

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 8 August 1985

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

PETITION: BOTANIC GARDEN AT PORT AUGUSTA

A petition signed by 93 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to establish an arid lands botanic garden at Port Augusta was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

PETITION: RACING BROADCASTING

A petition signed by 247 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ensure that the live broadcasting of all racing codes can be received throughout the State was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

PETITION: SPEED LIMIT

A petition signed by 23 residents of Gledstanes Terrace, Port Lincoln, praying that the House support the implementation of a speed restriction on the Lincoln Highway adjacent to Gledstanes Terrace was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

PETITION: CRAIGBURN FARM LAND

A petition signed by 50 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to purchase Craighburn Farm Land north of Sturt River and retain it as open space was presented by the Hon. D.C. Brown.

Petition received.

PETITION: UNSWORN STATEMENT

A petition signed by 2 253 residents of South Australia praying that the House support the abolition of the unsworn statement was presented by Mr Olsen.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: HOUSING TRUST DEFICIT

The **Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Housing and Construction)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS**: Yesterday in the House, and on Monday in the *Advertiser*, the member for Light referred to a Housing Trust deficit and implied that it would be worsened by the freeze on general trust rent increases announced recently by the Government. The figure of \$10 million referred to by the honourable member was an operating deficit for the year 1983-84. It was the result entirely of the 62 per cent of trust tenants who now do not pay full rents.

While the Government was concerned that the operating deficit should not grow, it has always recognised that reduced

rents are a necessity for the wellbeing of many households, such as the unemployed, the aged and the sick. At the same time, the State Labor Government has been working for the past two years on ways of reducing the operating deficit. Because of the statements by the member for Light, it is appropriate at this time for me to inform the House on the success that the Government has had in its efforts to reduce the trust's operating deficit.

As the House well knows, the Government has renegotiated the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement with the Federal Government. One of the major reforms included in the new agreement is a clause allowing the States to use some CSHA funds towards offsetting rent reductions. This was not allowed by the Fraser Liberal Government. The Hawke Government accepted in principle the Bannon Government's argument that public housing rent reductions are the result of insufficient income and are therefore a Federal Government responsibility. As a result of this reform, the State Government in the financial year just ended was able to greatly alleviate the burden of reduced rents on Housing Trust funds.

Consequently, as a result of the Bannon Government's policy initiatives—in particular, the renegotiation of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement—I am able to inform the House that initial figures gathered for the trust's 1984-85 annual report indicate that overall the trust has overcome its deficit problem. This has been achieved in conjunction with the largest public housing program on a *per capita* basis in the country.

Full details of this glowing success will be contained in the Housing Trust's annual report, which I will table in Parliament in September. I hope the member for Light will acknowledge this further confirmation of the excellence of Labor Government housing policies and management and stop knocking South Australia's ever-growing list of achievements.

QUESTION TIME

CHILD ABUSE

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier immediately direct the Minister of Community Welfare to investigate an allegation in this morning's *Advertiser* that staff in the Department for Community Welfare may have concealed information from the Minister about a serious case of sexual assault involving a four year old girl? The information about this case in this morning's *Advertiser* will be of serious concern to all parents who have children cared for in centres approved by the department. Amongst other things, this morning's article alleged delay in inquiring into a case which has resulted in a four year old girl undergoing extensive psychiatric treatment for months after the alleged assaults took place. It also suggests that the Minister may not have been fully informed by some departmental officers of the facts of this case, even though the Minister sought details to answer questions put to him in a complaint.

The suggestions of delay and deliberate frustration of inquiries are reinforced by the fact that the centre's licence to care for older children was finally withdrawn only yesterday, apparently after the department was aware that the *Advertiser* was making detailed inquiries. Cases of child abuse and sexual assault have increased significantly in recent years and parents will be seeking assurances from the Government that centres which it licenses apply strict criteria in relation to care givers, and that, when there is any doubt, the interests of children are put first.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the Leader for his question and thank the *Advertiser* for its coverage of this

matter, because it has brought an important issue to light. Yesterday the Director-General of the department brought down strict regulations with respect to licensing provisions, not of a child care centre but of a family day care giver. There is a distinction about which the Leader should know. The Leader stated that a serious sexual assault was involved. The problem in this case is that that has never been proven and it has made the work of my officers all the more difficult. I am satisfied with the guidelines that have now been promulgated by the Director-General and, after all, the responsibility under the Act is vested in the Director-General and not the Minister (and I leave such matters to those who are professionally qualified to make these judgments and I act upon their advice).

In this case I was concerned about the matter and last year referred it to the Ombudsman for proper and full investigation outside the department altogether. I received a reply from the Ombudsman about 10 days ago. The Ombudsman had also had discussions with the department in the meantime and set out what she considered were deficiencies in the department's handling of matters of this type. So, that also has resulted in these regulations being promulgated. I hope that this now resolves this isolated instance where doubt has arisen and the matter could never be proven. People's reputations were very much at stake where reports had been prepared by a number of people who are professionally qualified to make such reports, including the police who investigated the matter. It came before appropriate panels, and the like.

However, I assure all honourable members that no risks should ever be taken in the care of children within the family day care situation. That service has an excellent reputation in this State: it is one of the best in Australia, as I think all honourable members will agree. Many honourable members have asked me to extend, increase and provide more funds for it. I am very proud of what it does. So, I want to protect the reputation of that service. I am confident that honourable members and the community—

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Yes, I have also asked the Director-General to give me a complete report on this whole episode so that I can further review it and, if necessary, I will refer it back to the Ombudsman again if there is some doubt about the procedures that we have currently put in place.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Will you keep informed?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Yes. I believe that I have had all the relevant information given to me. I do not think anyone held back information.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Why the Ombudsman?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Because the Community Welfare Act—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I have already explained that in cases like this there should be some objective review of all the circumstances, so that the community can know that it has not only been reviewed but is seen to be done by someone outside—disinterested, if you like—from the department.

I have exercised my responsibilities, but I would like the public to know that they have also been reviewed by an authority outside the department. The previous Government made amendments to the Community Welfare Act, and part of those amendments provided for more public scrutiny of the actions of that department. Over three successive Budgets no funds were provided for those accountable procedures. When I became Minister there were still no funds available in the department for that purpose. I took steps to set up the objective review through the

Ombudsman's Office. I believe that it has acted very efficiently.

The statements emanating from the Liberal Party and the Leader of the Opposition are really quite frightening for the community, if that Party was ever returned to government. The Community Welfare Department staff was literally gutted by the Liberal Administration when in government. Very many key executives of that department left. The morale was at a very low ebb when I became Minister. It has not helped to know that, if there was a change of government, we would see the implementation of statements like those referred to yesterday by the Deputy Premier with respect to the new President of the Liberal Party, who said the first area the Liberal Party would cut would be welfare expenditure.

CENTRAL LINEN SERVICE

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Premier provide the House with details of the efficiency of the Central Linen Service? I was concerned to hear the Leader's comments this morning that he had a buyer for the Central Linen Service. I understand that this facility employs in excess of 250 people, many of whom would share that concern about their future. Is this the first stage in the privatisation plan of the Liberal Party?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I heard this statement. It is interesting that there is a buyer. There certainly would not have been a buyer under the previous Government, because the Central Linen Service then would not have been worth buying. We know that a private buyer would not wish to take over such a service in order simply to deliver a service. It would take it over in order to make a profit in what is, of course, an area which requires the highest standards of hygiene, cleanliness and service. As I say, there would not have been a buyer interested at the time of the hapless administration of the former Minister of Health.

Since we have come to office there has been major work done to make the Central Linen Service cost efficient and productive. That work has borne fruit. It is interesting to note that the Leader of the Opposition's statement came in the aftermath of the announcement by the Minister of Health of a further capital infusion into the Central Linen Service which will add to its productivity and effectiveness in servicing the hospital system. The Central Linen Service currently processes more than 200 tonnes of linen per week and services over 100 clients. Since my Government commissioned a major review of the service in April 1983 and obtained a full consultant's report, it has set about implementing it and the number of clients coming to that service has increased, as well it might, because its efficiency and cost competitiveness has improved.

In both financial years 1983-84 and 1984-85 the Central Linen Service income exceeded its expenses, notwithstanding that the standard price of linen has not increased since January 1983. That is a pretty good record of efficiency and productivity, and it is very welcome indeed in the hospital system. I imagine that there would be a few hospital boards feeling very uneasy about the suggestion that a private buyer is going to take over this service and attempt to make a profit out of it, because the impact on their costs will be very large indeed.

I turn now to the question of productivity. Comparing the Central Linen Service with other large scale laundries of this type, there is no question that on the standard productivity level, which is based on kilograms per operator hour, the productivity level has increased markedly. When we came to office the level was about 27 kilograms. It has now risen to 35 kilograms per operator hour, an increase of 30 per cent. First, I will compare that with the general

standard for large scale laundries of this type. The general standard is precisely 29.03 kilograms per operator, while our service is delivering 35 kilograms. Secondly, we have made comparisons with the situation interstate in relation to the type of laundry it would become under the Liberal's sale of the century of the State's assets. There is a major free enterprise laundry in Victoria which currently achieves 32 kilograms per operator hour (while, as I have said, we are achieving 35 kilograms). Again, I point out that that is well above the productivity rate.

I notice that the Leader of the Opposition is very keen indeed to look at overseas examples in these areas: the British experience of privatisation, the successful Thatcher policies which have resulted in record unemployment and inflation in that country. The Leader of the Opposition would like to bring out British experts to help us achieve record unemployment and inflation in South Australia. I suggest that he does not need an expert to come in and tell him how to achieve that; he only needs the unfortunate South Australian community to see him in office for a short while, because he will achieve it on the basis of his policies alone. Fortunately, he will not get that chance.

Looking at the British experience, if the British experts come here to advise the Leader of the Opposition about how to implement privatisation they could perhaps talk about the experience of the supply of hospital linen in Britain, which has been transferred from Government to private laundries. The sale took place there. It has been found that a high quality reliable competitively priced and safe laundry service (remembering that standards of hygiene are absolutely vital—there can be no corners cut in hospital linen laundry) in Britain has in fact been replaced by a service where the standards have notably deteriorated and the costs have risen. Surely we are not going to wish that on our community.

I totally agree with those who say that our public sector services must deliver efficiently and competitively. In the period from 1983 until now that is the approach that we have taken with the Central Linen Service. It has resulted in a 30 per cent improvement in productivity; it has also resulted in better efficiency rates than any private competitor of comparable size interstate. We should be proud indeed that those efficiencies can be achieved. I say to the 250 or so employees at the Central Linen Service that they need not fear for their jobs. With the efficiencies and investment we are putting into the service it will expand on the basis of cost savings. Indeed, it has been calculated that the saving on linen costs in our hospital system has freed up some millions of dollars for use in patient care and services. That is a pretty good profit margin and a pretty good way of applying that margin to having an efficient linen service.

'THE WHOLESALER'

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier immediately ask the Storemen and Packers Union to lift a ban which threatens the jobs of 70 people and will force a wholesale cash and carry business to dump at least \$250 000 worth of perishable goods next week? This business, named 'The Wholesaler' had planned to open at Underdale next week. However, its future is threatened because the Storemen and Packers Union is ignoring an injunction granted to the company in the Federal Court on 26 July.

The union has informed two major suppliers to the wholesaler—Nestles and Carnation—that they will be black-banned if they supply the business. As a result of the union's black ban, 70 employees will have to be retrenched next week and \$250 000 million worth of perishable goods destroyed if the business cannot open, even though the

company has done everything possible to resolve the situation, which involves a demarcation dispute between the storemen and packers and the Shop Distributors and Allied Employees Association.

I understand that the company has made approaches to the Government, but so far the Government has refused to become involved. I therefore ask the Premier, as a matter of urgency, to approach the Secretary of the Storemen and Packers Union, Mr Apap, to have this ban lifted and the law upheld so that this business can open next week and 70 jobs can be preserved.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: As Minister representing the Minister of Labour in another place, I can assure the honourable member that my colleague in the other place is already involved in this matter. The Government is not ignoring the problem; it is a problem that needs to be resolved and, consistent with our long-standing and successful policy of consultation rather than confrontation on these matters, we will continue to be involved with a view to ensuring that the parties come to an amicable settlement.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN NETBALL ASSOCIATION

Mr MAYES: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport explain the details of the grant to the South Australian Netball Association referred to in this House yesterday by the members for Hanson and Goyder, and will he say whether comments made by those members are correct?

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling the Minister of Recreation and Sport I indicate that the latter part of the question seeking comments on remarks made in this House yesterday is out of order.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: As indicated by the member for Unley, yesterday, the members for Hanson and Goyder, and to a lesser extent the member for Bragg—

An honourable member: Shadow Minister.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I do not know which one of them is the shadow Minister. I want the members of the House to appreciate and understand the facts about this matter. For a number of years the sport of netball has unfortunately been somewhat fragmented in South Australia and on a national basis as well. The division of opinion that exists has tended to become more acute with any efforts made to achieve amalgamation or a reconciliation of the various groups.

It is claimed by some that the division in the netball fraternity arises from the unequal representation under the South Australian netball constitution. I am not in a position to be the umpire or the judge as to whether one group is correct or otherwise, but both the Department of Recreation and Sport and the Minister have a responsibility to the sport in general. The department has tried to act as an arbitrator, and has asked the parties to attempt to reach agreement for the mutual benefit of netball in this State. I believe that the use of taxpayers' money involved should be devoted to the whole of the sport. Of course, there is a group of associations which play netball but which are not affiliated with the South Australian Netball Association.

Along with my departmental officers I have undertaken negotiations in an effort to help the sport and bring about a reconciliation, but unfortunately that has not occurred. That is not the reason why the grant has not been made. I approved it some time ago, and, for the benefit of the members who spoke yesterday. I point out that the grant involves \$13 500 this year, \$12 000 for 1986-87, \$10 000 for 1987-88 and \$8 000 for 1988-89. That was approved by me on 12 June 1985, and those figures total \$43 500.

