooperation program being shared between our industries.' 'The benefits of those kinds of programs can clearly be seen in the 3.83 million tonnes of shipments to China and the friendship which exists between the Chinese and Australian wheat industries,' Mr Paice said.

I have further articles from which I shall quote. The first, taken from the livestock section of the *Stock Journal* of 6 August, is headed 'Ram prices rocket'. Referring to merino and poll merino ram sales on the property of Collandra North, at Tumby Bay, it tells of the high prices received at record breaking sales. It is pleasing to see such a big demand, which should give the wool farmers confidence that there is a great future in their product. Another article from the same publication refers to the high prices paid for rams at White River.

I have two further reports from which I wish to quote, the first being headed 'High priced Taiwan rice may help Australia'. This article explains the reasons for the boost in Taiwanese and world prices and says that these will be a tonic for Australian rice growers who recently held their annual meeting at Leeton, in the Murrumbidgee area. It is also pleasing to see that that product is holding its own.

An article from the same edition of the *Stock Journal* headed 'Victorian buyers push lamb to records', states:

Rain-reduced offerings forced lamb prices to record levels in New South Wales sale centres this week as Victorian buyers clamoured for supplies.

Both the top price of \$55 a head, at Dubbo, and the lowest price of \$47.50 quoted in the article are most pleasing. The last article to which I refer in this regard concerns the benefits to be derived from the widespread rains and, although the article deals mainly with New South Wales, all members know that South Australia has also enjoyed good rains recently. I hope that, as a result of what I have read from those reports, everything stays stable for the farmers in the future.

Certainly, conditions for primary producers have picked up considerably over the past 12 months, but in 1986 it was a different matter. The following is a quotation from the booklet *Rural Crisis* published last year:

World prices have fallen suddenly for wheat, barley, rice, sugar and many other primary products. European Community countries and the United States are dumping heavily subsidised farm products onto traditional Australian markets and forcing down world prices still further. Many farmers face ruin and will be forced off farms which their families have owned for generations, leading to still greater concentrations of land ownership and corporate control of many farm enterprises. Farmers and rural communities are confused and angry at this sudden crisis and look around for answers to why this has happened and how it can be reversed.

The New Right comes up with ready answers, blaming workers and their unions, city people generally, Labor and Liberal governments alike for protectionist policies and calling for a completely free market in everything including industrial relations. Vanguard of the New Right assault is the National Farmers Federation headed by Ian McLachlan, very wealthy member of Adelaide Establishment, whose father was president of the South Australia Liberal Party... Ian McLachlan has all the trappings of a conservative politician: a traditional education in Adelaide and Cambridge—

apparently, Mr McLachlan had the same sort of education as a former Prime Minister, Mr Fraser, except that the latter was educated in Victoria—

and family ownership of the world's biggest sheep station. The McLachlan family own the huge Commonwealth Hill station,

Australia's biggest sheep flock of more than 300 000 head roam over 100 000 sq. km.

As that information comes from the *Australian* of 5 July 1985, I assume that it is correct. The article from *Rural Crisis* continues:

'Mr McLachlan has extensive pastoral interests in South Australia and New South Wales and is a member of one of Australia's wealthiest pastoral families', reports *The Australian* (17 May 1984). The same paper reported the view of 'a grizzled grazier' in April 1978, who said of him: 'He's born, bred and educated for leadership'.

McLachlan discounts talk of his huge family wealth but refuses to disclose what it is, claiming that family members own only three properties in South Australia.

If all those properties are as big as Commonwealth Hill, that would not be too bad. The article continues:

Besides his family's extensive landholdings, said to comprise five per cent of South Australia's arable land, Mr McLachlan is director of several companies including South Australian Brewing and Elders IXL. His Elders IXL post causes some concern among working farmers who know from practical experience that this giant agribusiness corporation has interests which often run counter to theirs. McLachlan is often challenged on the conflict of interests between his hat as National Farmers Federation president and that he dons when sitting on the Elders board. This surfaced at a Dubbo meeting of farmers in March 1986:

Wheat farmer Mr Brian Locke asked Mr McLachlan if, as director of Elders, he had any problems implementing the rural sector's requests for action. Mr Locke said: 'If I was in big business I would love your policies. Let things go for 18 months and let the farm protest movement get what big business wants.'

A similar view was expressed by Cobar grazier, Tom Murphy, who travelled 885 kilometres to Sydney in September 1986 to tell the media that growers had not obtained any benefit from the dollar's devaluation. 'The floor price for wool rose from 500 cents/kg to only 506 cents/kg since November (1985), but it should be more like 700 cents,' Mr Murphy told the *Sydney Morning Herald* (16 September 1986). The *Herald* report went on to quote the woolgrower: 'Mr Murphy also attacked the president of the National Farmers' Federation, Mr Ian McLachlan, the so-called "messiah of the bush", for wearing two hats as a farm leader and board member of Elders IXL.'

Sarah Sargent, author of the pioneering book *The Foodmakers* (Penguin 1985) which investigates the growth of agribusiness corporations like Elders IXL, got the same response from Paul Kahl who pioneered cotton growing in the Namoi Valley. Kahl was scathing in his criticism:

What I am saying... is that the only way out is through properly run marketing boards and co-ops.

We won't do it through turning it over to the Elders and Dreyfuses, because they are looking after the Elders and the Dreyfuses. They get their money by taking it off the farmer and I'm not saying they took it illegally, but that's where they got it. And that's their first loyalty to the shareholders and their second and third loyalty is to their shareholders. Around the fourth and fifth, they finally get around to the farmers.

If members are interested, that quote is from *The Foodmakers* at page 217. The article further states:

Mr McLachlan is obviously quite perturbed by such well-founded and persistent criticisms but tries to brush them aside:

'Obviously there were minor conflicts in many places,' Mr McLachlan said, 'but when you are talking about an organisation as big as Elders, you are really saying that if any of the Elders policy that has anything to do with agriculture conflicts with any of the NFF? policy then you should resign. I am saying that I haven't really found any substantial conflict. In fact, I believe that my contacts from the Elders board are a good thing for agriculture.'

That last passage was quoted also in the *Australian* of 1 February 1986. The article further states:

Three major companies now control a large slice of the agricultural economy and the food industries which buy its products. These are Elders IXL, Adelaide Steamship and Industrial Equity Ltd (IEL), controlled by three of the most powerful figures in Australian corporate life respectively, John Elliott—

and Mr Elliott has raised his head also lately in other quarters—

Janis Spalvins and Ron Brierley. Adsteam's 1983 revenue from food sales was \$1 200 million, IEL's \$320 million, but Elders is

the real giant. It straddles agriculture and food production from wool marketing and livestock sales—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the honourable member please take his seat? There is a point of order.

Ms LENEHAN: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, despite the fact that the honourable member is having to scream and shout over the interjections of the Opposition, I cannot hear him.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point is well taken. I ask the House to come to order.

