

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 21 November 1991

The **SPEAKER (Hon. N.T. Peterson)** took the Chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

STATE FIRE SERVICES

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.H. Hemmings:

That this House endorses the current constructive moves to rationalise the communications and training facilities of the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service and the South Australian Country Fire Service.

(Continued from 20 November. Page 2152.)

The **Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier)**: Last night in speaking to this motion, I dwelt at some length on the rather jaundiced view held by two members of the Opposition in regard to any form of liaison between the Country Fire Service and the Metropolitan Fire Service. I refer to the member for Bright and the member for Goyder. Last night, as I was drinking my Milo, I realised that the bulk of my contribution was wasted with their allegations of amalgamation between those two important arms of firefighting. My motion talks about a better servicing of the community by those two organisations if we rationalise their training facilities and their commercial operations. The principal objective of the rationalisation is to maximise operational efficiencies and coordination during fires and other emergency operations, and we saw that during the awful Ash Wednesday fires of many years ago. Eliminating inter-service problems is also a very important part of any form of rationalisation, as is providing the public with the most efficient fire service practicable. I doubt whether anyone in this House would have any problems with that aspect.

The aim is to maximise resource sharing by the common use of facilities, equipment and systems, and we often hear that from the Liberal Party. We need to develop agreed and unified policies of planning that will maximise cost savings, eliminate avoidable duplication and meet the requirements of GARG. That is almost from the lips of the Deputy Leader. We have heard that many times from him. We also need to further enhance the very good relationship developed between CFS volunteers and MFS wholetime and auxiliary firefighters and to retain the individual identity and operation of the CFS and MFS organisations, with separate management—and I stress that—administration and funding. That final objective which the Minister decreed should be part of the rationalisation program, clearly identifies that there will be two separate organisations in relation to firefighting services.

It is proposed that these objectives will be specifically achieved in the area of communications on a State-wide basis by developing a joint use of the radio network, including associated equipment and with totally coordinated operations of MFS country brigades with the CFS group and the regional system. Last night I mentioned my own service—the Smithfield CFS—and it stated, upon seeing these objectives, 'This is what we have been wanting for years and at last it is happening.' That is first hand—straight from the horse's mouth. That group wants to see this happen.

A further objective is to develop the predetermined mutual response system to upgrade the identified problems evident in the existing mutual aid plan. That is a very important part of the combined operations. The proposed system will

ensure that the public is serviced by the response of the nearest appliance, CFS or MFS. Mr Speaker, if your house were on fire, you would not care whether it is a CFS unit or an MFS unit that responded. You would simply want somebody to respond quickly to put out the fire at your lovely house at Semaphore. That is how the whole thing will work. It will enable resource sharing of facilities, equipment installation, repair, maintenance, and associated technology to provide both services with the most efficient and cost-effective operation.

No-one would deny that, in the area of firefighting, that is the important integral part. I mentioned last night that nobody can replace the guts or raw courage of the firefighters but we need high technology to be able to maximise their use, serving not only rural communities but also the urban community. A further objective is the development of a computer-aided dispatch system, in a manner that will benefit both fire services and maximise the turnout response times of appliances and crews. It is a matter of getting in there as quickly as possible and not stuffing around with the telephone, ringing different numbers. Computer-aided technology will get the crews there as quickly as possible.

Another objective is the establishment of a joint State control centre fire operations room that will enable the collocation of CFS/MFS staff and operational chiefs in major emergencies, bushfires and State disaster circumstances. That is the crux of this motion. There will be a rationalisation of the services provided by the CFS and the MFS, so that in the event of a disaster the combined arms will be ready to respond as quickly as possible to meet the needs of the community. This motion deserves the support of the House and I urge members opposite to ignore the words that have come from the lips of the member for Goyder and the member for Bright to ensure that this motion gets the full support of the House and gives an indication to the Minister to proceed.

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

Mr **S.G. EVANS** secured the adjournment of the debate.

'BUY A MATE A JOB' CAMPAIGN

The **Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier)**: I move:

That this House supports the 'Buy a mate a job' campaign by the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, SA Great and Kickstart designed to encourage South Australians to support local jobs and industry by buying Australian made and locally produced items.