Yesterday the member for Hanson listed a large number of organisations which had been recipients of this grant.

The cheque had not been forwarded, because the department wanted some further details in regard to this development grant. Of course, the grant has now been made.

Mr Becker: Why?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Because we have received the details we requested. The way the member for Hanson and the member for Goyder performed yesterday does not assist in creating a good atmosphere in which the sport may prosper in this State.

What I resented most were the comments made about officers of my department, denigrating their ability, expertise and professionalism as public servants. I believe that the member for Hanson, the member for Goyder and other members ought to publicly apologise to those public servants, who have acted in the best interests of netball in this State.

Mr MEIER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the Minister is reflecting on comments made by me, among others, and in so doing he is reflecting on one of my constituents. I ask that he not continue with that line of attack on any of my constituents.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I urge the Opposition to be a little more responsible and to refrain from making such comments in parliamentary debate, because I think it is in bad taste. I believe that the Opposition was unjustifiably critical of the department, because the officers concerned have acted in the best interests of netball, and of sport and recreation generally, in South Australia.

DUNCAN CASE

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: In view of the Government's decision not to call a Royal Commission at this stage into the Duncan case, because it wants to obtain and assess all available information, will the Premier ask the Deputy Crown Solicitor, Mr Bowering, to arrange to interview the two former Scotland Yard detectives who compiled the report on this case, in view of the allegation that there was political interference in their investigation?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: It seems that members opposite wish to suppress questioning on this matter. The allegation of political interference is that the former Scotland Yard detectives were told in 1972 to cease their line of inquiry into a certain person. As the Government will not call a Royal Commission at this stage it would appear appropriate for action to be taken to seek information on this matter from the Scotland Yard detectives themselves.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I can add nothing to what I said yesterday about this matter. It is the Government's earnest desire that whoever perpetrated this action in 1972 be brought to justice. Nothing will be suppressed and lines of investigation will not be neglected in order to ascertain such information. That is exactly what the Attorney-General has authorised.

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member may have some information. He asked a question last week which implied that he had some special information. I hope that he took up my offer then to see the Attorney-General or the Deputy Crown Solicitor and place such information in the hands of either individual so that the line of inquiry could be followed. I appreciate his suggestion, just as I said yesterday, that we should look at suggestions regarding reward rates, immunity for people not directly involved, and a number of other things. Indeed, that is being done.

It is fine for him to make the suggestion, but he should communicate that or any other information that he has to the Attorney-General rather than waste the time of his colleagues who, no doubt, have matters to raise in this Parliament which could be more properly answered here. I am unsure of the whereabouts of the two detectives concerned. Neither are any longer in Scotland Yard. Both, as I understand it, are serving terms of imprisonment for various offences committed in Britain. Be that as it may, their report, which has been the subject of intensive interest and speculation, I remind the House, was a report examined by the previous Government.

In fact, it is recorded in *Hansard* that Attorney-General Griffin, having made certain comments before and after the election, was asked by the current Attorney-General in October 1979 (and it is reported in *Hansard*) whether he was going to release the report as he had promised to do. The then Attorney-General, Mr Griffin, I notice is leading the charge in this current inquiry and trying to make political capital out of something which is essentially not political. It is in all our interests that the matter be solved. In response to that question Mr Griffin, to paraphrase his answer, said he could not answer it at that stage, that the report was with the Chief Secretary and under his jurisdiction, that it would be examined and that Cabinet would make a decision on whether or not it should be released. Subsequently, he reported back to the Legislative Council and to my colleague, the Hon. Mr Sumner, that he had decided that the report should not be released. He said, 'I understand that a number of Ministers in previous Governments had also examined the report and had come to the same conclusion.'

There we have the position of the previous Government, and it is interesting to recall that the current Leader of the Opposition was Chief Secretary for a time and therefore in charge of police. He was in possession of that report and able to do something about it.

Mr Olsen: That is not right.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am just going on what the Hon. Mr Griffin advised the Legislative Council in October 1979, namely, that the matter was in the hands of the Chief Secretary. So, if that is not right, he had better talk to his colleague and ask him why he misled the Parliament. I am simply saying that that was the consideration then. In those circumstances it is quite apparent that, unless there are very good and strong reasons, the report should not be released. My colleague has undertaken to examine and pursue the lines of inquiry. I hope that what the Opposition is asking for is that we will be able to launch a successful prosecution against the perpetrators of that offence. All our energy should be directed to that, not political grandstanding about the matter which, after all, does not involve any of us who are sitting here in the Parliament today.

DRUGS IN SCHOOLS

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Education say what procedures are followed now where drug use involving school students is reported, and whether these procedures are proving satisfactory?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am pleased that the honourable member has asked this question, particularly in light of recent reports of an incident that took place at a high school in the northern area. As I have said previously, I believe that that was ably handled by the principal and staff of that school. They did something which every parent of children at that school would have expected.

I note that last night the member for Light concurred similarly in that view, because the school is within his electorate. It was in that context, having had that episode

this week which must have been a matter of considerable moment and concern to the staff of the school dealing with it, that it was reported to me this morning that there had been a press release issued last night by the shadow Minister of Education with respect to drug procedures in schools.

I note that this press report, as I have had reported to me by the media, is nothing other than a vote of no confidence in the teachers in our schools, and it was not raised by the honourable member in this House. The honourable member has spoken on two occasions since this press release has been apparently issued—last night in the Supply debate and today in Question Time—and on neither occasion has he chosen to raise the matter.

However, as I understand it, and doubtless the honourable member can clarify what took place (although I expected a question from him today as to whether we can undertake the investigation he calls for): he called for an investigation into the extent of drug use in South Australian schools. He called what was happening a 'wait and see' approach, as I understand it, by the Government, and he called for action.

Then he asked for departmental officers to go into schools to pursue the matter. Apparently, he referred to the increasing drug problem within our schools. A number of those points need very clear clarification. I am gravely disappointed that the shadow Minister did not take this opportunity to raise the matter within this forum. What happened at that school earlier this week was an appropriate response: it is the kind of thing we would expect to happen within our schools and the kind of guarantee we can give to parents in this State. The Education Department, teachers and principals, are concerned about what is happening.

That is not to deny that there are instances from time to time when in Government and non-government schools some students may have on their person or property drugs and may even use those in those places. However, I guarantee that whenever that information is made known to teachers, or there is a reasonable suspicion, action is taken. It is not sufficient to say that departmental officers should be called in to do that. That implies that teachers and principals do not want to do it. Clearly they do, and they have an interest in what is taking place in their schools and they will pursue the matter.

On a number of occasions parents or members of the community give advice to myself or to the department about an alleged possession of or use of drugs in or near schools. Every time that happens it is followed up and every time it is followed up the staff of the school are involved, as are departmental officers. Where appropriate, quite clearly the police are also informed. That is not a 'wait and see attitude'; that is an action policy. It has been happening now for some considerable time.

The other point that needs to be mentioned is that the honourable member apparently asked about the extent of drug use in our schools. I believe there is a real danger of this becoming a scaremongering tactic to create in parents' minds the image that there is rampant drug use in our schools. It needs to be observed by people that there are from time to time instances that are reported and followed up. However, of course, schools are part of the wider community in which drug abuse is taking place. Where is the concern of the honourable member about what is happening in parks, gardens, shopping centres or the like? Rather than raising scaremongering fears about what is happening in schools, surely he should be concerned about what is happening in the whole community in terms of protecting young people from the real danger of drugs.

I can tell the House what is going on—it is the promotion of curriculum programs and in-service programs for our teachers to enable them to teach against the abuse of drugs in the education system. For 12 years we have had a health

education program respected not only nationally but also internationally. One component of that program deals with the use and abuse of drugs. In addition, earlier this year we introduced the program entitled 'An Approach to Drug Education—Free to Choose'. It is a program to make young people realise that they have the freedom to say, 'No' when they are suffering from peer group pressure. That program involves in-service teachers. Recently, we announced a joint program with Rotary whereby a further 60 teachers will receive in-service training on this matter.

It comes down to the question of whether drug use is occurring in our schools. It is my belief that, because it is occurring in the community, instances will occur within schools. When it is found, it is reacted to. I think it is something that each individual school is monitoring all the time. When there is a matter of concern, it is brought to the attention of departmental officers who then become involved. When there was recent press coverage on glue sniffing in a northern area, the issue was canvassed by local schools, the Education Department, the police and I, as Minister, in trying to monitor that situation. Whenever these sorts of issues are raised they are automatically followed up. There does not have to be a press release saying that that should be done, because it is being done automatically. There does not have to be scaremongering amongst parents about that sort of issue.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: What are the results?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Well, as an example, I refer to glue sniffing, which was raised in the press by certain members of the community who tried to create the impression of rampant glue sniffing in a northern area in certain schools. The police advised me, following consultations with teachers, principals and officers of the Education Department, that there was not especially inordinate use of glues in that area compared to other areas of the State and that it was unfair to single out that area. They also informed me that there was no evidence that glue was being used at schools during school time. They had no evidence to substantiate that, and no teachers, staff or Education Department officers could accept the assertion made by some people that students were turning up at schools stoned, which was reported in the press. That is the result of that investigation.

The fact is that the abuse of solvents is taking place. The approach adopted was to use a more constructive program rather than the scaremongering suggested by the Opposition. The program involved teachers, the police and the Education Department to work out the best way for local schools to react to these sorts of problems.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: It was initiated under our Liberal Government.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Coles says that it was initiated under her Government. Does she think that she was a Minister—or even a member—12 years ago, in 1973? She has a strange memory. I think we need a constructive approach. I have said—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I have said in the media that, if people are concerned about what is happening in their schools, they should visit those schools and ask what is going on. That is the best way to find out whether there is a problem. I can assure honourable members—

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Torrens to order. I remind honourable members again—and this is the last reminder that I feel is necessary—that in calling any one member to order I am giving notice to all honourable members. The next offence receives a warning, and any further offence the ultimate penalty.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: As someone who has visited over 250 schools in this State since I became a Minister, and many more when I was in Opposition, I can assure members that they will find a good state of education in the schools of this State. They will be reassured by what they see in the schools, because we have exciting programs in this State. More significantly, in terms of this issue, they will find a caring body of staff and principals who are concerned about community issues and are concerned about any suggestion that there may be drug abuse on their school premises. They are taking action when that evidence is brought to their attention. That is the issue that is at hand, and I believe that honourable members in this place should be supporting the work that is taking place at the chalk face (to use a cliché) in terms of protecting the children of this State and giving the guarantees that the parents of this State want to receive.

HOME LOAN INTEREST RATES

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Can the Premier guarantee home buyers that there will be no further rises in home loan interest rates this year? In a press statement on 14 March, the Premier said:

I firmly maintain that a number of factors now contributing to the pressure for increases in home loan interest rates may subside.

Since then, the opposite has occurred. The Premier has already approved two applications from the building societies for increases and the pressure on interest rates is continuing. This, and the rapidly escalating price of houses in Adelaide, means the situation for people seeking their first home loan is particularly critical.

The average home loan being approved by building societies in South Australia is now \$47 000, requiring monthly repayments of \$566 over 30 years. That is \$142 a month more than the repayment for the average loan being approved 12 months ago. To fully repay the average loan over 30 years now costs \$203 760.

Interest rates are now running at record levels in real terms. They are higher than at any time since 1950 and it is estimated that the two increases this year have pushed a further 1 000 couples out of the home ownership market. This is reflected in the declining numbers of applicants on the State Bank home purchase waiting list, where, at the end of March, the number of applicants was 47 per cent fewer than a year earlier. Yet, despite this growing crisis, we hear no concern now from the Labor Party about interest rates, despite the fact that the position is far worse than it was in 1982.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member's final comment is totally untrue. It is a matter of great concern to the Government, and I have expressed that concern on a number of occasions. Of course, as the honourable member knows, I cannot guarantee whether interest rates will go up or down. If only it was in the control of the State Government, it would be very good. I think that the predictions that interest rates will go up and the kind of fear and anticipation that that might occur does not help in the situation at all. I suggest that the reasons which I gave in March and which I have repeated since that time are good reasons as to why we actually should see interest rates coming down, not going up.

As the honourable member has pointed out, and as I have pointed out on many occasions, the real interest rates are at record highs. The difference between the interest rate and the rate of inflation has increased. It seems quite extraordinary with the success that has been achieved in getting the inflation rate down in this country that we have not

seen a consequent drop in interest rates. It is worthwhile noting that interest rates are lower than they were some years ago. There is no question of that, but nonetheless, this year there has been an upward pressure on interest rates from a number of complex factors, and I think that is to be deplored. It is certainly something about which we have been concerned, both at the State and Federal levels.

My colleague has made representations to the Federal Minister for Housing. In fact, a task force has been established to look at the possible impact of deregulation and the effects on low income earners of housing interest rates. Under the general policies that the Liberal Opposition adopts there is no question that they would move to the deregulation model on housing interest rates, which could well see them going well above the current level. My Government does not support deregulation of housing interest rates at the national level, and we continue to make representations to that effect. The figures adduced in terms of lesser numbers on the waiting lists are in part, of course, a consequence of the enormous uptake of loans in the past two or three years.

Members will do well to remember that in the last two or three years we have had record numbers of people achieving their first home. It has been a marvellous opportunity for them, and schemes such as our Home Ownership Made Easy scheme at the State level and the Federal Government's policies have all assisted home buyers.

Equally, the action that we are taking in relation to stamp duties will further assist home buyers of this State. We are conscious of the problem. We cannot predict the way in which interest rates go up, but I repeat that I think it is a very poor situation which sees interest rates climbing while the rate of inflation stays low. The banking system says that the problem is that its number of deposits on low interest is shrinking. The fact is that people are looking after their money, if you like, more carefully: they are chasing higher interest rates and making different forms of deposit.