Mr PLUNKETT: The article further states:

It straddles agriculture and food production, from wool marketing and livestock sales, owns piggeries and stockfeed companies, divides control of brewing with Bond. It has expanded into the agricultural export trade, taking business away from marketing bodies like the Wheat Board, recently snapping up retired Wheat Board chairman Sir Leslie Price as an executive to help expand its market share.

Elders IXL's 20 subsidiary companies between them control almost half the country's wool clip, 40 per cent of its livestock sales and has substantial interests in many other rural industries. But perhaps its most profitable and most powerful arm is its financial network which includes merchant banking, insurance and other financial services to farmers.

High interest rates, which squeeze the farmers dry, are a source of huge profits to Elders, a prime example for Mr McLachlan of what farmers mean when they talk of a conflict of interest. Supplying credit to farmers is profitable for Elders in both good times and bad; the moneylender can't lose. This was shown poignantly in the 1982 drought, as Sarah Sargent points out in *The Foodmakers*: 'While farmers were forced deeper into debt to withstand the crisis, agribusiness was able to profit from the increased demand for credit.' Elders IXL finance division 'grew by 120 per cent during the drought'.

I could quote much more, but I am afraid that half an hour is not enough time in which to deal with a matter of such importance. I now turn to page 28 of the same publication, and it states:

A recent Statex (Stock Exchange Research Service) survey (October 1986) showed that the top 150 corporations paid tax at a rate of only 28c in the dollar instead of the 46c rate [as do all other workers] applying in 1986. Had these 150 companies paid the full tax due, revenue from company tax would have been another \$900 000 000. But some very wealthy corporations did ever so much better, including the following:

Members interjecting:

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

Mr PLUNKETT: The article further states:

* Ron Brierley's Industrial Equity Ltd paid only 4.66c in the \$.

* John Elliott's Elders IXL paid 10.35 per cent.

That is another up and coming member of the Liberal Party. He is the financial whiz of IXL and they paid only 10.35 per cent. The article then mentions other companies, but those that I have mentioned are the two top companies. I have a table, which is purely statistical, and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The following table shows the tax saved by some of the Stock Exchange high-flyers using their total gross profit compared with tax actually paid:

Corporation	Income* \$'000	Tax at 46% \$'000	Paid \$'000	Avoid \$'000
News Corp.	600	276	58	218
Elders IXL	569	272	28	244
Bond Corp	522	240	16	224
Bell Group	338	154	57	97
Bell Resources	217	100	37	63
Adsteam	171	78	33	45
David Jones	128	60	9	51
FAI	117	54	31	23
Ariadne	105	48	-5 (cr)	53
Rothwells	74	32	7	25
Westfield	41	19	2	17

Corporation	Income* \$'000	Tax at 46% \$'000 -	Paid \$'000	Avoid \$'000
Sunshine	32	15	1	14
Southern Farmers	28	13	1	12
Total	2 942	1 361	275	1 086

* Income is total profit before interest and tax are paid. All figures are rounded to nearest million.

Mr PLUNKETT: That table highlights that in 1986 Elders IXL had an income of \$569 million.

Mr Ingerson: They gave it to their shareholders.

Mr PLUNKETT: That is how they get out of it, and you know that, because you have got shares—

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr PLUNKETT: That company paid \$28 million tax on an income of \$569 million and it avoided paying \$244 million.

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

Mr BECKER: On a point of order, could you, Mr Deputy Speaker, rule that the honourable member quote factual information? He said that those companies avoided tax when the income that they received, as you, Sir, would know, came from dividends from other companies. No tax was avoided.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I place on record my dismay at the inaccurate impression that the member for Peake has placed in *Hansard* for the minds of historians who in the future may have the misadventure to read that speech, or even, for that matter, members of the general public in his electorate and elsewhere in South Australia who may read it when it goes to print. Obviously, it was intended to create the misleading impression put forward by other speakers from the Government benches who have focused their attention on various sectors of the economy during this Address in Reply that all is well in the South Australian economy, when that is not the case. The member for Peake, in his usual fashion, raised the demons and shattered the plaster on the ceiling in this place, as well as my eardrums. Many of his remarks were incoherent and illogical, if not inaccurate in fact or substance.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I know that the members for Fisher and Bright want to be included in the category of people who are known for their capacity to use hyperbole and distorted statistics to give false and misleading impressions. Accordingly, I happily include them in the category with the member for Peake—I have no wish to exclude them.

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I will include also the member for Mawson, should she desire to be included. Let me happily place on record that wish.

I want to thank the Governor for the speech that he made upon the opening of Parliament, and I place on record my support for the motion. I, too, add my condolences to the members of the families of deceased former members who have had the misfortune to suffer that bereavement since the Parliament was last opened by His Excellency.

From the time that the member for Adelaide rose to propose the motion of support for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the very present time, members of the Government backbench have attempted to convey to the House and to the public outside the impression that all is well in South Australia—and indeed, from the member for Peake's figures, that all is well in Australia—and that there is nothing to worry about, whereas nothing could be further

from the truth. To simply say that is to ignore the reality of the situation. We have not yet recognised the necessity to restructure our economy in a way which will ensure that it has the capacity to change as the circumstances of the international environment in which it is operating change.

We do not have a dynamic economy. We do not have an economy that has within it the elements of flexibility so essential to retain relevance. I put it to members opposite in such simple terms as the following. Thirty years ago there was no question about the fact that Australia, if not the most prosperous place on earth with the best prospect for long-term future for its citizens, was certainly amongst the most prosperous. Another factor that I want members to keep in mind while I make these remarks is that 30 years ago many people migrated to this country—among them, I am sure, was the honourable Minister of Housing and Construction. It was probably at about that time that the honourable Minister of Labour jumped ship in Whyalla and stayed here. He hopped off the *Atlas* for a while and took an extended holiday and eventually, under amnesty I understand, became a migrant. At the time his action was illegal, but that is beside the point and we will not hold that against him.

Those and other honourable members here present were part of the wave of migrants who came to this country in the sincere belief that it offered a far better prospect for their future and that of their families and their youngsters than the country they left, whether it was the United Kingdom or indeed other European countries at that time torn by war. They came with nothing. Amongst them to be remembered are two other people who now are very prominent not in politics but certainly in Australian business—Sir Peter Abeles and—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I am sorry, I do not understand what the Minister of Housing and Construction is attempting to interject. It needs to be borne in mind that those people had nothing when they arrived here, yet today many of them are extremely prosperous and have consolidated the position that they have on this planet, under the sun in our fair country, through their own diligence and efforts as private entrepreneurs. There are thousands upon thousands in that category who support the view of the world which I have, and that is that there needs to be in any Government anywhere a close association between personal industry and commitment to productivity (in serving others with goods and services that they are prepared to pay for) and personal welfare. There must be an understanding in the mind of every citizen that the best way to prosper and to get on in life is to serve the needs of one's fellow man; do it within the law, do it honourably, and do it in competition with anybody else who wishes to do likewise, and if one prospers doing that one has done so to the benefit of all humanity and, accordingly, society will prosper.