A motion such as this could be seen by some people as a motherhood statement or as a reflection of my very parochial attitude. I hope, ultimately, that the entire House will support this very important initiative. It is not a motherhood statement but a motion designed to support a campaign that emanated from the Minister sitting on the front bench. In effect, when people purchase an item they should look and say, 'Is it Australian-made or, better still, is it South Australian-made?'

I have heard around the corridors that the Liberal Party will oppose the motion. I cannot pin down the reason. If one goes down into the car park, one will see the collection of Porsches, Ferraris, Mercedes Benz, Opals—all the luxury cars preferred by the moneyed classes represented in this place. I have driven Holdens and Fords, and I am proud of it. Currently I drive a Ford. However, there is a mentality among members opposite that if it comes from Europe or Japan it is obviously a better product.

Mr Ferguson: It gives status.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: My colleague the member for Henley Beach has put it in a nutshell; it represents status.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Look at Hewson.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I do not want to spend the whole of my speech responding to interjections, but, as the Minister said, 'Look at Mr Hewson.' Mr Hewson drives a Ferrari. It is important to note that under the GST, if the Liberal Party is successful federally, when Mr Hewson buys his new 1993 Ferrari, he will pay about \$20 000 less for it. I hope that someone will ring the *Advertiser* hotline and ask about the price of Mr Hewson's Ferrari if we should have the misfortune to have him as Prime Minister of this country. Sir, I digress, and I apologise.

I firmly believe that Australian patriotism does not begin and end in the swimming pool, does not reflect our views on what our people do in sport, whether it be on the cricket pitch, on the football field or on the rugby field, although I agree that they are important. When I came to this country in 1964, I found that everyone to whom I spoke who was not a migrant suffered from a cultural cringe. They did not want anything Australian. About the only thing Australian that they wanted was the meat pie. They were very proud of their meat pie and their cricketers, but when one tried to get them to talk about Holden motor cars they did not want to know, because it was their dream to buy a Mercedes.

In those days—25 or 30 years ago—that was fair enough. But now we have an industry that is geared up technologically and TAFE offers some of the finest training programs, despite the fact that the Federal Minister is doing his best to torpedo them, but our Minister seems to be holding his own very well. That was okay then, but not now. Every time you, Sir, or I buy a Holden motor car, a Ford Fairlane or Actil sheeting, or whatever, we are providing a job for a fellow South Australian or Australian.

It is not something that has been dreamed up by the Minister: it is something that has been avidly supported by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, by SA Great and by most of our major industrial organisations. The awful part about it is that it is not being supported by the Liberal Party, by those people who, I agree, have some degree of persuasion over people in the community, in the same way as members on this side of the House, but every time people buy anything that is Australian made, it provides someone with a job.

I have not told the Minister this, but as a result of the campaign that he launched two months ago—I understand that it will be reaching its peak during the Christmas period—one of my local community groups picked up this 'Buy a mate a job' campaign in its newsletter. In two local shopping centres in my area, that is the theme. The local deli and all the other shops that service that community have picked it up in their sales campaigns, and I understand that seven young kids have been given jobs as a result of that move by the residents' group through the community newsletter. If in my neighbourhood—an area which covers at most about 4 000 homes—buying local has produced seven jobs, just think how it could reflect throughout the whole of the State and country.

Mr Ferguson: Thousands of jobs.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: As my colleague the member for Henley Beach says, it would result in thousands of jobs. Everyone and all our children would have a better chance in life. The economy would lift. Then there would be no need for the iniquitous goods and services tax, and that is the important thing. This is a twofold campaign. The most important part is to give our kids jobs, but it will also

ensure that we need not have that iniquitous goods and services tax.

As I move around my electorate and the State people ask me what they can do about the present situation. My answer is simple: continue to vote Labor and to buy Australian made. They say to me, 'But my local member drives a Mercedes. When I was invited to his house party I saw that he had expensive Italian tiles in his bathroom.' What is wrong with Caroma, which produces fantastic plumbing work? But, no, they do not buy it. They think that it gives them a lift out there in the community if they can say, 'Look at my Mercedes and Volvo, and come into my expensive Italian tiled bathroom.'