There is greater competition to offer higher interest rates to depositors. That has resulted in a greater cost of money in terms of lending, and that is one reason given for the pressure on interest rates. However, I still say that it is vital that we keep control of interest rates, and I would hope that they come down. I am certainly not going to make predictions which will help talk the market up. On the contrary, I think we should look towards keeping pressure on the financial institutions to keep those interest rates down and not encourage them, as the honourable member's question would do, to raise those interest rates.

POLICE FORCE

Mr GREGORY: Will the Minister of Emergency Services approach the Commissioner of Police with a request to extend the upper age limit of 30 years which has been placed on persons who voluntarily resign from the Police Force and are seeking re-engagement? I have been approached by a constituent regarding the Police Department's policy of not re-employing persons who voluntarily resign from the Police Force. She felt that the policy discriminated against female police officers who have children and may resign because of difficulties encountered in raising those children. I agree with her.

Earlier this year I approached the Minister of Emergency Services regarding this matter. He considered the complaint and took the request to the Commissioner of Police. In June I was informed by the Minister that the Commissioner now advised that the longstanding departmental policy, which precluded the re-enlistment of members and cadets, had been reversed. A number of criteria were placed on the

re-engagement of those people, including an upper age limit of 30, which is the limit for current engagement of persons who have not been re-employed. A number of other requirements were listed in connection with suitability and did not guarantee re-employment. It was stated that people who were re-employed would have to undertake additional training, that there would be no seniority on re-entry and deployment and that all persons leaving the Police Force would be interviewed and advised of the new policy.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I would like to commend the honourable member for his persistence in this matter. I am aware that it is, in part, as a result of his consistent advocacy that the reforms are already in place. I am only too happy to put to the Commissioner his suggestion relating to this further modification of the policy and to bring back a report for the honourable member and the House.

ADELAIDE CONVENTION CENTRE

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Will the Premier advise the House of the level of bookings for the new Adelaide Convention Centre for its first year of operation in 1987 and for the subsequent triennium, and, bearing in mind that the lead time for national conventions is a minimum of two years, and for international conventions between three and five years, will he acknowledge that the \$100 000 allocated in the last financial year for marketing the centre was so inadequate as to make its future viability an almost impossible goal?

In the 1984-85 Budget, \$100 000 was allocated for the marketing of the convention centre. This sum contrasts dramatically with the \$300 000 proposed by the Government to promote its own image among the unemployed and contrasts even more dramatically with sums in excess of \$1 million allocated to centres such as 'Conrad Jupiters' on the Gold Coast to ensure sufficient resources so that marketing of the centre is in line with the capital investment and operating costs. It is common knowledge in the tourism industry that the \$100 000 was exhausted by the end of 1984 to the extent that, following the mailing of a promotional pamphlet to potential convention centre users inviting requests for further information, there were no funds available to produce additional detailed information.

I understand that this week—eight months after potential users requested additional information—brochures are at last being printed. Does the Premier acknowledge the total inadequacy of the Government's handling of this critically important marketing project, or is he satisfied with marketing arrangements of the South Australian Government by comparison with those of our interstate competitors?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is the usual helpful question from the former Minister of Tourism, who apparently has this responsibility in Opposition to attempt to play down the tourism industry and undermine it. I am very pleased to hear this question, because it really highlights the attitude of the Opposition on these matters. We are told that \$100 000 marketing for the convention centre is totally inadequate, that it ran out, things are not going too well, and so on.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the honourable member for Coles.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I appreciate that the honourable member, in her role of attempting to ensure that tourism is on its knees in this State, would want to ask those questions. Let me put the record straight.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I name the honourable member for Coles.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may be heard in explanation. The honourable member for Coles.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Mr Speaker, in the uproar that followed my question, I have heard no word from you, but I have just heard a statement from my colleague that you named me. I heard no warning and I did not hear the naming. The noise was so considerable that I simply did not hear the Chair.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have listened carefully to what the member had to say, and I have also taken some advice. I clearly called a warning. I accept the honourable lady's explanation that she did not hear it, but I will say this: she herself certainly added to the uproar that was going on, and she can consider herself most fortunate—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! She can consider herself most fortunate that I will not proceed with the matter. I have warned members on both sides of the House that this practice of barracking and uproar is going to cease, and there will be very limited occasions on which anybody will be able to convince me that they did not hear the warning that was given. The honourable member for Light.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I move:

That the explanation of the member for Coles be accepted as more than adequate.

The SPEAKER: I take that as a point of order which I do not uphold. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, I request that you, Mr Speaker, give your instructions more clearly to the House. I did hear the warning, which you mumbled, but I am not surprised that other members did not hear it. I request that you give your instructions to the House more clearly.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order and the honourable member is behaving in an unseemly way. I spoke quite clearly. The fact of the matter is that, to the disgrace of honourable members, they were shouting and roaring like schoolchildren. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Let me continue. The marketing of the casino is going on well. As I understand it, there are a number of bookings. I cannot give the number, chapter and verse, to the House. For example, in 1987 the Australian Federation of Travel Agents convention—one of the largest and most prestigious conventions in the tourist industry—will be held here at the new centre as a result of efforts by my colleagues the former Minister of Tourism and the present Minister of Tourism, who was able to finalise the deal in Hawaii. Did we hear the so-called shadow Minister of Tourism say anything about that? Did we see her statement of congratulations on the achievements of that convention? Not a bit of it! There are also a number of other conventions and exercises, such as an international conference that I am aware of as it comes within the arts jurisdiction. I imagine that there will not be too much problem in securing major conventions for the centre.

It is also associated with an international hotel that will be doing its own promotion for part of the overall complex and in a number of areas there will be promotion of conventions in this State. It is important to make the point that tourism promotion in this State does not begin and end with what the Government puts into a budget. Tourism in this State must depend on the efforts that the industry puts into it. The shadow Minister mentioned Queensland. They do not say there, 'Let's see what the Government can do to market Queensland'. One will find that individual operators are spending many thousands of dollars interstate and overseas promoting their resort or attraction. I

suggest that there ought to be a lot more of that done in this State.

Indeed, it would be useful if, instead of knocking Government effort and suggesting (an odd suggestion coming from an Opposition that wants to privatise everything) that the Government should do it all. We should be encouraging industry to do more itself. The logic of the privatisation issue is that we sell off the convention centre with the Government having nothing to do with it, which means that it would not have happened, and that we should then sit back and do nothing. On the contrary, while the Opposition is privatising it is demanding that we spend more money on things—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The promotion of the convention centre will continue over the next couple of years and the Government will be making allocations for that. It is interesting that the Jupiters complex was mentioned, the chief segment of which, of course, is a casino. The very same honourable member wants us to promote this development of hotel/casino/convention centre, but somehow ignore the casino because it is a shameful and terrible thing to have. She opposed it to the last ditch all night in this Chamber in 1983.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yet, now she is conspicuously silent about it. There will be promotion of that facility as well and it is interesting to compare it with Jupiters. We have a far better complex here. It will be infinitely more saleable and will see more success and use in my view, provided that the whole community gets behind it. Those who profess to speak about tourism in South Australia must do something to support it.

OVERSEAS SOCIAL SECURITY PAYMENTS

Mr GROOM: Will the Premier arrange for urgent discussions with the Federal Minister for Social Security, Brian Howe, with a view to both expressing concern and requesting the Minister to consider altering aspects of a proposed reciprocal agreement between Australia and some other countries for social security payments. The agreement with which I am particularly concerned is a proposed reciprocal agreement between the Australian Government and the Italian Government. I know there are agreements with other countries such as Greece along similar lines over payment of pensions and over the criteria for determining each country's responsibility for social security payments. It is only one aspect of the agreement with which I am concerned, as there are a number of beneficiary aspects of the proposed reciprocal agreement.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr GROOM: In general terms it affects people who may have come from Italy, lived and worked here in Australia and returned to Italy, or *vice versa*. Presently the residential qualifying period for a maximum Australian pension payable overseas is 10 years. In Federal Parliament on 8 May 1985 the Minister for Social Security outlined proposals for a new reciprocal agreement between the Italian and Australian Governments to replace the one about to expire. He said in that speech—

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, is what the member for Hartley presenting to the Chamber now in your opinion an explanation or a comment?

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: On a point of order, the member for Mallee asked you, Mr Speaker, for a deci-

sion. I fail to see how you can say that there is no point of order when he was asking you for a decision on what was being said on the subject matter of the member for Hartley's explanation.

The SPEAKER: To make it absolutely clear, I do not uphold the point of order made by the member for Mallee.

Mr GROOM: To quote directly from the Minister's speech, he said:

In other words, to qualify for a maximum Australian pension overseas it would be necessary in future to have resided in Australia for 35 years during working life.

There has been widespread opposition to this proposal in the ethnic media.

Mr Lewis: Question!

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hartley will resume his seat.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The matter raised by the honourable member has been brought to my attention and it is a matter of concern. One of the problems is that there has not been an adequate explanation of the system proposed. I know that certainly the more information that could be provided on this subject by the Federal Government the more debate and consideration of it could be advanced. As it is, it has caused considerable concern amongst some of the communities.

My colleagues the Minister of Ethnic Affairs and also (because there is indirect effect on the community welfare system) the Minister of Community Welfare have taken up the matter. It is under discussion and I hope that the fears of people can be allayed and that the system can be explained properly, both its benefits and disadvantages, and any appropriate adjustment be made. The State Government certainly is ready, willing and able to take the concerns of those in the community to the Federal Government. I will be happy to refer the honourable member's question to my colleague the Minister of Ethnic Affairs for his consideration.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: DEPUTY PREMIER'S REMARKS

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: In answer to a question I asked today, the Deputy Premier claimed that I gave the House wrong information. Since the Deputy Premier's answer, in which he claimed that Minister Blevins was actively engaged in seeking to solve the problems of The Wholesaler, I have had the opportunity to check the information I gave to the House.

The information I gave was perfectly correct. In fact, The Wholesaler approached the then Deputy Premier (Hon. Jack Wright) two months ago and has heard nothing since that time either from Mr Jack Wright or, indeed, from Hon. Mr Blevins. This morning he rang the department in desperation and was given the runaround of about six different phones between the Department of Agriculture, of all things, and the Department of Labour. Finally, he received a message that the department would contact him in 30 minutes. I checked with him at about 2.45, I guess, and he said he had heard nothing from the department, and has never seen Minister Blevins. I simply put the record straight. The information I gave the House was perfectly correct and the information the Minister gave the House was grossly incorrect.

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The **SPEAKER**: Call on the business of the day.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 7 August. Page 106.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I make clear at the outset that the Opposition will facilitate the passage of the Government's taxation legislation today. We do so even though the Government has given us only 24 hours to analyse these four important pieces of legislation. We will do so even though the Premier will not do this House the courtesy of allowing honourable members to assess the true impact of these tax cuts.

I asked the Premier on Tuesday to provide information on Treasury estimates of total State tax collections this financial year. The Premier has refused to do so, even though he has the figures. Those figures would allow this House to determine whether these tax cuts go far enough, or whether, after the record rises in State tax collections over the last two years, South Australians should be getting back more than this Government proposes.

Certainly, under a Liberal Government, there will be genuine and long-term tax relief—something a Labor Government can never deliver. Indeed, South Australians have no reason ever to trust this Government or this Premier again on the question of State taxation. The Premier blatantly deceived the public before the last election. The Premier, who promised no increases in existing taxes, no new taxes and a limit on the growth in charges, has increased the rate of seven taxes, introduced South Australia's first new tax in 10 years, and increased 188 separate charges—most at rates well above inflation. And the Premier calls that winning again. Slogans like this will not hide the reality of the largest hike in taxes and charges in South Australia's history. With this record, it is little wonder that the Premier has attempted to dress up this week's announcement in a plethora of activity and accusation, hype and hysterics. There have been simulated helicopter rides to rush into production a television commercial. That helicopter stayed well and truly on the ground. These tax cuts will not fool the electorate at large because the people will well recognise that in these tax measures there is no Bill before the Parliament as it relates to ETSA tariffs, no Bill to permanently remit the turnover tax on the Electricity Trust of South Australia—it is a one-off election year gimmick.

The Government got a cheque back for \$11 million this year which happens to be \$2.1 million less than the take for the restructuring of interest rates on ETSA. The Premier restructures interest rates by putting them up \$13.1 million and then he says to the electorate, 'I will give you \$11 million back.' However, he has not told the electorate that it is a one off in this election year. So, con job No. 2 is about to come up for South Australians but they will recognise that when they realise that the rebate of their electricity tariffs over the first quarter will amount to a whole \$2 on ETSA tariffs as a result of the Government's measures. The Government is not prepared to bring a Bill into the House to remit permanently part of the turnover tax. It is a one-off election gimmick yet again. The electorate will well know that the tax will be on again next financial year. There is no doubt about that at all.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: If they are back.

Mr OLSEN: Yes, and that is why con job No. 2 will not be accepted by the electorate—by South Australians. Having been bitten once by a Government that is deceitful, they will not, for a second occasion, accept this Government at its face value. We have seen a number of things, not only a simulated helicopter ride. We have seen press conferences at 7.30 in the morning, a phoney challenge to the Opposition to block Supply and a challenge to the Opposition in relation to debating the matter.

I turned up at the radio studios on two occasions, but when the Premier knew I was there he refused to debate the matter with me publicly; he refused to take telephone calls from the public about this phoney tax relief package that we have before the House at the moment. It is called trying to defend the indefensible. That is what he does not want to do, because he knows his tax package and position is, in fact, indefensible. He also said that there would be a suggestion that we would block Supply. Let me put the facts so far as the Opposition is concerned on that matter.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: I draw your attention, Sir, to the position of the member for Ascot Park physically in relation to the Chair.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not know whether the honourable member is taking a point of order. If he is, he has not spelt it out. Secondly, I take it that the member for Mallee wants to interrupt his Leader. There is no point of order. I ask the honourable Leader to continue.

Mr OLSEN: We have been calling for tax relief ever since the Premier started his tax hike in 1983. In a press statement on 22 April this year I called on the Premier to introduce tax relief from 1 July. In doing so, I indicated that if he was prepared to introduce and back date that legislation operative from 1 July the Liberal Party would give passage to it.