If, on the other hand, one demands that someone else pay the cost of one's decisions and chosen lifestyle, and if government then entrenches that attitude in the mind of any section in the community, be it small or large (and at present governments are doing it for a large section of the community, directly and indirectly), then there will be a society which is constantly going downhill. The attitude of people believing that others should meet the cost of their own existence will detract from the capacity of those other souls who wish to provide the goods and services and enjoy a reward for it. Those people who are providing the goods and services, in return for a fee for that effort, will have the incentive to do so reduced. That has been the problem here in Australia.

Clearly, since the time to which I have referred, that is, post Second World War—indeed even before that—the economy of this country has depended on exports for the balance of payments necessary to enable us to enjoy, in our modern lifestyle, equivalent technological benefits which are dependent on those many things that other countries can make more effectively than we can because the home market for manufacturers and producers of those goods in those other countries is greater in size, and therefore because of the volume the greater economies of scale in those enterprises within those larger markets enable them to produce each unit more cheaply than we can produce it here in this country in many instances.

If we accept the wisdom of that—and it is economically stupid to argue otherwise—then what we should do in this country, which is so vast in the land mass that it offers to humanity, and so productive (if we use the science and the technology that we have developed to make it produce) is to do those things that we do best and most efficiently. We should sell the products of our labours, our efforts, collectively as a nation to the other countries that are not blessed with such a large area from which to obtain that production but which are blessed with large markets at home for manufactured goods and which therefore can develop the industries that produce those goods more cheaply than we can here. That is called 'trade'. We sell what we can do best when other countries cannot compete for reasons that their environment in producing the things that we are good at is not so good, and we buy from them the things that they are good at producing—and both parties are better off.

The only circumstances in which there is any legitimate reason to divert one's attention from that simple approach to economic management is where defence is involved. If, for instance, there needs to be an industry within this country that can continue thereby to ensure its survival in times of war or provide us with the means of defending ourselves in the event that anybody should declare war upon us, then clearly we need to do something about establishing those industries. These days such industries are fewer and fewer in number and smaller in the total spectrum of services and goods that can and need to be manufactured here.

So, there is really very, very little argument for protection of any industry in this country on those grounds. I do not know that there ever was any legitimate argument in the past 30 years, anyway. It is my view that it was marginal if legitimate, and we would have done better not to have entrenched in our minds the belief that we should protect local industries for that reason, because the reason why it was done was forgotten and it seemed to become part of the folklore of the former Country Party and the Labor Party to believe that it was necessary to protect industries to create employment—what nonsense!

Such a policy has never been successful in this country nor in any other country at any time in history unless it was known that for the establishment phase of such industry there that would be no competition with the goods and services it would produce and that the prices at which they would be offered would be those prices at which it could be expected to supply those goods and services once the protection was gone.

Industries in this country which have been protected by legislation, by tariffs and by other devices in the economy have resulted in employees striking—refusing to go on—and in Governments of the day being coerced by employers into believing that what is needed is an increase in tariffs to enable employers to pay an increase in wages to ensure an industry remains in Australia.

That has had the effect of putting up costs for everybody else in the economy. Where we all take in each other's laundry, as it were—that is the service industries and other industries supplying only the local market with their goods and services—we can pass our costs on. However, those people engaged in the predominant export income earning industries cannot pass their costs on: they are price takers on world markets. They do not have an international arbitration commission to which they can go and say, 'Hey, our costs have gone up; therefore the increase is legitimate, and we should get more money for our wheat, coal,' or whatever commodities may be. They simply have to sell on world markets at prices that the marketplace is prepared to pay. That means that they are in open competition with everybody else who is offering those goods or services to the world market, and they must compete on that basis.

That would not be so bad if we in Australia in general, and in South Australia in particular, were not dependent upon our export industries—but we are. Accordingly, we find that the capacity of these people to remain viable has been constantly eroded over recent times. It has been eroded to the point where there is no longer any real incentive to remain involved in those industries that can produce export income for us. That is happening at a time when we more desperately than at any other time in our history need that export income. Why? Only four years ago Australia's international debt was \$32 billion. Now, on the most recent figures released, Australia owes \$109 billion.

It took from Federation in 1901 until 1982-83 to reach \$32 billion, and I was alarmed enough at that point. However, it has only taken just over three years to get to the point where we are now in debt overseas to the tune of \$109 million and the way in which we incurred that debt is more disturbing than the debt itself, because what we have now decided to do (and this makes Gough Whitlam's attempt to borrow \$20 billion from the Arabs back in 1974 pale into insignificance), and what we are doing, is borrowing principal, compounding the interest on it for 30 years and then expecting future generations to repay it in one lump sum.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: What is the answer to all this?

Mr LEWIS: The answer to all this is to live within our means and, more particularly, for the public sector and Government instrumentalities to live within their means. I am not talking about the private sector debt, because that is not borrowed on the basis of roll-over bills for 30 years—it is forbidden, anyway, by law. If you can buy out one business from the proceeds that come from the efficiencies and profits of another, then it only stands to reason that you should do so, especially if you can go on paying dividends.

By definition, an investment of that kind is better than leaving the money somewhere else in the economy. However, that is a digression from the real question before us. The solution to the problem, therefore, is for governments to not spend more than they make and for them to reduce the extent to which they interfere in the economy: it is not a bottomless pit.

If we look at a pie chart (and that is the way in which we can get the clearest concept of what is going on), whatever slice the Government takes of the pie there is a smaller slice for everyone else, so the answer is clearly to reduce the size of the slice taken by local, State and particularly Federal Governments, and to leave it with the individuals who created it as a reward for their effort in providing the goods and services in free competition with others. If it is not an individual but a firm, then there are other firms doing likewise. The sooner we deregulate the economy so

that a free economy can exist, and do things to encourage it to exist, the better off we will all be. Life is not a big feather bed and the pot from which we derive our prosperity is not a bottomless well.

Mr Robertson: You're mixing your metaphors.

Mr LEWIS: Whichever way the honourable member wants to understand it, I am quite sure he knows what I am telling him. A trite interjection of that kind indicates that the honourable member does not understand the gravity of the problem confronting this country. It is an even more serious problem for my constituents, because they are the people who are producing rural commodities that can be sold on overseas markets.