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: We are not sure. We are trying to track down who on the other side has the BMW. I think the member for Bragg has a BMW. I hope that he will sell it at the first opportunity and buy a Falcon, like mine, or a good old Holden Commodore. The answer is to buy Australian. I am sure that the people at Semaphore are no different from the people at Elizabeth and Munno Para. There is a genuine concern there for other people. Fortunately, we have not yet got to the selfish stage of perhaps some of our cousins from the United States or the United Kingdom who care only for themselves. In Australia, and in South Australia in particular, there is still concern for other people's jobs. If we can tap that concern and make sure that people do buy Australian, there would be a marked improvement in the employment situation.

About three weeks ago I heard a commercial about South Australian-made products. It said that South Australian goods are no good. That was what was being said. Over the airwaves people are being told that it is no use buying South Australian, because our goods are no good at all. Yet, what do we hear? I will give an instance. Dairy Vale consistently wins national awards for its cheese. But what do we see? Sir, I would bet that if you went into the home of a member opposite for dinner you would get imported Dutch and French cheese—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: The brie and chablis set.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: That's right: the brie and chablis set. There would be imported French wines and imported Italian wines to go with their Italian tiles in their Italian bathrooms. There would be all those things. What do they do? They are not in the least bit ashamed to take good South Australian money for their salaries.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I am getting a lot of interjections. It is the Adelaide cultural cringe. They are quite happy to go to the South Australian voters to get them into this place, but do they support South Australian products? No way. Do they support Australian products? No way. We do on this side, because we have a fierce pride—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: —not only for the State we live in but also for Australia. The member for Bragg said, 'What a load of rubbish.' I invite him to stand up after I have finished my contribution and explain why he drives a car that was not made in Australia. I would be interested to hear what he says. All the other members on this side will give up their place in the debate and let all those other Liberal members who drive continental cars, who drink French wine and who eat Dutch cheese stand up and justify it.

I would be interested to hear the member for Custance—who is one of the most stalwart rural members I have met in my career—stand up and defend his colleagues who buy

continental, buy European and buy Japanese. I do not include the member for Custance—he is a good old country boy. Let us talk about another subject—alcohol. In all these restaurants, what do they buy? They buy imported beer. Why? Because, if they do not, they might be seen by other people and not be considered a part of the Adelaide cringe.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: My colleague the member for Henley Beach says, 'Eastern suburbs carpetbaggers and born again yuppies.' Members opposite have the temerity to oppose this motion, which says that, if we want to help one of our fellow Australians out of the unemployment queues to get a job, we should buy Australian or locally-produced products. I look forward to members opposite defending their Adelaide cringe stance and their European stance, but they will not win me and, I am sure, they will not win you, Sir.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): Last night I referred to a speech made by one member as being spiteful, but that would be praise compared with the effort we have just listened to—talk about politics of the gutter. There is no suggestion yet that the Liberal Party will not support this motion. Having listened to what the honourable member has just said, we cannot let this go. Talk about a snaky effort! I would like all members on the other side of Parliament who drive cars that were made overseas to stand up. I have seen a few Volvos out in the car park. This is the level of the thinking and the debate of members opposite.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, where are the MGs; where are the drivers of the Volvos? Talk about a gutter effort!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Members opposite cannot get over the fact that Hewson has come up the hard way and is interested in cars. Members opposite go to the Grand Prix. South Australia's great event. Where do those cars come from? The event of the year, according to this mob opposite: the only thing they have done since they have been in Government is bring in a Grand Prix and all the imported stuff that accompanies it.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Talk about hypocrites: what about Keating with his French clocks and Italian suits? What about the big white hope of the other side of the House, the Prime Minister in waiting, Keating? He is top brush; he can't get anything that is any good over here, he says. He has to get Italian suits because the others do not fit him; he is too lean and skinny. Talk about in the gutter! The best thing the honourable member can do if he wants to create jobs and make people buy Australian is to make Australia competitive. The best thing he can do is to get hold of the package that has been partially released by the Federal Treasurer as a big coup and compare it with what the Liberal Party will do to create jobs and make Australia competitive. Even the Government does not worry too much about buying Australian. Just looking around the Chamber: this one is made in New Zealand.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot display articles in the Chamber.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will not display it. I have in my possession four articles supplied to Parliament by the Government, this former Minister, this hypocrite. I have in my possession two rulers: one made in Taiwan and one made in New Zealand. These articles are used here every week. We have here a stapler made in Japan and a

pair of scissors made in Sheffield, England. This is the mob that says, 'Buy Australian'.