So, this call or suggestion to the media on Monday or Tuesday this week that we would slow down the process is an absolute nonsense. It is fudging yet again. On 22 April we called for tax relief. I named a number of areas where relief was needed—in electricity tariffs and land taxes—specific areas that needed attention. I repeated that call in Parliament last week. I am pleased that the Premier has now responded to our pressure in relation to giving taxation relief, albeit limited and short lived in some of those areas. So, the challenge he issued on Tuesday for us to support these measures was phoney, because he well knew they would be supported. I stated the position publicly the preceding week.

The Premier has also said that because we have called for tax relief for so long, we must support what he is doing now without criticism. We certainly support these measures because tax relief is long overdue. At the same time, we maintain our case that tax relief this late in the day, so close to an election, from a Government committed to higher and higher levels of public spending, is nothing more than a vote buying exercise. The talk-back programs on Tuesday on which the Premier appeared certainly gave the clear impression that it was a cynical exercise in vote buying. The callers gave that message to the Premier loud and clear. In fact, they gave him a bath. That is the best way to describe the response from the talk-back program.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: I understand that the Premier's staff were unhappy about it.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed they were. They had to keep me away from the studio. I was not allowed to go on air with the Premier to debate these matters. The Premier's staff were preoccupied with that. They did not have time to set up the telephone calls, as the Labor Party usually does. That is the context in which we support these measures today. I

also place in proper context the Premier's claim that these are the biggest tax cuts in South Australia's history. The fact is that, in money terms, the tax cuts implemented by the former Liberal Government in 1980 were worth as much as the tax cuts we are considering today. But the former Government's cuts were far more significant for the reason that they represented 7.5 per cent of total State taxation collected in the year in which they were implemented. These cuts amount to much less as a proportion of total taxation—about 4.5 per cent of likely tax revenue this financial year.

And the former Government's tax strategy also involved firm action to keep the lid on Government spending so that lower levels of taxation could be maintained. This Government has no such strategy. Its public sector employment policies alone have added at least \$46 million annually to the public's tax bill. Total Government outlays over the past two years have increased in real terms by 20 per cent.

To meet this escalation, over the past two financial years this Premier has collected, in aggregate, an extra \$375 million in State taxation. He claimed, falsely, that he had to put up taxes to cover a \$60 million deficit. But, in fact, he has collected more than six times that much in extra tax in the past two Budgets—and the Budget deficit remains in excess of \$50 million. It is clear that the Premier should not have raised State taxation to its present high level in

the first place. Any relief, therefore, is vital. Any relief will be supported by the Liberal Party.

But my Party reserves its position on what more action is necessary to bring to an end the tax spiral South Australia has suffered under this Administration—a spiral which has forced up *per capita* State taxation by 50.2 per cent—the highest growth of any State, and the highest growth in South Australia's history. Our full tax policy will be released before the election, after the Budget papers and the Auditor-General's Report have been presented to this Parliament.

I now turn specifically to the Stamp Duties Act Amendment Bill, the measure now before the House. This measure is a further extension of the initiative of the former Liberal Government in 1980 to provide relief in this area and encouragement to first home buyers. When the former Government first took this action, the Premier said he doubted whether it would have any effect in stimulating the home building industry. I am sure the many thousands of South Australian home buyers who have benefited from this measure welcome the Premier's conversion to the importance of this relief. However, it is going to be important for the Parliament to keep this concession under continuing review, because escalating property values and other charges are eroding its impact. To illustrate this point, I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* a table of a purely statistical nature.

Leave granted.

COMPARISON OF COSTS RELATED TO HOME PURCHASE

	December Quarter 1982 \$	June Quarter 1985 \$	Percentage Increase %
Average price (Single unit residence Metropolitan area and Gawler)	46 927.00	81 894.00	75
Stamp duty	1 090.00	2 196.50	102
Stamp duty (first home buyers)	310.00	1 116.50	260
Lands Titles Office Registration fee	55.00	155.00	182
FID	—	32.76	—
Total costs first home buyers	365.00	1 304.26	257
Total costs other home buyers	1 145.00	2 384.26	108

Mr OLSEN: This table reveals that, for the December quarter 1982, the average price for a single unit residence in the metropolitan area and Gawler was \$46 927. For the June quarter 1985, this had increased by 75 per cent to \$81 894. In December 1982, stamp duty payable on the average price home was \$1 090. Based on the revised rates under this Bill, stamp duty on the average price home now will be \$2 196.50—an increase of 102 per cent since 1982.

However, for the first home buyers, the increase in duty payable is somewhat higher. In December 1982, the purchase of a first home at the then average price attracted stamp duty of \$310 with the Liberal State Government concession. Under this Bill, first home buyers will now pay \$1 116.50 for an average price home—an increase of 260 per cent. This is an interesting point that has been lost so far in the debate on these tax measures, and something we should take on board. After taking into consideration other State Government imposts relating to home purchase—land titles office registration fees—they have increased by 257 per cent for the first home purchase, compared with a 108 per cent rise for other home buyers.

The House should also note that the increase in land titles fees imposed by this Government of \$100 exactly offsets the \$100 reduction in stamp duty provided in this Bill for other than first home buyers, so that under this Government they have had no benefit at all. The great tax concession—the stamp duty concession for home buyers—is phoney, because the Lands Titles Office has increased the fees to \$100: \$100 back on the one hand, and \$100 taken away on

the other hand. That is the stamp duty concession offered to home buyers by this Government. It is a con job.

And this almost threefold increase in land titles fees had been much more than was needed to cover increased operating costs. In 1983-84, the Lands Titles Office made a profit of \$4.5 million. Last financial year, it is estimated that this surplus on operations will be about \$5.4 million. Honourable members will see from these figures that, despite the concessions in this Bill, this Government has significantly increased its imposts on home buyers. This only compounds problems they are having with interest rates. In June 1984 the average loan approved by building societies in South Australia was \$39 000. At that time, a person borrowing that amount over 30 years was committed to a monthly repayment of \$424. The amount repayable over the full term of the loan was \$152 640. In March this year, the Premier said that he believed the pressure on interest rates would not be maintained. However, since then he has approved two applications from the building societies for increases in their rates.

Today, in response to a question, the Premier was not prepared to concede that the reason we have escalating interest rates in this country is because of Labor Government policies, big spending which allows the deficit to blow out. That is why we are paying extra interest rates in this country, because of Labor Government policies—and well the Premier knows it.

I noted the absence of that commitment to the House, the guarantee that he could not give to South Australians

that interest rates would not rise between now and the end of the year. He cannot give that commitment because he knows that inflation will continue to rise and that it will get close to double figures by the end of this calendar year, and certainly by the end of this financial year we will be in double digit inflation. The way the Premier is going with taxes and charges, thereby establishing Adelaide as the inflation capital of Australia, will have an even greater impact on residents in this State *vis-a-vis* their counterparts in other States of Australia.

Because of rapidly rising property values, the average home loan being approved by building societies in South Australia has now risen to \$47 000. At the new rate of interest approved by the Premier, the monthly repayment for the average loan is now \$566. That is \$142 more than the monthly commitment of the home buyer with an average loan in just 12 months. Over the full term of the loan, this will amount to an extra \$51 120. That is what first home buyers are confronted with, with Labor policies being put into place. There are escalating interest rates and, of course, we see this concession, which is not really a concession, being applied.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: And a reduced sum available.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, a reduced sum is available. The fact is that young home buyers wanting to establish the Australian dream of buying and owning their own home will find under Labor policies that at the end of the loan they will have paid \$51 000 more on average than would have been the case had these policies not been in effect.

Under Federal and State Labor Governments, real interest rates are now at their highest levels in more than 30 years, yet we hear nothing from the Premier and members opposite—the same people who, when they were on this side of the House, ran a quite dishonest campaign over interest rates in 1982. In circumstances where it is becoming increasingly difficult for potential home buyers to enter the market, any relief of the type provided by this Bill is to be welcomed. At least home buyers will not be worse off due to land title fees going up. At least this Bill puts it on an equal footing, but it makes a nonsense of the claim of the big tax cuts being offered by this Government. The Opposition supports the improvements in eligibility for the exemption for first home buyers. I have received a great deal of correspondence in relation to the three months requirement to take up residence.

I now turn to the other measures in this Bill. The change to stamp duty on workers compensation will give some limited relief from the 33½ per cent increase in this particular duty introduced by the present Government in 1983. This relief further reflects the fact that the youth employment policies of this Government have not worked. It was extremely disappointing to see the employment/unemployment figures which came out today and which indicated an increase of 600 in the number of young people who have joined the unemployment queues in this State in the past month—a 600 person increase over the last period.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: What happened in the other States?

Mr OLSEN: Well, we have seen a trend where this State is not making any ground. We have spent \$100 million of State and Federal taxpayers' money on job creation schemes. Quite clearly that has failed dismally, and this is why we need new policy directions for youth employment opportunities for young South Australians.

The abolition of stamp duty on residential tenancy agreements will provide some benefit to those living in rental accommodation. However, the impact of the Federal Government's plans to remove negative gearing and to introduce a capital gains tax will more than offset the benefits of this concession because of the pressure they will place on rents.

The net effect of the introduction of the package involving abolition of negative gearing and the introduction of a capital gains tax will be to slow down the commercial and industrial property investment in this country. It will cost jobs in the commercial, industrial and property arena and, in addition, those people least able to afford the rent increases will have the cost of this passed on to them. The net effect of Labor's abolition of negative gearing will be passed on to those who can least afford to pay it.

An increase in the threshold to \$15 000 on receipts from rental business is long overdue. It should have been provided as one of the offsets to the introduction of the FID in 1983. In today's deregulated environment, the stamp duty on transfer of corporate debt securities has been an impediment to the smooth functioning of financial markets. This form of stamp duty has severely limited the development of a secondary market in corporate securities. Effectively, it has amounted to a reduction in interest of 0.1 per cent to the investor for one year borrowings, had the investor wanted to sell the security.

This has had a severe impact on the larger amount short-term securities where the major investor interest has been in recent years. Stamp duty on corporate debt securities was abolished in both Victoria and New South Wales during 1984, and it therefore is important that South Australia should take similar action. The cost of these stamp duty relief measures amounts to between \$9.5 million and \$10 million a year and should be seen in the context of the very significant \$56.2 million increase in stamp duty collections over the last two years.

We ought not to lose sight of the fact either that this measure, this relief, is a phoney one, because in effect the increase in fees, on the one hand, more than negates the relief provided as a result of this Bill, on the other. It is a continuation of the false statements, the portraying of false perceptions, that this Government likes to make. Indeed, the Government will be caught out because the electorate at large well understands that this Government is not honourable as it relates to its taxation commitments to the electorate of South Australia.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Fisher): I take pleasure in supporting the proposition, although it does not go as far as I would like to see it go. Those who have been in this Parliament for as long as I have would know that when I first came into this Parliament I made the claim, which I still stick by, that to ask people to pay a Government fee for attempting to buy their own shelter is a disgrace in any democratic society. I still hold that view. It is bad enough in this modern day and age with high interest rates for people who wish to buy their own shelter. I am talking about the vast majority of people in the community who set out to buy their own shelter. They should not have to become working agents for money lenders and the slaves of interest rates.

One has to save to get a deposit to buy a home and, after one has a deposit, if one gets that far, one has to borrow some money. People are charged a fee for borrowing money and then a further stamp duty fee for a transfer of a property into their name. Where is the logic in that? There is a waiting list of some 33 000 families for Housing Trust homes. Further pressure is being placed on people to try to buy their own shelter. I am not talking about the rich, as they can manage. I am talking about those people who are trying to buy a home, the average price of which today is \$70 000 or \$80 000. We are going to hit them for \$3.50 for every \$100 they spend over \$50 000.

I thank the Premier and the Government for increasing the limit to \$50 000. However, let us consider the next group, those people buying a home at \$80 000. They must pay stamp duty at \$3.50 per \$1 000 on the extra \$30 000.

They must find something like \$1 050. It does not sound much in \$80 000, but if a person has already borrowed \$47 000 or \$55 000 of that \$80 000 and is paying interest rates as well as stamp duty to get the mortgage, it amounts to a pretty rough deal. If we believe, as Frank Walsh claimed back in 1962, that home ownership is the cornerstone of democracy (and I suppose most parliamentarians say that in their electorates when they are electioneering, trying to gain the support of those trying to buy their own homes), how can we in any sense of reality support the concept that people should pay stamp duty?

In the 1968-70 term of the Government of which I was a member it was maintained that the Government could not afford this relief (and the Government would claim today that it could not afford it). However, I was thrilled that by 1975 the Liberal Party accepted as part of its policy a concession for stamp duty applicable to first home owners. But how far have we really progressed since that time? The price of houses has more than doubled in recent times, but we have not doubled the exemption. In other words, we should now be up around the \$75 000 mark if we are to be sincere in our attempt to help the average first home owner.

Is there an opportunity under this system for a person to rig the system or gain a benefit from it? I say that there is. If two people decide to buy properties separately, before they become attached, whether by marriage certificate or through any other relationship to become permanent or semi-permanent partners, at something less than \$50 000 each, they do not pay one cent of stamp duty. However, when it is a married couple buying the first home, neither having ever owned any property before, they are allowed only to have a property with an overall value of \$50 000 to gain the benefit, whereas two individuals who buy houses independently and come together later can receive a combined benefit on a total sum of \$100 000. We must look at this principle. We are concerned that there are many people on the Housing Trust waiting list, and we are subsidising them through this stamp duty, collected from a group of people who are buying their own house and from the other areas of taxation collected from the community.

We should then abolish stamp duty altogether for the first home buyer up to the average price prevailing at the time for a home. If we are trying to encourage people to save to buy their own home, that is not an unreasonable proposition. It is not going to cost the State very much. It may remove a few more applicants from the Housing Trust waiting list and it may provide an incentive to some of the people who end up on that list to perhaps strive a little harder so that they can be removed from it.