If we as Australians at large do things that detract from the capacity of people like my constituents to earn the export income that gives this country the prosperity that we all enjoy, we will all suffer in the long term. That is what we have been doing for too long and we have got away with it. In the past three or four years we have believed that we could continue to get away with it by allowing ourselves even further extended lines of credit. We are living on money borrowed from tomorrow, ignoring the reality that we have to live within our means to produce. I have the latest farm cost data from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics which shows that, after interest repayments, the heaviest slug on farmers comes from the public sector. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a graph showing farm costs and how they have risen in the 1980s.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can the member assure me that it is purely statistical?

Mr LEWIS: Yes, it is purely statistical.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have one trouble, and that is that we cannot accept a graph.

Mr LEWIS: Where do Standing Orders say that, Mr Deputy Speaker? We arranged that five years ago.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will take that on notice, but I cannot at this stage give the honourable member an assurance that I can accept the graph. I will take up this matter with the Speaker and see where we go from there.

Mr LEWIS: Since 1980-81 farm rates and taxes have risen by 87 per cent, while farm gate product prices are only up 13 per cent. The cost of meeting interest repayments has escalated 11 times faster, increasing 151 per cent in five years.

You, Mr Deputy Speaker, and other members of this House should know that farm terms of trade have declined by a further 7.7 per cent in the 12 months to March 1986, the most recent period available for our consideration, so there is a combination of an 8.4 per cent rise in farm costs and zero improvement in prices received across the board which produces that decline. One might say that it warrants explanation in some detail. As cost inputs affect efficiency and viability of production, fertilisers are up 12 per cent; chemicals used by farmers, 9 per cent; fuel, down 8 per cent at that time but now up again; machinery, up 12 per cent; maintenance, up 11 per cent; hired labour, up only 7 per cent in the rural areas (worse in other parts of the economy); and marketing costs up 5 per cent.

Against that we need to remember that prices received by farmers have moved down in the case of wheat and other grains, wool, sheep, butter fat and sugar. There are marginal increases such as .5 per cent for cattle, 15 per cent for vegetables—largely, I guess, as a consequence of seasonal influences—and 2.5 per cent for pork. Fruit is also up 7 per cent in the same way as are the other perishable vegetables. Those figures show that, after interest rates and taxes, the worst areas of farm inflation have been in electricity, which is up 67 per cent; machinery costs, up 66 per cent; main-

tenance costs on all that machinery, 64 per cent; and fertilisers, 52 per cent—in no small measure thanks to the Seamen's Union.

An honourable member: That's a bit rough!

Mr LEWIS: I could go on. I could give you half an hour on what they have done to the superphosphate industry in this country.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Tyler): Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

Mr LEWIS: I could not help but respond to a provocative interjection of the kind which I know the member for Fisher can make from time to time. I would like to incorporate in *Hansard*, subject to the same constraints suggested by the previous incumbent in the Chair, a graph which illustrates prices paid and the figure received by farmers since 1960, indicating what I am trying to get across to members. I assure the Chair that this is purely statistical and is valid. It is from a quarterly review of the rural economy. I seek leave to have that graph inserted in *Hansard*.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Leave is granted, but it will be on the same condition as was ruled by the Deputy Speaker.

Mr LEWIS: I understand that. We also need to look at the way in which, against the odds during the period from 1960 to the present time, farmers have been able to continue to increase their output. That has gone up at 1.7 per cent per annum on an almost straight trend line since 1955 or 1956 until the 1980s, but in the late 1960s and early 1970s there had to be a turnaround in inputs if farmers were even to survive. Accordingly, they have reduced the amount of inputs needed to produce that increasing volume of output. This reduction of inputs has been 2.2 per cent per annum. A graph, which I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard*, illustrates this point and shows how use of inputs has decreased whilst outputs have continued to increase. I seek leave to have that graph incorporated in *Hansard*.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Since my last comments to the member for Murray-Mallee I have had time to consult the Speaker, and the ruling I am giving is that no graphs or charts will be taken for reproduction in *Hansard*. This is in view of a longstanding rule. An application was made yesterday by a Government member for the introduction of a graph, and permission was refused. If the member would like to provide that information which he has in tabular form, it can be accepted.

Mr LEWIS: I will not argue with you, Mr Deputy Speaker, but I can draw your attention to a number of places in *Hansard* where graphs are actually printed. Let me go on, as time permits, from the farm survey report produced by the BAE. On page 1 it states:

Farm debt has risen sharply in the past few years, particularly among cropping specialists, although one-quarter of farmers have no debt at all and half have only modest debts.

It is those others I worry about, because they are, in the main, people I represent. I continue:

Substantial downward adjustment in land value is occurring right at the present time, after it reached its highest point about two to three years ago, especially in the 1984-85 period. The subsequent fall in values has brought land down to slightly below the trend in real terms. Declining land values affect equity and farmers' ability to borrow additional funds to finance farm operations. Farmers with higher debts and reduced cash flows, mainly in the cropping sector—

people I represent—

have their ability to service their debts, especially in view of the higher interest rates, severely curtailed.

That is the sad story that now confronts us all, because a continuing number of farmers are at risk, according to definitions commonly accepted by economists, and that category is predominant in areas of the type I represent.

Recently I personally gave an undertaking to support a rural counselling service to help people out of the crisis in which they find themselves. Although time does not permit me to lay the blame for that squarely where it belongs, I think that it is the height of impertinence for the Government to require those ailing rural communities already in crisis to contribute half the cost of that counselling service. I provided \$1 000 from my own pocket.

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

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): At the outset, I support the Governor's speech, and also pass on my condolences to the families of the Hon. Mr Simmons and the Hon. Mr Loveday. Those members were not in Parliament during my time here, but I did meet them and know them.

The Address in Reply is always an interesting debate, and this session has been no different. It has been interesting to listen to the different inputs from members. I wish to comment briefly on the speech of the member for Playford (Hon. T.M. McRae) in relation to changes to the electoral system, which I think are sensible and deserve some consideration before the next election. As a matter of fact, many of his suggestions I can remember speaking of with the Attorney-General at the time of drafting the relevant Bill. I put forward some of those ideas, which were not acceptable at that time, but let us hope that time has ameliorated the situation and the Government is a little more considerate.

Let us look at a couple of the points made by the member for Playford. The point about placards and posters I agree with absolutely. They are a waste of time in many cases. If one is not known to the people in one's electorate at the time of the election, there is not much point in feeding one's ego by exhibiting one's face around the area: I cannot see any point in that. We must do it, of course, because everyone does it, and I really do not think—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: That is right: some of us have faces that should not be on posters of that type. As a matter of fact, following the Federal election some weeks ago, there is still an election poster at a railway crossing in my area.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: That is true: it has even been alleged that some of us use photographs taken years ago in which we look younger and more attractive, although in some cases, again, it is hard to make us look attractive. As I have said, they are superfluous and do not really serve the purpose.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: They are all marginal seats and one only has to win them. A poster used during the recent Federal election can be seen at a crossing in my electorate.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: It was put up by one of the losing candidates. Perhaps he is preparing for the next election. Another point dealt with how to vote cards, and again I agree. At the next election, in about 1990, it will be archaic to have people at polling booths handing out how to vote cards. I have had many complaints from older people who feel daunted by the experience of walking up to a booth and having several people rushing forward and poking cards at them. Most people take all the how to vote cards and sort them out later because they are not sure to whom they belong. Under the Act we are compelled to provide cards in the polling booths, so it seems superfluous and a waste of money to have all those people handing out how to vote

cards at every polling booth. The printing industry does very well out of it, but I do not think that this practice is relevant in this day and age. A problem faced by both major Parties in the future will be finding enough people to man polling booths. People are becoming less endeared with politics and politicians, and there will be a problem in the future.