An honourable member: Where was your suit made?

An honourable member: He found it.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes; I got it down at Trim's. Members opposite hate people to be successful. They cannot get past these politics of envy. They hate success; they want to tax employers out of business to keep all their hangers-on. They think money grows on trees; that is the problem. The best advice I can give the honourable member who just made that miserable speech—one of the most miserable efforts I have heard from him for a long time, and I have heard many from him—

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I have two points of order, Mr Speaker. First, I think that what the member for Kavel said is a reflection on me and—

The SPEAKER: What in particular?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: He said that it was the most miserable speech I have ever made.

The Hon. J.P. Trainer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Walsh is out of order. The Chair does not uphold the point of order. What is the second point of order?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: My second point of order is that the member for Kavel referred to me as 'him'.

The SPEAKER: The Chair upholds that point of order. All references to members in this place, as I have said many times, must be to their electorate or the office they hold.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will not call him 'her'. The best thing I can do is to photostat the summary of the Hewson package, which is in the process of being announced and which is the best thing the honourable member could study. He should study it in depth to know how to buy Australian, because we must make Australia competitive. What about the imposts of this Government, such as payroll tax? The Opposition's tax package will get rid of that. What about WorkCover? In the minutes remaining, let me just refer to some of the business incentives, let alone the personal incentives, to work a bit harder. The honourable member claimed in his speech yesterday that he loves work. He could have fooled all of us. Anyway, these are some of the business incentives to help people buy Australian.

A Federal Liberal Government would abolish \$9.4 billion in wholesale sales tax and \$5.8 billion in payroll tax. What would that do to create employment? It would be the biggest single incentive to employers to employ more people than anything I can think of in living memory. It would abolish \$6.6 billion in excise on petroleum. What would that do for the cost of transport around this country, and transport has a big input into business costs? It would be an enormous relief.

As for customs duty, it would reduce tax on exports by \$1.7 billion. In trying to become competitive and create work, it would abolish the training guarantee levy. There would be full capital gains tax relief on the roll-over of a business into a light business where the disposal price does not exceed \$5 million, and that would be available once every five years. Capital gains tax would be abolished on the sale of a business up to the value of 10 times the average annual earnings, provided the funds are placed in an approved deposit fund.

And so it goes on: the most brilliant package yet devised in the memory of anyone in this House to try to get this country back on to its feet. And what do we get? A dose of the politics of envy from the honourable member opposite. It would not be bad if he could stick to the facts, but he never lets the facts stand in the way of the sort of stuff that

he churns out, as in the miserable little speech we were just subjected to.

An honourable member: Absolutely miserable!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It was a miserable speech, and that is praising it up. I have become used to some miserable people in my time, and I have become very tolerant—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I can't hack you yet. As you know, Mr Speaker, I have become very mellow in my later years as my long parliamentary career draws to a close. However, I have not become so mellow and tolerant that I can hack the sort of garbage that we had from the honourable member this morning. It is that sort of stuff that has really cruelled our pitch in this country.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course they can't. The Minister of Youth Affairs interjects. A third of the young people in this State cannot get a job. If ever there was a condemnation of the efforts of the Minister of Youth Affairs, it would be him: it is an absolutely disgraceful record.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister should not remind us of that miserable, despicable action. When I see the AJA code of ethics and when I think that the Minister was an AJA member—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: I still am.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: When the AJA sent us this code of ethics and expected us to take it seriously, when I know that the Minister has been and is a member of the AJA, it is enough to make a cat laugh. The Government tries to sell the Privacy Bill by sending us the code of ethics, when we have experienced this sort of behaviour.