The other reason for making the plea is that up until recent times there was an incentive for people to start with a vacant allotment and build their own home. They did not have to worry very much about this stamp duty concession, because a block of land is nowhere near the value of a home, or anywhere near the \$35 000 to \$50 000 mark, but suddenly it has become more difficult to build your own home. There is a shortage of skilled tradespeople. Building regulations have also caused a problem in that builders have to include more protective pricing in the houses which they are building in order to protect themselves when, quite often through no fault of their own, a dispute arises in relation to material which is not of their own choosing, or in relation to faulty workmanship.

The engineers are charging a lot more money to carry out their work, so the person seeking to become a home owner is avoiding that area and is now buying an established property. We then find that the price of established properties has dramatically escalated within the last 18 months or so. The fear of ending up with a home which is inferior in quality to that which was originally expected has had a

bearing on that escalation. The other factors which have helped to escalate the price of established properties are the difficulty of locating good tradespeople and the higher price the builder has had to include in his estimate in order to protect himself against any future action that may be taken on behalf of the client.

I came into this House wanting to fight tax on the individual who was trying to buy his own home. My Party knew that I was adamant on that question and I clashed with various people in relation to that matter in those early days. I am grateful that over the years we have gradually moved down the right track, but I make the plea to all politicians to reach the point where everyone who is purchasing a home up to the average price that is being paid at that time (and which is a most significant investment) will be exempt from any stamp tax at all.

Once you get to \$50 000, you do not revert to charging the lesser rate, which is \$2 for every \$100 after \$30 000, but charge it at the rate of \$3.50 up to \$100 000; in other words, we accept it up to \$50 000 and do not revert to the base rate, which really is \$1.20 on the first \$12 000, or to \$2 as it is from \$12 000 to \$30 000. I think that system is grossly unfair.

I support the proposition, because it is a step further down the track that I have been trying to fight for some 17 years. I hope that those in power will do their best to correct the situation for future home buyers in order to give everybody an opportunity to buy an average priced home without paying something to the Government for the privilege of saving to buy their own home. At the same time, I hope that more people wake up to the fact that, once they get into this field of high interest rates, they are only becoming working agents of the money lenders and slaves to interest rates and that it is better to save earlier than later. I support the proposition.

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): I congratulate the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Fisher for covering the area of stamp duties so thoroughly and talking about the impact it will have. Rather than reiterate what has been said, I turn to one further proposition which should be brought to the attention of the House. As an economist, I look at the impact of taxation and charges on a variety of things, including mobility and volumes of money in terms of the housing market in South Australia. We can see some strange aberrations.

There is no doubt in my mind that, if there was no stamp duty on housing, we would see a greater movement in the housed population. There would also be fewer increases in the price of houses, which disadvantages those who cannot afford it, and people would be more willing to change their residential lifestyle as a result. I will cite an example of a person who wishes to change from one area to another. If they buy a house of the same quality today, their charges, whether stamp duty, agents fees, or cost of making minor alterations in order to bring the other house up to the standard required, is somewhere in the order of \$5 000 to \$10 000. That is for no improvement in lifestyle whatsoever, except for a change in area. We say that there is a net capital loss to anybody who changes a house, suffered for no other reason than taxation and charges.

It may well be argued that we should tax everything and tax everything lightly, but the very impost of stamp duty reduces the willingness of people to move and it is the movement of people within the marketplace which dictates the price. A very simple explanation of what has happened over the last 12 to 18 months is that there have been a lot of people who, except for charges, have been willing to move but there have been fewer moves.

The demand on those houses has been extraordinarily high for a number of reasons, for example, the interest rates diminution that took place some 18 months ago and the assistance given to first home buyers by the Commonwealth Government. The third major factor was that Adelaide had been depressed since the boom days between 1975 and 1977, so all these factors acted in concert, but they did not encourage people who would have liked to move but did not because they knew that they were going to suffer a capital loss. People, particularly in their retirement years, discover that, if they move from a house to a unit, they suffer a capital loss, so there is an unwillingness to suffer that loss, because as retired people they cannot afford to pay \$10 000.

I draw to the attention of the House that it is the taxation itself which has a fairly substantial impact on the housing market. I would like to see the market much freer and to think that, if people want to move, they can and that they do not have to suffer the capital loss inherent in any change in residence. We know that that is not possible and members on my side of the House have outlined why those imposts have become extraordinarily high and why they have made first home buyers and many other home buyers far worse off than they were previously. I moved house some 12 months ago and the bills associated with that move were quite extraordinary, as was the Government's revenue relating to one simple transaction.

In welcoming the Premier's proposal to decrease the impact of stamp duties, I thought it would be helpful to refer to the Parliamentary debates in 1884. The Bill introduced at that time was the Taxation Bill. The Treasurer, Hon. W.B. Rounsevell, was received with cheers—which is quite unusual. The *Hansard* report states:

The Treasurer (Hon. W.B. Rounsevell), who was received with cheers, said he was sure the House would not expect him to make a very lengthy speech in moving the second reading of the Taxation Bill, because the question had already been thoroughly sifted and examined by honourable members in all its branches. At the same time he would not like to introduce so important a measure in a perfunctory manner. He would, therefore, in as brief a manner as possible, point out the more salient features of the Bill. Its object, as the House was aware, was to increase our revenue by imposing a tax on land, and on income derived from real and personal property, and from professions, trades, and vocations . . . The Bill did not depart in a single particular from the lines he laid down when the matter was previously discussed.

The speech goes on to say some nice things about the Government. I also noticed some of the rates of taxation in vogue at the time. The report states:

Clause 8 specified the amount of the tax. There would be a tax of a halfpenny for every pound sterling of the amount of the taxable value of the land.

We then come to income taxation:

Clause 10 referred to the rate of the income tax, which would be imposed on all incomes derived from personal exertion at the rate of 3d. in the pound—

in today's current terminology that would be 1.5c in the dollar—

and on all incomes derived from produce and property at the rate of 6d. in the pound sterling on the taxable amount.

In other words, that is 3c in the dollar. That compares with a top rate today of some 60c in the dollar. No wonder the Treasurer of the day was indeed applauded! Perhaps they knew what was coming 100 years hence. That was in 1884 and it is now 1985—only 101 years since the Treasurer was applauded into the South Australian House. It is a unique piece of history, looking back at the words spoken at the time and the reasons given for raising taxes. The reasons have never changed: the visions of Government have changed.

I also have a copy of the Stamp Duty Bill introduced in 1886. The Government thought that it was a fairly easy way of raising money. I believe they charged one penny per

cheque, so the writing of cheques has become cheaper if we take inflation into account. However, only the rich could afford cheques back in 1886. Referring to the Treasurer, Hon. J.C. Bray, the report states:

. . . in moving the second reading, reminded honourable members that these duties were in force in almost every British colony, and none were more easily collected.

I guess Labor Governments of this country love taxes that can easily be collected.

I wish to finish my contribution to the debate by welcoming the move by the Treasurer. I would prefer a number of initiatives such as those outlined by my colleague the member for Fisher. I would also like to see him place in the Bill a commitment by all Governments to ensure that inflation does not, by its very nature, take people into higher tax brackets.

We know that in the Federal sphere the Commonwealth Government is having great difficulty with the increasing cost to taxpayers as a result of inflationary creep. There will be fiddling at the margin, we can only presume, to try to make it look as though the tax is not as heavy at the upper end as it is. I would like to think that the State Government can grasp that principle and say that we should write into the Bill an adjustment mechanism whereby, whilst we collect the same relative amount of tax, we do not collect far more tax due to inflationary pressures. It is quite unacceptable that certain segments of the community, some of which can ill afford it, are caught up in the never-ending price spirals and that Government taxation systems themselves dispossess these people of money they can ill afford to lose.

I welcome the move and hope that at some time in the future we can in our taxation Bills put in clauses different from those currently existing to clearly state that the Government is required to collect taxation but that that taxation shall not place an increasing burden on people without remedial action.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 10 passed.

Clause 11—'Amendment of second schedule.'

Mr OLSEN: I seek clarification on this clause as to procedural arrangements to be undertaken to ensure that accurately and effectively we can identify these young people. In prefacing my remarks to the question, there is no doubt that removing stamp duty as it relates to people under 25 will assist, albeit marginally, and without reservation I support it: I make that clear. Has the Premier had any discussions with employer groups or the Insurance Council in relation to internal administrative changes required by them to implement this to identify under 25 year old employees *versus* over 25 year old employees? I understand that not only will insurance companies be required to reprint stationery to take account of this but also computer programs in a whole range of businesses will have to be reprogrammed to pick up over 25 year olds *versus* others. Have discussions taken place with both the Insurance Council and employer groups to establish the cost factor and the difficulties in implementing this measure?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Commissioner of Taxes has had discussions with the Insurance Council, which will remit the amounts to the Commissioner. The way in which this can be done was discussed. The Insurance Council in turn, through its members dealing with premiums paid in handling insurance arrangements, talked to employer groups. The system will be set in place by those means.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LIQUOR LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 7 August. Page 107.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I am pleased to say that this is another initiative of the Liberal Party which this Government is now copying.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Honourable members opposite would well know that, in a comprehensive wine and tourism policy released by the shadow Minister of Tourism on 29 April, I committed a Liberal Government to rebates on liquor licence fees payable on wine sales at the cellar door. So, it is quite clear: the record is there on what the Government is attempting to do. We support this measure. We put the ground rules down: they pick them up. That is fine. South Australia owes much of its scenic and certainly its cultural tourist appeal to the wine industry.

So, it is quite clear: the record is there on what the Government is attempting to do. We support this measure. We put the ground rules down: they pick them up. That is fine. South Australia owes much of its scenic and certainly its cultural tourist appeal to the wine industry.

I hope that the Federal Labor Government does not repeat an exercise of last year and increase taxation on the wine industry. Endeavours by the South Australian Government should be at the highest and loudest level to ensure that in the Federal Budget coming down on Tuesday week we do not see an increase in the impost on the wine industry in South Australia, because of the net effect that will have, not only on the tourist industry but certainly on employment of people in the wine industry in South Australia.

It is a big employer of South Australians and needs a champion within this State to ensure that it is not restricted or shackled by high taxing policies. We have seen how dimly the current Government failed last year to resist the introduction of a wine tax that had been successfully resisted by governments previously. The former Liberal Administration persistently argued for no wine tax, and was successful. In what can only be described as a major turnaround last year the current Government failed dimly to hold back the tide of taxation on an industry that is a big employer in South Australia.

This State is the wine tax State of Australia, because we are the wine State of Australia. As such it has a disproportionate effect on tax for those in South Australia in an industry that is important to our State—an industry that we need to maintain at a high level of viability. It needs support: it does not need imposts by Labor Government policy. I certainly hope that this Government will make the appropriate submission to Canberra to ensure that we do not have an extension of that 10 per cent wine tax applied to the wine industry in this State.

I mentioned that the wine industry was a very important component of our tourist industry. The tourist regions of the Barossa, Clare Valley, Southern Vales, Coonawarra, Riverland and the Adelaide Hills depend to a large extent on the attraction of their vineyards and on wine industry infrastructure such as cellars, tasting areas and other facilities which service visitors. Cellar door sales, which traditionally have played a key role in both attracting visitors to these areas and in developing educated attitudes to wine, have declined in recent years, due to factors such as price discounting at retail level and the cost of travel.

I am soon to represent an electorate that takes in the Clare Valley, that very significant wine growing area in South Australia, where that travel cost component has had a net effect on cellar door sales in that region. The Liberal

Party has recognised the important role the wine industry plays in attracting tourists to the producing districts by proposing its scheme of relief from liquor licence fees as an incentive to the development at the cellar door of improved tourist facilities and customer services. Hopefully with that tax lifted, with the licence fee remitted and not applicable in the future, we will see expansion of those cellar door sales, which is a component of the tourist industry. To those who go on daily trips occasionally to those districts to test and purchase wines it is a very important industry. Those boutique wineries mushrooming around the State ought to be encouraged. They make a very significant contribution to the tourist industry.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: It is at the heart of it.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, and that is why I support this Liberal policy initiative being put into legislative effect by a Labor Government. It is a right move in the right direction. One of the difficulties in policy formulation by an Opposition announcing it in advance of an election campaign is that the Government picks it up and runs with it. It says, 'That is our initiative.' That is fine. In this instance it is good for small business.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: They pick up many of our policies.

Mr OLSEN: I do not mind if the Government picks them up and 'me toos' and 'come stand on our grounds' all the time, and introduces Liberal policy. It clearly indicates how right our policy formulation has been in those brief two years that we have been in Opposition. In the not too distant future we will really be able to put some policy direction down for the benefit of South Australia. The privatisation policy has been mentioned again. It has certainly been abused and misrepresented by the Government. We have heard a whole range—

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: The fact is that the Government is going to try to feed on misrepresentation in relation to this policy. No individual in South Australia will have their jobs put at risk as a result of that policy. That is a clear and specific fact. There are many instrumentalities within Government services that will not be privatised, which are not appropriate to be privatised, and which never will be by a Liberal Administration. However, there are some where there is duplication and there is a bottom line cost to South Australia—to the taxpayers.

In those areas we should seek to review the suitability of going down that track to implement a smaller Government policy. It is not as portrayed by those members opposite. They are seizing on it as a last desperate grab to hang on to something, to try and stave off the tide of electoral defeat that is clearly staring them in the face.

The measure before the House—remitting liquor licensing fees on cellar door sales—will establish and enhance those boutique wineries. It will help the knowledge and appreciation of South Australian wines by removing an impost and therefore encouraging more people to be involved. It is clear that everything possible must be done to encourage that vital industry for South Australia, following the Government's decision to impose that 10 per cent sales tax in the last Federal Budget. As a result of that, it has been estimated that growth in wine sales has fallen from 4.8 per cent to 2 per cent following the imposition of the tax. That has a direct effect on employment opportunities within the industry.