The member for Playford spoke about a committee to investigate this area. I would support any move to ascertain what we can do to amend the Act and make it more suitable to current times. Another point made related to public funding, which has good points and bad points. Many points made by the member for Playford were valid but the public should not fund presidential type campaigns in opera houses, and so on, which require vast amounts of money to make them look good on television. There is no way that the public should pay for that. I understand that some donations could be seen as payment for favours to some person or group. A sensible approach would be to nominate a set amount for public funding. I hope that something is done, perhaps as a private member's motion, to set up a committee. That may come from the member for Playford or me.

I now refer to my own electorate. On 16 July I received an invitation from the Health and Environment on Le Fevre Peninsula Group. The member for Price mentioned this group in Question Time in regard to a report that it did. The invitation was for a public meeting on Tuesday of this week. I attended the meeting and some 200 people turned up. The invitation states:

At this meeting we will discuss the findings of the attached Environmental Health Survey Report and the issues raised by it. We are interested in your ideas ...

The group knows of my ideas, as I have had plenty to say about the problems of the environment in industrial areas.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: Seaweed was one of the early problems. We did fix it to a degree, although the seaweed is still there. The environment is becoming more important to people, and it behoves every member of this House to remember that. When we look at the issues being raised by groups in our community—Jubilee Point, to name one—we see that people are concerned and involved and want to improve the environment, whether it be the scenery, the air or the sea environment.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Or the Bridgewater railway.

Mr PETERSON: They say that it is a scenic railway. As a Parliament we must ensure that those issues are properly looked at. The meeting on Tuesday night was attended by representatives from many Government departments, which surprised me. The Departments of Environment and Planning, Health, and Housing and Construction were represented. Whilst on the subject of the Housing Trust and while the Minister is here, I advise him that one comment made related to a fungus problem on the walls of trust houses. A comment was made about its removal, and remarks about the attitude of Housing Trust officers were not complimentary. I will speak to the Minister about that later. Apparently the officers concerned did not handle the situation very well, and it was mentioned at the meeting.

The agenda at the meeting listed for discussion industrial pollution, gas and dust emissions and noise. On the Le Fevre Peninsula we have had an ongoing history of accidental spills of corrosives, dangerous gases and dust, which have affected people's attitudes. The invitation that I received mentions industrial accidents including spills, leaks, plant technology and maintenance, safety measures, staff training, storage and transport and health surveys. The meeting also touched upon Government legislation such as the Clean Air

Act, the Occupational Health and Safety Act, the Dangerous Substances Act, waste management legislation, and right-to-know legislation. In fact, the United States has already introduced right-to-know legislation. Someone at the meeting made the point that the public had a right to know what is happening in the community and what is being done. The report mentions some of the problems involved, and I will return to that in a moment.

A low key electricity generating plant at Osborne, in my electorate, has been converted from coal to gas operation and the pollution has been greatly reduced. An old gas plant has ceased operation. In a moment I will discuss the ICI factory, the cement works, a building material plant and oil storage units. Changes on the peninsula have concentrated pollution into fairly well defined areas because of the removal and closure of some factories and plants. It is easy to define from where the pollution is coming. Members who do not have any industry in their electorates will find that it is a much larger problem than they may realise. Housing and residential developments have grown up alongside industry. It is something that we must be aware of in the future. Further developments will occur on the peninsula, but I hope that residential development is not permitted next to industrial development. The member for Price has a similar problem with residents living next to industry which disrupts people's lives.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: I am sure the honourable member has some industry in his electorate, but I will lay Price and Semaphore against his electorate for disruption. People are fearful as a result of dangerous chemical spillages over the years. Last year there was a chromium arsenate spill and a chlorine spill in the river.

I refer to a 1983 report entitled 'Survey of Health Services in the Western Urban Sector of Adelaide'. It is volume 2 of the Epidemiology and Health Services profile prepared by the Department of Primary Care and Community Medicine at the Flinders University of South Australia. This official report raises several issues. One cannot refute the qualification and authenticity of the report as it is done by people who know what they are doing. I refer to page 3 of the introduction. The western region is a large region and includes Port Adelaide, Enfield, Woodville, Henley and Grange, West Torrens, Thebarton and Hindmarsh. The area is broadly defined, and the report deals with certain differences in some areas.

The paper states that certain differences experienced by the subregion would appear to warrant further study. Then there follows a list, the second item of which concerns greater lung cancer incidence and mortality. The report states that there are areas with larger than normal quotas for that type of illness. Page 5 of the report has a section headed 'General mortality'. However, since 1983 no in-depth or specific study has been carried out. It states:

Between 1969 and 1978 Hindmarsh, Port Adelaide and Thebarton experienced higher age-sex-standardised death rates than those applying for the State as a whole. In particular, lung cancer incidence and mortality was higher.

That report indicated that there was a specific difference in those areas and included a definition stating:

Port Adelaide—ischæmic heart disease, cancer, and the category of bronchitis, emphysema and asthma... were higher than in other areas.

There is something there that caused that. On page 5, the following statement appears:

Figure 2 illustrates the pattern of lung cancer deaths by areas in Adelaide and demonstrates a very high incidence in Port Adelaide which has increased rates for females.

Again, that emphasises the problem. On page 59, there appears the following comment:

A possible relationship exists between the distribution of cancer, and especially lung cancer, and the emissions which in Port Adelaide contained 10 tonnes of particulate matter in an area 3 km by 3 km. Further study including comparative emission levels would appear to be strongly indicated.

That was not done as far as I know. There are ongoing reports of emissions and dust fall-out, but no survey has been made since then to the degree that it was surveyed previously. Even in 1983 there were indications of problems. So, there was official recognition of problems at that stage, but there was no substantial reaction from the Government or any Government department. There has been a known discharge which is visible, which involves particulate matter, and which produces the smell of the gases. Possible dangers have not been followed up, so comments and requests from the community have not been satisfied. There is a real fear in that community that there will be a fatality involving a major spill of gas, especially chlorine. There is ongoing experience of polluting discharges from industry in the area and some of those contain life threatening materials.

After some years of these community concerns being experienced, a group has been formed to act. In 1983, I suggested that such action be taken after certain reports had been published. The residents have formed a group called HELP in order to get their point across and see some action on their problems. The group has decided to assess the problems being experienced by people in the area in case their point of view was wrong or biased.

A survey has been produced and I congratulate the group of people on their initiative and effort in doing this because, to my knowledge, this is the first time such a group has got together to make things happen. The report produced by the group is headed 'If you don't like it, move' and is described as a preliminary environmental health survey of the Northern Le Fevre Peninsula in June 1987. The title of the report has a significance which I will explain later. The background and rationale of the report, under the heading 'What is this all about', states:

In September, 1985 there was a spillage of copper chromium arsenate in the Port River at Gillman, causing concern to residents, the local fishing industry and environmentalists alike. Some months later another serious spill, this time of approximately one tonne of chlorine gas into the atmosphere at Osborne, caused widespread alarm. Such incidents form a backdrop to the lives of those whose homes are on the northern LeFevre Peninsula, an area which combines residential and industrial sections. For others of us who live and work in the Port Adelaide area (but not directly 'under the cloud' of northern LeFevre Peninsula), the big spillings have led to the stark realisation that the environmental health risk factors of the area are likely to be numerous. This is not simply because of the bigger, more publicised spills, but from the day to day leaks and emissions.

There has been ongoing history of such leaks and emissions. The report continues:

This report is largely the result of a wider community becoming aware of and sensitised to the problems of having large industrial plants as your neighbours. Those people who have had these neighbours for years are very aware, and have made many efforts to improve the situation.

They have made many such efforts, and I have been involved in those efforts. The report contains a map, a copy of which cannot be reproduced in *Hansard*. It shows the distribution of the survey. The report goes on to refer to the industries in the area of which I have already spoken. Explaining its title, the report states:

The title of this report, 'If you don't like it, move', is a comment that many of the residents have heard when they have complained about the various types of industrial pollution. The attitude of many of the involved organisations, companies and departments has been that it is their (the residents') choice to remain in the

area. Of course, the reality is not that clear cut, and as some have said, 'Why should we have to move when all we want is a safe living environment.'

True, the residents want only a pleasant, clean, living environment. The other day, at the invitation of the local member, I visited Elizabeth to see the local swimming centre and he showed me around the layout of that city. Compared to Port Adelaide that city is paradise with its clean parks and open space areas. That approach has not been adopted in Port Adelaide, a matter of which the member for Price and I are well aware. We need to raise the consciousness of the environment. The report continues:

This report is the first attempt to document some of the health problems experienced by the northern Le Fevre Peninsula residents.

Indeed, the report has a chronological connection with what has happened since 1980, especially with individual instances and reports of what has happened. The report tells how the random survey was made over an area taking in Osborne, Taperoo, Northhaven and Largs North, which cover much of the peninsula. The largest single problem experienced was gas emissions and the smells arising therefrom, followed by dust and noise. Concern was also expressed as a result of waterway pollution.

The report contains an interesting table showing the health problems. Of the people surveyed, 67 per cent had respiratory problems, 18 per cent irritation of the skin, eyes and ears, 24 per cent headache and nausea, and 13 per cent anxiety, stress and sleeplessness. Some people on the peninsula really suffer because they are concerned with the next spill and the danger.

These people are concerned about their environment and their health. In relation to the incidence of asthma, 22 per cent of people questioned at Taperoo said that they had asthma, 27 per cent at Osborne, and 21 per cent at North Haven. Of the total population surveyed, 22.6 per cent have asthma. The respiratory symptoms used in the survey included breathing problems, coughing, choking, sore or infected throats, sore, infected or bleeding noses, sinus, hay fever, asthma, bronchitis, chest problems or emphysema. As a result of the survey it seems that in this area there is a higher than average degree of chest and respiratory problems.

I know that the Minister of Health, the Minister for Environment and Planning and the Minister of Labour have been cooperative. I have taken a deputation to the Minister of Labour and next week I will take a deputation to the Minister for Environment and Planning and then, later, to the Minister of Health. I thank them for their cooperation and they have certainly assisted in every way that they could, but I ask them to think of this matter as a much broader problem. Today the member for Price asked the Minister for Environment and Planning to consider expanding what they do—if they do anything at all. I noticed that he said that they 'have done', but they have not done much yet. Let us hope that what they do from now on will include the whole Port Adelaide area and that a significant environmental and health study will be undertaken. Let us make it work for the people who are there.

It saddens me to think that it is almost two years to the day since I raised the matter of the safety of the oil berths in the Port River. Previously I raised the matter on the basis of a Department of Marine and Harbors report that stated that those berths were dangerous, were totally unprotected, and were well below the standard required in any port in Australia. Unfortunately, the day after I raised the matter there was a fire in one of the terminals and, as a result, a death occurred. There is nothing one can say about that—it happened, but it was not related directly to the

topic about which I speak in the sense of a ship's transfer of fuel, but it indicates that there is an eternal danger with these types of facilities. I think that yesterday in America a fire in an oil terminal was put out. With the very best of precautions, one cannot prevent these things occurring. I think that I raised this matter on 14 August 1985, when I stood in this very same spot and told the Minister of the dangers that existed in that area. A day later a fire occurred. Twelve months later I stood here again and said that there was a danger. I am here again, and I will keep standing up as long as I am a member until that problem is rectified.

After that fire occurred in the Port River, grandiose proposals were put forward. The Government was going to relocate, rebuild and dredge. On 22 October, straight after the fire, Mr Abbott said that construction of the new berth would take 12 months and he expected the work to start in February. Not a shovelful, not a stroke, not a nail, not a tap, not one single thing has been done. Even the dredge that has to be used to deepen that berth is about to be sold. The deepening section of the Department of Marine and Harbors is about to be closed.

Mr Gunn: Perhaps you shouldn't support them.

Mr PETERSON: We can consider what happens in the future, but two years after a report from the Department of Marine and Harbors (which report was supported by the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service) in Minute No. 48 of 1985 to the Deputy Premier, as Minister of Emergency Services, when referring to a report of the Department of Marine and Harbors, to which I referred before the minute states:

The report certainly identifies the existing deficiencies and reflects the levels of inadequacy in fire protection facilities and to which urgent consideration must be given to the measures necessary to ensure appropriate standards are attained.

In this regard it is now essential that the S.A. Metropolitan Fire Service fire officers be associated with the designated officers of the Department of Marine and Harbors and management of the oil companies involved, to examine the report in detail and move to the implementation of appropriate measures to upgrade facilities and fire protection in the short term and to report and recommend on long-term proposals where these are considered necessary.

That report was presented in 1985.