While the concession in this Bill will help producers to absorb some of the impact of the Federal tax, it is to be hoped that this situation will not be immediately eroded again by an increase in the sales tax in this month's Federal Budget. As it is, the House should note that because State licence fees are calculated on wholesale purchases, the cost

of this concession will be offset to the extent of about \$600 000 of additional revenue to be generated by the existing component of the Federal sales tax which is included in the wholesale price. We should not lose sight of this fact. In each of these taxing measures, if one looks at the net effect, the gives and takes, one gets a completely different picture. That is why the tax package released on Monday is phoney, because it does not deliver that which it is proposed to deliver or that which the Government claims to deliver to beneficiaries of tax relief. We support the Bill for quite obvious reasons. It is an initiative we have indicated we would put in place in Government. For that reason, we support the measure before the House.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): As my Leader indicated, the Liberal Opposition supports the Bill. We note the irony at the same time that, in claiming to represent the wine industry, the Government actually has no policy at all. Those two Budget items—one being the measure we are considering currently, and the other the expenditure of \$250 000 on promotional advertising in the Eastern States later this year—do not constitute a policy.

The Liberal Party, by contrast, has a policy. Its contents deal with the background of the reason for development of such a policy. It also deals with policy goals, with the establishment of a wine industry/Government consultative committee, issues concerning promotion and marketing and with the general economic policy of the Liberal Government, which will affect the wine industry beneficially.

It deals with industry, education and consumer education. In other words, it is a well developed and well co-ordinated policy which was developed in consultation with the wine industry and the tourism industry. It contrasts markedly with the adhocery and reactionary nature of the Government's responses to the initiatives of the Opposition in respect of the wine industry and so many other issues. I endorse what my Leader has said about the importance of the wine industry to this State. It is a focal point for our tourist attractions.

In relation to the 12 tourism regions in this State, virtually half of them rely principally on the wine industry as the focal point for their attraction to visitors. The international visitors survey for the year 1981 clearly indicated the percentages and the estimated numbers of international visitors who visited the wine regions of the various States. The domestic tourism monitor for any year indicates that the wine regions—notably the Barossa—are amongst the most popular regions to draw visitors in South Australia. In fact, in 1981-82 the Barossa Valley received 228 000 local visitors staying overnight, 155 000 overnight interstate visitors, and 8 000 international visitor nights. The Mid North, taking in the Clare Valley, received 565 000 local visitor nights, 276 000 interstate visitor nights, and 25 000 international visitor nights.

The Riverland drew 110 000 local visitors, 190 000 interstate visitors, and 45 000 international visitors. Fleurieu Peninsula, taking in the Southern Vales, attracted 1.3 million local visitors, 97 000 interstate visitors, and 8 000 international visitors. That was three or four years ago. The numbers would be considerably higher now.

Another point that needs to be considered in reinforcing support for the Bill is the enormous investment made by wine companies in relation to visitor facilities and the provision for cellar door sales. According to this week's issue of the tourism magazine *Grape Vine* there is news of the Adelaide based wine and brandy maker, Thomas Hardy & Sons, investing another \$2 million in its Southern Vales operation. A \$1.5 million modernisation program at the company's historic Tintara winery at McLaren Vale will incorporate modern fermentation cellars and other new

winemaking technologies for red and fortified wines. A further \$50 000 will be spent on the historic Chateau Reynella winery which has already had some millions of dollars spent on it by Thomas Hardy & Sons.

I have mentioned one winemaker, but I could mention dozens. The capital investment in providing for visitor facilities is immense. It is only fair and reasonable that the Government recognises the role that wineries play in respect of cellar door sales in attracting visitors to specific areas. I support the Bill and commend the Government for recognising the merit of the Liberal Party's initiatives announced in April.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill on the basis that it will help tourism and, in particular, will help some small businesses. I say that based on my experience: previously, I had the position of shadow Minister of Tourism and I had the opportunity of looking at this particular aspect of tourism in other parts of the world. In my district there are some operations in the field of cellar door sales for wine; and there is also a major project in my district involving the Old Mill at Bridgewater which will be upgraded in the near future by persons involved in this industry who will be selling wine at the cellar door. Therefore, I support that aspect of the measure.

In amending the Licensing Act, as we are, I am conscious that back in 1969 the Government of the day introduced a Bill to increase the licence fee paid for sales of alcoholic goods and, at the same time, to reduce the age for consuming those goods. At that time I said that that would bring problems. I was grateful that a majority of members supported that argument. Subsequently, in 1970, there was a change of Government and a change of personnel, which brought about another proposition before the House to reduce the age at which one could legally consume alcohol from 20 years (which applied for nine months) to 18 years. The age of 20 years was the proposition that I and others put to the House during the debate in 1969.

Recently, we had a toughening of the licensing laws in this Parliament although they are only now having effect to some degree. I hope that will mean that it will be more difficult for under-age people to obtain and consume alcoholic goods on licensed premises. That is a good thing, and I believe that all members support that. However, today we are providing an opportunity for cheaper alcohol to be sold at the cellar door. We are hunting under-age people, who can have a driving licence, of course, out of licensed premises and into another field to acquire and consume alcohol.

That will occur if the cellar door price for alcohol becomes considerably less than that in local bottle departments. Therefore, if under-age people are out for a trip on the weekend and they can obtain alcohol more cheaply at the cellar door, they will stay away from the hotels. In some cases they will be driving a vehicle and they will be consuming alcohol not on licensed premises but in a public place. In a previous debate in this Parliament I tried to get the House to accept that argument, and I would have been doing the same by way of amendment today—

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: Was there much support for that argument?

Mr S.G. EVANS: I will come back to that. However, had I moved an amendment today it would have delayed the business of the House, thereby delaying private members' business and a matter that I wish to speak to. That is why there is no amendment before the House, and I will not talk about that. The Minister interjected and said that there was little support for the argument that, if we make it illegal for an under-age person to drink on licensed premises where there is some supervision, there is no need to worry about

making it illegal for an under-age person to drink alcohol or be given alcohol in a public place.

I took up the challenge and wrote to different groups to obtain a response. I believe that the Minister and his colleagues who did not previously support my proposition will change their minds. I am not saying that there was not some support, because there was on both sides of the House. People know that what I said was accurate. Being prepared to take up the challenge is a different thing. Of course, that is part of the democratic process and getting people to accept the challenge. I believe that this proposition opens the door a little further, enabling under-age drinking in public places, because we will be making the sale of alcohol at the cellar door a bit cheaper. We should be conscious of that. On the one hand we are supporting tourism through the cellar door and, on the other hand, we have a social problem.

We are all aware of that, and I refer to the lass kicked to pieces in the Mall by someone who drank too much. Whatever the hour of the morning throughout the city there are young people on grog. We know that. As a Parliament we have the ability to do something about the matter, to make it a little easier for the police. The problem will not be solved, but it may stop some of the things that are occurring. That is what we should be doing.

I support what is before the House today. If we are not conscious of the problems of alcohol with juveniles, some of whom virtually become addicted before they are adults, either we are not prepared to look at the situation and take note of what is going on around us, whether it be in relation to people in our own families or others, or as parliamentarians we are scared to do something because those within that group have mates who have just started to vote, and we might lose their votes. That was the argument used in 1969, 1970 and 1972 in relation to lowering the age of majority.

At that time it was considered that political Parties would be seen by young people as giving them something, that they would remember that and subsequently vote for us in future. However, those in that generation do not stay 18 years old for long, and already the 18 year olds of the day have forgotten who made those changes and most of the parliamentarians who were in the Parliament at that time have gone by the way. There are many other problem areas besides alcohol that have been created due to lowering the age of majority.

I shall finish on this note: in America, the Federal Government told the States that if they did not get the drinking age up to 21 (and I am not advocating that at this stage) they would not get their road grants. Two-thirds of them now have the drinking age up to 21, and the other States are trying to do the same as quickly as possible, because money becomes all important and above the great ideology of trying to win young votes. That is the way it is going there, and I hope that we wake up and say that juniors should not be entitled to drink in a public place and, more particularly, that adults who give liquor to juniors should pay a high penalty for doing that. We would thus get rid of some of the problems that occur in this field.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I thank members of the Opposition for their support for this measure and their indication of the effect that it will have on industry is appreciated: that, of course, is the intention of the Government. The member for Coles indicated some degree of the confidence in the wine industry due to the capital investment that is being placed in a number of key areas of the wine growing regions of the State. She referred particularly to the Thomas Hardy proj-

ect, which is a major boost to the establishment of facilities for tourists and for the sales of wine. I understand the point that the member for Fisher made with respect to under-age drinking. That is a matter that concerns the Government and is a matter that we have already addressed in the amendments to the Licensing Act. I know that the honourable member intends to debate the matter in more appropriate circumstances.

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

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 7 August. Page 107.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports this Bill. With the Opposition facilitating the Government's passage of the Bill I would have thought that it would be appropriate for the Treasurer to be present in the Chamber. In relation to the Bills we are considering the Opposition has not taken objection to the fact that they are to be processed quickly. However, for the Premier to be absent from the Chamber does not do the House the courtesy that it merits.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Momentarily.

Mr OLSEN: It is not momentarily, as the Minister knows. Quite some time has elapsed since the Premier was in the House. Be that as it may, the Opposition supports this measure. I find it rather curious to look back on the comments of the present Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, when the former Liberal Government in 1979 introduced legislation to abolish land tax on the principal place of residence. It is difficult to work out just where the Government is on matters such as land tax, because the present Premier, when Leader of the Opposition, indicated that the only reason he supported the measure was because of the former Government's mandate for it. That was fine, because in the House on 30 October 1979 he said:

We [that is, the Labor Party] believe that land tax is an important tax that should not be forgone. But the Government clearly believes otherwise.

On that occasion he also said that the Labor Party felt very strongly about land tax. He said:

It considers that, although it has to support the Bill at this time, it does not feel fully in one mind with the Government over its approach to this matter.

That was when the former Liberal Government was giving some land tax concessions and honouring our election promise. This attitude to land tax—that it is a tax to get at rich property holders—still prevails in the Labor Party. The Party Convention in March this year adopted a policy which urges the Government to maintain progressive taxation on unimproved land values. Clearly, the Premier has done an about face, in relation to the position he espoused as Leader of the Opposition.

While I welcome the fact that he is supporting Liberal Party policy at present, it is open to question what the Labor Party would do about land tax if a Labor Government is ever elected in the future, given the Party's policy on the matter. I have been calling for land tax relief since August 1984, when I released a survey of businesses throughout the metropolitan area to demonstrate the extent to which their land tax bills were escalating. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a table of a purely statistical nature, which shows movements in land tax bills since 1980.

Leave granted.

EXAMPLES OF LAND TAX BILLS—1980-81 TO 1984-85

Location	Tax Paid 1980-81 \$	Tax Paid 1983-84 \$	Tax Paid 1984-85 \$	% Increase Over Year 83-84—84-85	% Increase Since 1980-81
Warehouse College Road Kent Town	* 80.68 (33 920)	112.90 (41 580)	186.26 (54 810)	+65.0 (+31.8)	+130.9 (+61.6)
Factory Bacon Street Hindmarsh	* 804.10 (112 200)	1 285.00 (140 250)	2 158.24 (179 200)	+68.0 (+27.7)	+168.4 (+59.7)
Factory Manton Street Hindmarsh	* 108.00 (40 600)	159.88 (50 750)	259.68 (64 960)	+62.4 (+28.0)	+140.4 (+60.0)
Retail premises Goodwood Road Kings Park	* 399.40 (80 400)	693.28 (104 520)	1 294.00 (140 700)	+86.6 (+34.6)	+223.0 (+75.0)
Retail premises Main North Road Prospect	* 1 745.60 (162 200)	2 528.68 (194 640)	4 913.02 (291 960)	+94.3 (+50.0)	+181.5 (+80.0)
Retail premises Main North Road Nailsworth	* 187.50 (55 000)	268.00 (66 000)	617.50 (99 000)	+130.4 (+50.0)	+229.3 (+80.0)
Factory King William St Kent Town	* 816.50 (113 000)	1 463.20 (149 160)	2 577.19 (196 620)	+76.0 (+31.8)	+215.6 (+74.0)
Office block Greenhill Road Eastwood	* 8 435.87 (435 750)	15 081.50 (707 000)	18 545.80 (848 400)	+23.0 (+20.0)	+119.8 (+94.7)
Factory Glenside	* 2 905.00 (210 000)	4 865.00 (290 000)	6 286.00 (348 000)	+29.2 (+20.0)	+116.0 (+65.7)
Shops Mt Barker Road Stirling	* 27.84 (16 420)	35.96 (20 320)	52.40 (25 800)	+45.7 (+30.0)	+88.2 (+57.0)
Shops Mt Barker Road Aldgate	* 24.40 (14 700)	38.32 (18 200)	65.00 (30 000)	+69.6 (+64.8)	+166.4 (+104.0)
Shop Unley Road Unley	* 347.50 (75 000)	598.75 (97 500)	1 118.12 (131 250)	+86.7 (+34.6)	+221.8 (+75.0)
Factory Somerton Pk	* 267.99 (66 000)	296.80 (69 600)	408.20 (81 200)	+37.5 (+16.7)	+52.0 (+23.0)
Warehouse Parkside	* 38.80 (24 600)	72.92 (31 980)	120.25 (43 050)	+64.9 (+34.6)	+209.9 (+75.0)
Showroom Brighton Road Brighton	* 152.16 (49 430)	387.40 (79 200)	535.00 (92 400)	+38.1 (+16.7)	+251.6 (+86.9)
Shop The Parade Norwood	* 58.01 (27 660)	241.60 (62 700)	424.16 (82 650)	+75.6 (+31.8)	+631.2 (+198.8)
Offices Tolleys Road St Agnes	* 69.80 (31 200)	465.40 (86 400)	691.60 (104 400)	+48.6 (+20.8)	+890.8 (+234.6)
Shops North East Road Walkerville	* 238.30 (66 000)	535.00 (92 400)	630.00 (100 000)	+17.8 (+8.2)	+164.4 (+51.5)

Source: Land Tax Accounts

* Indicates Site Value.

Mr OLSEN: The Premier rejected my calls for relief last financial year. Instead he decided to cash in for one more year on escalating property values, taking the view that the Government had some automatic right to do so. Recently, the Premier has taken it upon himself to compare some South Australian economic indicators with those of Queensland. We well remember that the score card left out some

of the most important factors, such as taxation, population movement, and inflation rates. It was a score card, prepared by the Premier, which ignored the very important economic indicators pertaining to any economy.

We know very well why they were ignored: because on that basis the Government did not rate, did not pass—in fact, it was a dismal failure. I invite the Premier to under-

take a similar exercise in relation to the impact of land tax in South Australia and in New South Wales and Victoria, presently under Labor Governments. I am sure that the Government would want to compare Labor Administrations. New South Wales and Victoria are the traditional yardstick in monitoring the competitiveness of South Australian business. The results of such an exercise have been

compiled in tabular form, and I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* this table, which is of a purely statistical nature, on the basis that if the Premier does not have time to do a chart I have done it for him, and he can read it in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

ALL STATES—LAND TAX REVENUE 1980-81 TO 1984-85

	S.A.		N.S.W.		Vic.	
	Money (\$m)	Real (a) (\$m)	Money (\$m)	Real (a) (\$m)	Money (\$m)	Real (a) (\$m)
1980-81	17.3	17.3	138.8	135.8	120.9	120.9
1981-82	19.3	17.5	143.8	130.5	115.9	104.9
1982-83	23.7	19.2	186.2	150.9	139.3	113.4
1983-84	28.0	21.2	189.0	144.4	143.2	108.4
1984-85	(b) 32.8	23.6	215.0	158.1	148.0	107.2
Annual movement	17.1	11.3	13.8	9.5	3.4	-1.1
5 year movement	89.6	36.4	58.3	16.4	22.4	-11.3

(a) Deflated by cpi for respective States 1980-81 = 100.

(b) Estimates 1984-85 and historical revenue from various Budget papers of respective States.

Mr OLSEN: This table indicates that land tax revenue in South Australia for the five years to the end of 1984-85 increased by 89.6 per cent compared to a growth of 58.3 per cent in New South Wales and 22.4 per cent in Victoria over the same period. In real terms, revenue to the Victorian Government has fallen by 11.3 per cent, and in New South Wales in real terms growth has been 16.4 per cent—less than half of that in South Australia. A third table that I seek to have incorporated in *Hansard* shows the impact of bracket creep on payers of land tax. It is of a purely statistical nature, and, accordingly, I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

LAND TAX AND LAND VALUE
1980-81 TO 1984-85
(\$m)

	Land Value	Index	Land Tax	Index
1980-81	2 218.9	100.0	17.3	100.0
1981-82	2 258.9	101.8	19.3	111.6
1982-83	2 555.3	115.1	23.7	137.0
1983-84	2 857.7	128.8	28.0	161.8
1984-85	3 411.9	153.8	32.8	189.6
Total change 1980-81 to 1984-85	+1 193.0	+53.8		+89.6

Source: Land Tax Office and State Budget Papers.

Mr OLSEN: The table shows that since 1980-81 land values have risen by 53.8 per cent, while the amount of land tax collected has gone up 89.6 per cent. That is inequitable, especially when the House considers that escalating land tax also impacts on rents, because rental property remains subject to the tax. The figures I have presented amount to an irrefutable case for land tax relief.

A Liberal Government will keep land taxes under continuing review to ensure they are levied on a more equitable basis than they have been in recent years. We have taken a profile in the past 12 months or so in relation to land tax and pointed out the inequalities of it and the bracket creep which has created a bonus for the Treasury. At least in this instance we are seeing some land tax relief which will have the direct effect of removing some of the imposts on the small business sector, a sector which can ill afford to have these imposts and charges applied to it. I trust that the implementation of this measure will give them at least some relief, because, unless they receive relief in some areas, they

are going to have continuing cash flow difficulties and will therefore not have the capacity to maintain existing levels of employment, let alone create extra job opportunities.

We well understand that, as a result of this Government's phoney tax relief on ETSA charges, those small businessmen are not going to be any better off at all as it relates to their quarterly electricity bills. It is in those areas where costs have been allowed to escalate within the last two years or so in the small business area and that has been the greatest retarding factor for creating job opportunities. If we look at the United States of America, where job opportunities have been created, they have not been created in the large manufacturing industries or the traditional smoke-stack industries, as one would describe them: they have been created by the small business sector, and that small business sector has that capacity, but it will only have that capacity if it has the viability to do so. That viability is created by a reduction of taxes and charges such as ETSA, water and land tax, and the like, in order to provide breathing space to give it the capacity to employ.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Scale of land tax.'

Mr OLSEN: In his second reading explanation the Premier indicated a reduction in the number of tax steps from 18 down to six. I do not expect that this information will necessarily be able to be provided by the Minister standing in for the Treasurer in the Chamber at the moment, but will the Minister representing the Treasurer provide the Opposition with the estimated number of taxpayers, the estimated amount of tax and the estimated amount of site values for each of the revised steps one to six for 1985-86?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I undertake to take up that matter with the Treasurer and to do that as expeditiously as possible. I think that that will be before it is debated in the other place.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 and 5) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 7 August. Page 108.)

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): Without doubt this is the most undesirable tax levied by the State Government. It raises the cost of labour relative to other factors of production, thus distorting the production process and discouraging employment. It is an iniquitous tax, and I do not think there is any divergence of view between the Government and the Opposition in relation to the net effect of payroll tax. For that reason, both Liberal and Labor Governments have gradually increased base exemption levels as they relate to payroll tax. As a person involved in small business for 14 or 15 years before coming into this place, I well understand the resentment at having to write out on a monthly basis a cheque for payroll tax, which is a tax for the privilege of paying someone else a wage.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: No, as we operated only a small business, we came into the exemption level under the Tonkin Liberal Government's increase in the scale of fees. We dropped out of payroll tax under the former Administration.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: They'll accuse us of tailoring it to suit you, John. That is the next thing they'll be alleging.

Mr OLSEN: They would know that I ceased involvement in the trading side of that small business well before the benefits accrued.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: It is a very important factor and a great educator in terms of the difficulties being experienced out there by small business people. One would well understand that, as there is a lack of knowledge along the front bench of small business, it is the reason why policies have not been put into effect to give it some breathing space and support.

Before making some more general comments about the abolition of payroll tax, I note that clause 3 covers a matter that I raised with the Premier during the Estimates Committee on 25 September last year. As a result, I am pleased that the Government now proposes, in this Bill, to rectify the anomaly where reimbursement to an employee for use of a motor vehicle on a per kilometre basis was regarded as taxable, while a refund of an expense incurred in relation to use of a motor vehicle was non-taxable. This was in contrast to the Federal Taxation Act, which permits payment to employees for car expenses on a per kilometre basis. So, I am pleased at least that that inequity, as highlighted last year by the Opposition, has now been picked up in this legislation.

Much has been said about the need to eliminate payroll tax. The Premier suggested that he would take a major initiative at the recent tax summit. But nothing came of it, because the Premier's proposal had no substance. It offered no realistic way to abolish this iniquitous tax. The State Treasury in South Australia collected about \$254 million from this tax on jobs last financial year. That is the equivalent cost of more than 12 300 jobs at the average wage.

Over the last 10 years, payroll tax as a proportion of total tax collections has dropped, but it still accounts for about one-third of all taxes that this State collects. State Governments as well as the Commonwealth must limit spending to allow tax cuts. That is the first step that needs to be undertaken. But, realistically, no State could afford to eliminate one-third of its revenue base in the short term and still maintain even basic essential services in areas like education, health, law and order without some other revenue to meet the shortfall. And the relatively narrow revenue base of the States is another problem. The Federal Constitution prevents the States from spreading the tax burden beyond payroll tax, stamp duties, property taxes, motor taxes, gambling taxes, business franchise fees, and financial institutions duty.

The Commonwealth holds most of the purse strings. So, if we are to eliminate payroll tax, this can be achieved only by a co-operative approach between the Commonwealth and the States. I believe that the Commonwealth must consider returning, or transferring to the States, a broad-based source of tax revenue that can and could replace payroll tax. At the same time, I make it clear that this should be done only in the context of the key objective of reducing the community's overall burden from Federal and State taxation.

I remain committed to reductions in the overall level of taxation, so this is a proposal not for more taxation or double taxation (or whatever one would like to call it), but for more equitable taxation. Under this proposal, the Commonwealth would have to agree to raise less tax, so the consequence would be to spend less money, although, the way the Federal deficit is blowing out, that does not necessarily follow.

Mr Baker interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, that has been proven in the last Budget. Payroll tax collections by the States last financial year were the equivalent of 1.8 per cent of the Commonwealth's total outlays. The cost involved to the Commonwealth in transferring to the States a revenue raising capacity of this magnitude therefore would be comparatively minor. I am under no illusion that such a transfer could be achieved easily or soon, but the debate must be kept alive, because this is the most iniquitous of all taxes, especially while unemployment remains at unacceptably high levels throughout this country.

In the meantime, exemption levels from payroll tax must be kept under annual review to provide as much relief as possible to ensure that South Australia's position *vis-a-vis* New South Wales and Victoria is such that we are not placed at a cost competitive disadvantage and also to ensure that the greatest capacity is given to business to create job opportunities. That will certainly be the highest priority of the next Liberal Government. We support the initiatives contained in the Bill for the reasons to which I have referred.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

Mr BAKER: I read the second reading explanation and have seen the provisions in this Bill. How does the Premier expect this provision to work? Will it be a massive calculation on behalf of employers, are we going on a trust basis, or will the Government issue an average travelling allowance for the various types of car? How will the provision work?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As the measure, we will use Public Service rates which are prescribed from time to time.

Mr BAKER: Do the highly exorbitant site and travelling allowances negotiated by particular unions come under the provisions of payroll tax?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not think they are relevant. We are talking about travel allowances, which will be measured against the standard Public Service rate. If more is paid, that is up to the employer's discretion. The same applies to the accommodation allowance.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—'Deductions from taxable wages.'

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier undertake to provide a list containing the number of businesses with payrolls of \$250 000 and over, broken down in steps of \$50 000 including the total number of businesses subject to payroll tax? We would like to know the number of businesses, and from \$250 000 up in \$50 000 brackets where people are slotted into that payroll tax scheme. I accept that the Premier may not have that information available here, but, in line with

a request earlier, I seek his support to provide that information. I hope that that will be forthcoming on the basis that the Opposition has certainly been forthcoming in facilitating the passage of his Bills.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It would be difficult to provide definitive figures in this area because it is on a return basis, but we can attempt to get some estimates. I will try to provide them.

Mr INGERSON: Is there any chance of advising the House of the number of businesses that are involved, which is a little different from the question asked by the Leader.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: They change, because the businesses come and go, but again I think that we can get some indicative figures for the honourable member.

Mr BAKER: One of the noticeable trends as far as payroll tax was concerned when I had some little knowledge of the system was the creation of more companies to bring them down below the threshold. Has the Premier any information as to the extent to which, with these new concessions, which in some ways are very good for those people in the \$250 000 plus bracket, the process of company creation to avoid payroll tax will take place, or has he any knowledge of what has happened in the past few years?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There are provisions that can deal with that kind of avoidance procedure. I do not think that there has been any major avoidance scheme or attempts to set them up in this area. By and large, the system seems to operate, but the grouping measures exist, and obviously the Commissioner can keep an eye on that and intervene if he feels that it is warranted.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 8) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I address myself to some issues that have concerned me for some time. I touched on the first of these in the Address in Reply debate earlier this week. At that time I expressed my concern at the long delays that occur when I forward correspondence to the Ministers of this Government. The delays I certainly cannot accept: in fact, if I get a reply from a Minister of this Government in less than six weeks I believe that I have done very well indeed. The Ministers may believe that that sort of timetable is acceptable, but I stress to them that it is not. I do not put pen to paper lightly: when I write to a Minister it is because a constituent of mine, or a school or some other organisation within my electorate, has a problem or is seeking information.

Of course, on behalf of those persons or organisations I will approach the Ministers either to try to help or obtain the information sought. Indeed, it is very frustrating not to get replies from Ministers. However, we have a follow-up system in my office. First, we use telephone calls. We ring the Minister's office and advise the staff that on such and such a day a letter was written and that to this stage we have not had a reply. We will do that a couple of times, but with a number of Ministers this has no effect whatsoever.

We then send follow-up letters, but unfortunately there are some Ministers who will not react even to that. At the moment we have a number of quite serious issues that I have placed before Ministers on behalf of my constituents. As I indicated in the Address in Reply debate, the Minister

with the worst record by far is the Minister of Education. Due to lack of time on that evening I was curtailed from placing on the record some of the more outstanding examples of the laxity that occurs within that Minister's office.

My other point about the Minister of Education, as my colleagues have so well pointed out, is that it is virtually impossible ever to be able to get an appointment to speak to him, let alone to take a deputation to him. We cannot look at all the examples, but I shall cite some of the worst examples I have been subjected to in awaiting answers to correspondence from him. First, on 25 November 1982 I wrote on behalf of a constituent to the Minister. I did not receive a reply until 4 February 1983.

In another case I wrote on behalf of a primary school to the Minister on 19 November 1982. I have still not received a reply! However, the school has been notified of the outcome of the representations I made on its behalf. The Minister took the trouble to write to the school even though it was I, as local member, who took up the matter with him. I repeat: it is 2½ years later—almost three years later—and I still have not received an official reply from him.

In another example, on behalf of a constituent my letter was written to the Minister on 29 September 1983. A reply was received on 24 January 1984. Another I wrote on behalf of a school was initiated on 1 November 1983 and a reply was received on 24 December 1984—not 1983, but 1984—13 months I waited! I have a list here as long as my arm of the number of reminders, telephone calls and letters I have written to the Minister on that matter.