Members interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: I believe that they are responsible. There is a danger to people. I am referring to the environment and to the safety of people. It will be a larger and much more serious matter for Governments in this State. They cannot afford to ignore the safety of people, nor their environment. The Government must fix the problem. For two years the oil berths have been ignored. If nothing is done in this budget session, public meetings will be arranged as occurred in relation to a meeting on health. At that time people were forced to resort to such measures in order to get some reaction, help and assistance. If the Government does not attend to the matter, it will force people to take action in their own right, just as occurred with Jubilee Point where thousands of people protested about that project.

People have a right to go about their livelihoods in safety. We all recognise that right, but nothing is done about it. These people work in the Port Adelaide environment, which could explode at any moment. I believe that the Shell depot was the best protected terminal in the Port for the truck-loading facilities, but it ignited, exploded and burnt down. As a result of that accident, one man was killed. If that terminal happens to explode when a ship is being filled, it will wipe out the Port. Insurance people always send me letters and pamphlets, so it surprises me that they have not taken up this matter. I am amazed that they have allowed this situation to continue, where a port's ship oil terminal

facilities are below the standards normally demanded within the country. There are Australian and world standards and that fact is recognised in the Department of Marine and Harbors report. Those standards are not met. If the Government lets this situation continue, it is atrocious. People's lives and the whole facility of the Port are at risk.

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

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy) I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): In Question Time earlier today I asked the Minister for Environment and Planning whether he would indicate what was happening about the need that has been recognised for some time for local government to be given more teeth in regard to the preservation of local heritage items in their own areas. This is a matter that I have discussed over a period of time and on a number of occasions with the Minister for Environment and Planning. As I explained in the question that I asked today, it is more than 12 months since the Minister published a discussion paper which provided the opportunity for local councils to have their say as to how they felt they should have a greater responsibility in being able to preserve buildings.

I do not refer only to the councils in my own electorate, because I am aware that a number of councils have expressed concern and are frustrated as a result of lack of action on the part of the Minister. In recent times there have been a number of examples where the local councils have been unable to preserve buildings that have been threatened with demolition. Pressure has been placed on them by their local constituencies and they have been able to do very little, if anything, about it.

I am aware that one of those councils was the Mount Barker council, in my own electorate, and I am aware that that same situation occurred some months ago when the National Bank building, and more recently the ANZ Bank building, were to be demolished. I am aware that a further building is to come under the same pressure in the very near future. It is essential that the Minister determine exactly what the responsibilities of local government should be, as it is the local government authorities that get the stick in the long run if they have to approve the demolition of a building to allow a new development to be undertaken.

The matter is urgent. Since asking the question and receiving the reply from the Minister I have had the opportunity to speak to senior officers of the Department of Environment and Planning, on the recommendation of the Minister, and they assure me that this is a matter which is to be taken seriously, and I hope that that is the case. A decision must be made as to how much responsibility local government should have in the preservation of heritage buildings in their areas—and I am talking about those buildings that are not necessarily on the State Heritage List. If it is the feeling within the community and of the council that a building should be retained, I think the council involved should have the authority to approve such action and that it should be able to make a decision concerning the outcome of such a matter. I hope that the Minister will take this matter on board and that he will treat it with the urgency that it deserves.

I do not know on how many occasions I have referred during grievance debates in this place to the tardiness of the Government in replying to letters written by members of Parliament. It is always a serious matter when, some five or six months after a member of Parliament has written a letter, still no reply has been received from a Minister's office. I suggest that that is a grave situation. I have a couple of pieces of correspondence that fit into that category. I will not go into the details other than to refer to one letter that I wrote to the Minister of Transport on 5 March this year concerning representations that I had received in relation to the installation of guardrails along a section of Mount Barker Road at Bridgewater. It is an extremely dangerous situation that I refer to. I have pointed this out to the Minister and I have pointed it out to the Highways Department.

Prior to the last Ash Wednesday fire there was some protection there; that has now gone with the removal of large trees that were along the side of the road. There is no protection now. There is some urgency in having guardrails installed. I do not know what is happening in regard to this piece of correspondence. My office has contacted the Minister's office at least four times and has been told that the reply is on its way.

Mr Oswald: Mr Deputy Speaker, I am having trouble hearing what the honourable member has to say.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I would ask that honourable members come to order; members will take their seats, please.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: If some action is not taken soon by the Highways Department to install these safety guardrails, I am sure that there will be a serious accident, and it will be a tragedy if that occurs, because of the time that has been taken by the Minister to have the appropriate action taken.

There are three other matters about which I want some information from the Minister for Environment and Planning, as all relate to his department. The first matter relates to the development that we heard about some time ago, with a considerable amount of fanfare, and I refer to the development in the St Michaels and Mount Lofty summit areas. Back in October last year we were told that a draft environmental impact statement into the \$40 million development of the Mount Lofty summit area was expected to be handed to the Department of Environment and Planning. We were told that that statement was to be with the Minister by the end of October last year. However, since that time we have heard absolutely nothing. There has been a considerable amount of speculation and people who particularly respect that area are quite concerned.

It is a very significant area for the State. Many of the local people want to know exactly what is happening up there. I believe that it would be appropriate for the Minister for Environment and Planning to provide a briefing on the latest moves in regard to that development. We do not know whether it is to proceed or whether it will not proceed, whether the environmental impact statement is currently being assessed or whether that process has been completed. I ask the Minister for Environment and Planning to seek information on that matter and to provide some detail to me as soon as possible so that I can inform the people of my electorate, and particularly those in the communities surrounding the Mount Lofty area, as to the future of that development.

Another matter relates to the 275 kV power line that we are told is to be built between Tungkillo and Cherry Gardens. Considerable correspondence has gone backwards and forwards to both the Minister of Mines and Energy and the

Minister for Environment and Planning. I am informed that the assessment of the environmental impact statement has been concluded and that it is now with the Minister for Environment and Planning. I do not have to mention the concern on the part of a number of people who are anxious to know what the outcome will be and whether their properties will be affected by that transmission line going through. Cases have been put forward by a number of people for the preferred route, as well as for the other option that is being considered. I hope that this matter is resolved as quickly as possible for the sake of those people who have properties in the area that the line will traverse. It is a very important matter and one which I hope the Ministers responsible will consider as a matter of urgency.

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): In the short time available to me in this debate I wish first to place in an historical perspective the issue of domestic violence and, secondly, to comment on a number of statements and questions raised by the review committee in its report 'Shelters in the Storm—A review of the management and administration of women's shelters'. Until the 1970s the assault on women within the family was shrouded in silence. In the public consciousness such violence was considered rare and any abuse of a female partner was not considered to be problematic. For the victims of domestic violence the violent attacks were a source of shame or guilt. The inference was that somehow the victim must have provoked the attack, either directly or indirectly or indeed by some sin of omission.

Essentially, domestic violence was privatised, individualised, medicalised depoliticised. In a recent article 'Domestic violence and the implications for social action' by Rosemary Knight and Suzanne Hatty, published in the Australian Journal of Social Issues of May 1987, the writers state:

The emergence of second-wave feminism challenged the dominant political construction of violence against women ... With the insistence that the personal is also political ... feminists asserted the validity of women's experience of victimisation.