I wrote to the Minister on behalf of a constituent on 9 November 1983, and he replied on 13 March 1984. I wrote another letter on behalf of a constituent on 24 February 1984 and finally I received a reply on 18 December 1984. Again, I have a list as long as my arm of telephone contacts and follow-up letters that I wrote to the Minister trying to get the information I was seeking.

I wrote another letter on behalf of a constituent on 15 March 1984, but I still have not received a reply to that. It is now August 1985. If I had time I could go down the list of dates, and members opposite could see where I have followed up on that matter. I notice that the member for Brighton thinks this is amusing. If she does, I assure her that my constituents are far from amused. I let my constituents know on every occasion on which I make a telephone follow-up and I send them copies of the correspondence when I am following up by letter. They know where the fault lies.

The honourable member thinks it is funny that her Government treats members of the Opposition and their constituents in this way. I assure her that I do not. I wrote another letter on behalf of a school and forwarded it on 4 April 1985. I have still received no reply. I could go on and on in relation to the Minister of Education. I have discussed the matter with my colleagues, who have indicated that they have exactly the same problem.

The Premier is no better. For months and months we have been awaiting a reply from him, and/or the Minister for Environment and Planning and/or the Minister of Recreation and Sport, about representations I have made on behalf of constituents who own land in the River Torrens Valley at Highbury. This land, unfortunately (according to the Government), could be required in the future for the River Torrens Linear Park, so at this stage those people are not allowed to use or sell their land, although they have to pay rates and land tax.

For months and months I have been writing to the Ministers and the Premier; I have telephoned the offices of the Ministers and the Premier, and I have said, 'For goodness sake, this matter has been going on for well over two years.' These people are awaiting a reply. All they want the Gov-

ernment to do is say, 'Yes, the Government requires the land and we will buy it', or 'No, the Government does not want the land. Use it how you like. You can subdivide it or do whatever you like.' These people have to pay rates and land tax, but they are not allowed to use the land.

Neither the Premier nor any member opposite has ever operated a small business, run a rural property or anything like that, so they have no comprehension of what it is like to try to eke out a living on broadacres when one is not allowed to use or sell the land but at the same time is being required to pay land tax and rates. I am not talking about small sums: I am talking about tens of thousands of dollars a year.

How would members opposite or one of their union buddies feel if they received a letter saying, 'You can't do anything with your land. You are not allowed to use it or sell it, but you still have to pay Government rates and taxes'? I can imagine how the unions would react. The trouble is that my constituents do not have the power of the unions, so the Government sits on them, treads all over them and says, 'We couldn't care less about your problem. We know that your member has been making representations on your behalf for more than two years, but so what!' The Government will not give me the slightest indication; it will not inform my constituents or their lawyers of the position. My constituents have written to the Premier, their lawyers have written to the Premier, and I have written to the Premier, but none of us can get a reply. Thus the land in the Torrens Valley is unused. Does the Government have to pay a penny in that regard? No Sir! The Government is raking in the dollars and at the same time ensuring that people cannot use their land as they wish.

My constituents just want to know their position. If the Government says, 'Yes, we want the land' they will be happy because they can sell the land to the Government, but these people are in a complete vacuum. The Premier and the Ministers just will not respond. I am only too happy to have had this opportunity to bring to the attention of the House the way in which this Government treats members of Parliament and the constituents of South Australia.

Mr GROOM (Hartley): This afternoon during Question Time, because the member for Mallee called 'Question!', I was prevented from giving a full explanation of a question I asked the Premier on a matter of great importance to the ethnic community. I want to put on record (because I intend to circulate my remarks to the ethnic community) that the effect of a member's calling 'Question!' is to cut off the further expression of concern that I was raising on behalf of my constituents in the ethnic community. It simply meant that I was prevented from giving a full explanation by the member for Mallee calling 'Question!' so that the Premier had to answer the question immediately, and this prevented me from bringing to the attention of the House matters that people in the ethnic community wanted me to raise in this Parliament. I was prevented from raising those matters that people in the ethnic community wanted me to raise in this Parliament because of the actions of the Opposition through the agencies of the member for Mallee. That was regrettable; it was an example of the flippant way in which the Opposition, through the member for Mallee, treats problems raised by the ethnic community.

I want to place on record fully the concerns that my constituents have asked me to raise. I will go through some of the matters that I brought to the attention of the House this afternoon and complete the explanation. The current agreement in regard to reciprocal arrangements for the payment of social security benefits between Australia and foreign countries (in this instance Italy and, in particular, Greece) is due to expire. That agreement was entered into

in 1973. Discussions instituted by the previous Liberal Government under, I think, Senator Chaney, to bring about a new reciprocal agreement between Italy, Greece and other foreign countries have been continuing for some time.

A number of benefits were announced in the proposed package by the Minister for Social Security, Mr Howe, to Federal Parliament on 8 May 1985. I will mention some of those benefits. At present, if a person from, say, Italy, does not reach pensionable age in Australia, has not qualified and returns to Italy before that age is reached, there is no entitlement to a pension. That will be rectified under the new reciprocal agreement and a part pension will be payable. In addition, the payment of foreign pensions represents an inflow of foreign currency (in the reverse situation), which assists the balance of payments and will have direct budgetary implications.

There are a number of other benefits in the proposed package. However, the aspect that is of serious concern to the migrant communities deals with the residential qualification period before a maximum Australian pension is payable overseas. At present, the residential qualification in Australia is 10 years. Therefore, people from Italy or Greece who migrate to Australia, stay here for 10 years and then return to their country of origin receive, provided that they are of pensionable age, a maximum Australian pension. I think the qualifying period used to be 20 years, but in 1973 the Whitlam Government reduced it to 10 years.

While it is true that most other countries that have reciprocal agreements provide a qualifying period of 40 years, the fact is that we have operated under a 10-year qualifying period for some 12 or 13 years. To change the maximum qualifying period from 10 years to 35 years will create a large number of anomalies and serious concern among the ethnic communities. That is not to say that the change in age will deprive people of pensions—quite the reverse. For example, if 35 years became the qualifying period in Australia and a person spent 30 years here before returning to either Italy or Greece, he would receive 30/35ths of the pension, with the Italian or Greek Governments providing a top-up of the other 5 per cent. That would also apply if someone spent 20 years in Australia and the residual time back in, say, Italy—provided that one qualified under Italian law previously with the necessary residential qualification.

The proposed agreement is for a proportion of the pension to be payable by Australia and by the home country. In addition, if the package of benefits falls short and the Italian top-up pension is not sufficient, in the sense that it does not match the full amount of the pension payable in Australia, the Australian Government, under the agreement, would give a further top-up to ensure that the benefits were the same as if that person had remained in Australia. The fact of the matter is that although there has been consultation with certain sections of the migrant communities by both the previous Federal Liberal Government and by the current Government, the extension of the period from 10 years to 35 years is just not acceptable to the migrant community. A great amount of concern has been expressed to the Federal Minister by me and by the Hon. Mr Feleppa in another place and, I dare say, by other members of Parliament.

My colleagues on this side of the House—certainly the members for Peake and Unley—have likewise expressed great concern with regard to the extension of the maximum qualifying period from 10 years to 35 years. In my view it is just not warranted. It requires re-examination and alteration. I am pleased to say that I read in this week's *Il Globo* that the Minister for Social Security, Mr Howe, has finally agreed to re-examine this aspect and, hopefully, that will

lead to the improvements that the ethnic communities have sought.

I was very pleased with the Premier's response, because he, likewise, today expressed great concern about the way in which the ethnic communities view this problem. I know, from his remarks, that he wants to see an acceptable solution—that is, completely acceptable to the migrant communities in Australia. I know that this is essentially a Federal matter, but when State members have such matters drawn to their attention they have a duty to pursue them.

I think that it is regrettable that the member for Mallee, through calling 'Question', prevented me from properly airing the concerns of my constituents on a matter of great importance to the ethnic communities. I hope that example will not be followed by other members of the Opposition. I am sure that it will not. The fact of the matter is that the Federal Government is clearly concerned about the adverse response that it is getting from the ethnic community on this particular aspect of the agreement. I hope that that will be changed as a consequence of representations received.

The State Government has an unparalleled record of support for migrant communities in this State, as is reflected by recent announcements of a new, bilingual education policy—the 10-year plan announced by the Minister of Education—to ensure that all students have an opportunity to learn at least one language other than English. Of course, this new policy will require the employment of a large number of additional specialist language teachers over the next 10 years.

In my electorate this is a very important matter. Many of the schools in my electorate are already geared for the teaching of Italian, because it has a significant Italian community. Those schools have in place Italian language programs which will be further bolstered by the new bilingual educational policy.

SBS television has been an outstanding success. As honourable members know, it commenced in this State on 1 July 1985. There is no doubt about that it is working well. It is an enormous success. It has been welcomed by the Adelaide ethnic population and many other people wanting a greater variety of programs. I am pleased to see that the Premier has contacted the Federal Communications Minister, Mr Duffy, in a bid to have adequate local content included in that station's programming.

We have a thriving film industry in South Australia and plenty of scope to feed South Australian produced documentary, drama and cultural works into the national SBS network, which is of great benefit to the ethnic communities. I am pleased to be able to reiterate this State Government's fine record in relation to support for ethnic migrant communities.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Mr Speaker, you have already been reminded of the disruption that occurred today in this Parliament during Question Time relating to an argument that took place between two backbenchers. As a result of that argument a number of members on this side were prevented from putting questions during that important period. Therefore, I will take the opportunity of this adjournment debate to raise a matter of State, if not extreme national, significance.

Members will be aware of the meat industry dispute that has surrounded the Mudginberri abattoir in the Northern Territory for some 19 weeks. As a result of that dispute, there have been various forms of agreement breaches, litigation and argument between the primary industry, its representatives, AMIEU workers and Governments in Australia. The Mudginberri abattoir dispute escalated dramatically this week. Industrial action by affiliated members of the

Australian Council of Trade Unions has ensured that the Federal Government will soon be forced to intervene.

The direction of the dispute also changed dramatically as the primary issue (that is, the right of individual workers to enter into separate employment contracts in the meat industry) has now been overtaken by the use of sections 45D and 45E of the Trade Practices Act. As a result, it is fair to say that so far the Federal Government has taken a back seat in this issue. Now that it is faced with widespread national disruptive action by unions not directly involved, it would appear to have no alternative but to intervene. I can see that the Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Kerin) and the Minister for Industrial Relations (Mr Willis) will have to take an active role in coming days if the dispute is to be settled with minimum disruption on behalf of the nation generally.

I believe that the time has come, as we are now being affected by sympathy strike action in this State, for our Premier to take similar action and intervene on behalf of all South Australians. It is clear that, as a result of the strike action taken again today in this State at an abattoir, a wool store and the wharf side storing facilities, and so on, the impact on primary producers, agents and the wider community of South Australia means that we are already suffering industrially, financially and socially to the point where some action must be taken quickly.

In raising this subject today it was my hope that the Premier would be present and that I would be able to draw to his attention that his own Minister of Agriculture, purporting to represent primary producers of this State, has had his head down throughout these 19 weeks. To my knowledge he has not murmured on the subject and has not participated with his Federal colleagues or his mates in the trade union movement to try to placate the issue and avoid the South Australian community being implicated.

The situation is around us now and, in view of that lapse of attention by the Minister of Agriculture, the Premier, on behalf of all South Australians, should take immediate action. At times we are counterquestioned on what good that will do. It is my view that when strike action of this kind is taken, where the issue is totally unrelated to South Australian industrial activities and is simply an internal sympathetic move by trade union members for colleagues in another State, that governments should intervene and insist that the trade unions call on their members to front up to work and act responsibly.

The strike in the Northern Territory is illegal. I recognise that it is not appropriate for me to talk about the litigation elements of this matter over the past 19 weeks. However, as clearly reported in newspapers around Australia during that period, about 20 employees at the Mudginberri works have refused to adopt a system of working in accordance with the employer's request. The matter was heard before the court. A direction to go back and negotiate those terms with the union members was handed down. Indeed, while the union in that particular part of Australia accepted the court's decision in the first instance, the employees have since bucked it and, in turn, sought and gained sympathy from other trade union members. It is a disgraceful situation when a Government which, on the one hand, admits its affiliation with the trade union movement, yet, on the other hand, seems to be helpless, if not useless, in the situation that we are facing.

One would have thought that, if anyone in the country could talk a bit of sense to those union leaders who are directing that strike action should be taken in this State, it would be the Labor Party itself—the Party amongst whose ranks there are many people from the trade union system. In this instance I think that it is extremely important for the Premier to take direct action. In these circumstances,

one had hoped of course that the Minister of Agriculture would ensure that primary producers could deliver their wool to Port Adelaide in the ordinary course of management and seasonal activity. However, it has become apparent today that they arrived in Adelaide not knowing about this lightening strike action that was taken today and they and their trucks laden with wool were turned away from the store.

The same situation has arisen at the SAMCOR abattoir, an institution which, clearly, is the responsibility of the Minister of Agriculture in this State. Under those circumstances producers either leave their stock in the yards and pay for the feeding of the stock until the strike is over or they return the stock to the paddocks and suffer the loss from the resultant deterioration that occurs.

In relation to wharfside loading of grain and other primary products of South Australia, on which we so heavily depend for our export income, again, disruption has occurred.

It is an absolute disgrace that neither the Premier nor to my knowledge a member of the other place has made a statement in relation to a desire for this matter to be resolved. As I have indicated earlier, not a murmur of an action has been evident on the part of the South Australian Government in clipping off this rolling strike and so called sympathy action by the unionists in South Australia. We deplore that action, which in this instance is having an enormous impact on the community at large. We implore the Government to take, through the appropriate officers available to it, the appropriate action to have those men resume their duties; that would allow industry generally to continue without further disruption or, as I put it, corruption, from the trade union employees involved.

Motion carried.

At 5.18 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 13 August at 2 p.m.