Thus in the 1970s domestic violence, or wife beating, was defined as a social problem of major proportions involving serious physical injury and sometimes death to the victim. The acknowledgment of this fact necessitated the public allocation of significant legal, medical and psychiatric services. The private sphere of the family was recognised as a possible place of danger to women and children and strategies were developed to alleviate the physical and psychological threat with the introduction of facilities such as shelters and refuges.

In South Australia the first women's refuge was established in 1974. As the review entitled 'Shelters in the Storm' states, shelters were run by voluntary groups in makeshift settings struggling for every penny with which to meet what was to become a burgeoning demand for their services. The report continues:

As the level of shelters' expertise and provision of Government subsidy have grown so too have the expectations of Government administrators for professional standards in the areas of management, administration, service delivery and evaluation of programs.

While I acknowledge that sections of the report are critical of a number of deficiencies or unacceptable practices in the administration of women's shelters, I wish to draw to the attention of the House and the public generally those aspects of the report which positively reinforce the work of shelters in South Australia. I will quote from the summary at page 11 of the report, where it states:

The majority of South Australian women's shelters are well managed facilities which, through the double bonus of dedicated and compassionate staff and responsible management, provide

an essential service for women and children suffering the devastating effects of violence, rape, incest, homelessness and poverty.

It was with deep regret and sadness that I learned of the criticisms of the Christies Beach women's shelter. However, as those allegations are currently being investigated I believe that it is inappropriate for me to make any further comment about them. However, I do want to highlight a recent commitment given to the southern community by the Minister of Community Welfare: that is, that the department is making contingency arrangements for the provision of services for women and children in crisis within the southern community who had previously been covered by the shelter.

I understand that these arrangements will be made in consultation with the local community which will also be involved in the planning and re-establishment of a permanent service. I was quite disturbed to find that, in fact, there was very little or no mention in the media of this very firm commitment given by the Minister of Community Welfare and I want to ensure that the public is made aware that the southern community will be serviced by the sorts of facilities that are so desperately needed for women and children who are victims of domestic violence.

I turn to an aspect of the report that I do not believe has been highlighted thus far in the media: that is, the reference in the review to appendix 6, which talks about a Canadian teacher scheme. It seems to me, as someone who is very supportive of the commitment, dedication and work of the staff in women's shelters, that one of the problems is the personal and professional burn-out of workers because of the type of day-to-day activities that they are required to carry out in their job. This Canadian teacher scheme, which I will outline for the House, has developed a range of tested strategies for preventing burn-out.

The scheme has been tried with the teaching profession in Canada with some success and it could be adapted (and I underline adapted) for the prevention of burn-out among shelter workers. The scheme involves staff volunteering to accept three-quarters pay for a three-year period and in the fourth year taking the entire year off on three-quarters pay. The appendix suggests that the scheme would pay for itself, as it is funded from a person's own salary. However, I can see that there are obviously factors that would need to be investigated—things like incremental increases and factors that would cover inflation. The report goes on to say that the scheme also provides for more employment creation since in the fourth year, when the regular staff member is on leave, another person could be given a year's employment, training and experience. I concur with the suggestion in the report that shelter management committees may like to discuss this scheme further with their staff to ascertain levels of interest. I am not suggesting that this is the only way in which suggestions or ideas may be put forward, but I believe we need to examine a range of alternatives that will help and support the staff.

I believe that the review into women's shelters will lead to better management, more efficient administration and, most importantly (and I stress this), improved services for women and children who are in crisis. We must not forget that it is for these people that women's shelters and refuges have been established in South Australia. I congratulate those people who have been involved in the shelter movement and I sincerely hope that the situation can be resolved in my own area as quickly and expeditiously as possible.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I will use this debate to call on the Minister of Transport to investigate complaints that I have received about overcrowding on the Glenelg tram during peak hours. I ask the Minister to review the allocations of trams, either as singles or doubles, together with

their frequency of peak hour operation. I have received letters from many constituents. One of them lives in Kent Street, Glenelg, and wrote to the Traffic Manager of the STA. A copy was sent to me, and it states:

Dear Sir,

I have at this moment arrived in my office after travelling to work aboard the 7.57 tram from Glenelg. I have spent the last 30 or so minutes whilst in transit trying to piece together the logic that foresaw the requirement to schedule only one carriage and two conductors on perhaps the busiest tram schedule of the working day.

For your information the carriage was totally full by the second stop on Jetty Road and was then jammed packed full by Brighton Road. The driver had then to negotiate stops from there to Marion Road so as to indicate to the waiting passengers the ridiculousness of the situation. From there to the city it travelled express as per schedule, however, with passengers 'hanging from the rafters' gravely increasing the danger factor should an accident take place.

One could imagine last minute breakdowns perhaps or even upheaval in rosters; but the ludicrousness of the whole matter was heightened by two incidents as I travelled into the city.

First, as the 7.57 travelled down Jetty Road towards the city no fewer than six carriages passed us travelling in the Glenelg direction. Secondly, when passing the depot at Morphettsville, there was one carriage sitting idle in the shed.

One can anticipate all kinds of explanations for incidents such as this taking place. However, with the current track record of the STA one can only presume that as I the commuter am of least importance to the STA, matters such as this morning have to be taken for granted as common occurrence. An explanation would be greatly appreciated.

The letter is signed by my constituent. I bring this matter to the attention of the House and the Minister of Transport because that letter is a fair summary of many complaints that I have received at my electorate office at Glenelg.

The passenger levels for the Glenelg tram since about 1982 have risen. Let me detail this slow rise for the benefit of members. In the year 1984-85 the Glenelg tram carried 3 335 000 passengers. In the financial year 1985-86 that number had risen to 3 368 000 passengers. I point out that there are only 21 trams available and, whilst the size of the fleet is limited, we are having a growth in the number of patrons.

Clearly, the STA management will have difficulty from time to time in accommodating them, but it has to be borne in mind by the planners of the STA that the patronage of the trams, unlike the railways and in many cases the buses, is in fact increasing. It is continuing to increase at a time when we have the situation as quoted by my constituent, whereby patrons are being stacked in like sardines in a can. That type of commuting in 1987 is just not on. The patrons pay a fair price to commute to the city.

We are always trying to encourage people to use public transport, and if they choose to go on the tram and must stand shoulder to shoulder and hang from the rafters, then I believe that is not on and is no way to encourage people to go by tram. Without further developing the figures relating to the number of patrons using the trams, which I can do at a later time, I ask the Minister whether he will review the timetables and the couplings of cars to see whether this problem which has been experienced in peak hours can be avoided.

Motion carried.

At 5.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 18 August at 2 p.m.