An honourable member: What a joke!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is the joke of the year. It almost compelled me to support the Privacy Bill, with my knowledge of the way the code of ethics is supposed to work! Nevertheless, we may amend the motion: we will have a look at it. At face value, it does not look too bad, but when the member gets up and goes on with this absolute, miserable, hypocritical rubbish—

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

Mr FERGUSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

PORT PIRIE HARBOR

Mrs HUTCHISON: I move:

That this House urges the Government to pursue funding at Federal Government level for the deepening of the Port Pirie Harbor, given this area's role in the production of export income for the State and nation.

In moving this motion, I will give some background material on Port Pirie, although I am sure that members such as the member for Gilles and the member for Albert Park know all about Port Pirie.

Mr McKee: And the member for Morphett.

Mrs HUTCHISON: And the member for Morphett, as my friend the member for Gilles points out.

Mr Hamilton: A city of friendly people.

Mrs HUTCHISON: Port Pirie, which is a city of friendly people, was first used as a port in early 1846. The construction of a narrow gauge railway line from Port Pirie to Gladstone in 1874, construction of the railway link to Broken Hill in 1888 and the opening of a lead smelter in 1889 turned Port Pirie into one of the busiest sea ports in Aus-

tralia at that time. At that time it was tipped as being the biggest city outside of metropolitan Adelaide.

The vessels that visited the port in 1910 typically carried 1500 to 3200 tonnes of cargo but, by 1951, vessels had increased in size, and they typically carried 4 000 to 10 000 tonnes of cargo. By 1986 cargoes had increased to 10 000 to 20 000 tonnes with vessels measuring 170 to 180 metres in length and with a five to eight metre draft. Over that time the tonnages increased markedly, and the ships coming into the city also increased markedly in size.

The trade pattern has generally been affected by the lead smelter production and the seasonal grain harvest fluctuations which, as all members would know, are the main products coming out of that area. Over the past 10 years Port Pirie has generally been ranked as one of the five busiest commercial ports in South Australia. The principal imports have been petroleum products, lead concentrates, coal, limesand and lead residue. The principal exports have been wheat and barley, zinc concentrates and lead and zinc metal products.

A number of changes have led to a decline in trade through the port in recent years, and this is to be very much regretted. The changes include a conversion of petroleum import from sea to rail in 1986, the cessation of lead concentrates import in 1989 and also a reduction in grain exports through the port of Port Pirie.

Debated adjourned.

The SPEAKER: Order! Call on the orders of the day.

CONSUMPTION TAX

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Quirke:

That this House condemns moves by the Liberal Party at both the Federal and State levels to bring in a broadbased consumption tax.

(Continued from 29 August, Page 607.)

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I must say that, some months ago when I first put this item on the agenda, I thought that the best thing to do was probably to delay it for some time until we actually saw the proposal. I do not know whether it was small minds thinking alike or what the story was, but today is the day that, in fact, the package has finally come down in what appears to be its entirety. So far, it has been an exercise that can only be compared with dentistry, pulling tooth by tooth, millimetre by millimetre, and suddenly the floodgates have operated and we have everything—roots and all.

No doubt over the next couple of weeks a number of very important political debates will occur in respect of the whole question of tax. I must say that today is indeed a very memorable day, because today we will see an Opposition do something that is very brave indeed. We are told that we are to have a tax-led recovery. A whole new range of taxes are to be imposed, the Government sector is to be reduced and, somehow, there is to be a miraculous turnaround in the economy. I can only say that there will be winners and there will be losers. I think it is interesting that, so far this week, we have not heard very much about that. In fact, if we look at the details of the package as they come out, we can see clearly that we will have the same old winners and the same old losers.

There is no doubt that, if implemented, this tax package will pose enormous problems for those people on low and fixed incomes. There is also no doubt that members in this place, according to ABS statistics, are in the top 1 per cent of income earners and, therefore, they will do very nicely out of the package. I can understand that some members

opposite who bleat on this issue will indeed find a number of supporters in their constituencies who will think this is the greatest thing since sliced bread. The surprising thing to me is that a number of those members opposite who have rural constituencies are so supportive of this package. The other thing that I find surprising is that the State Liberal Party in South Australia is also so warm and fuzzy about the package. The Premier's suggestion the other day of a State consumption tax to go on top must be part of the Opposition's secret agenda.

The details of this package came out today, and it contains a number of key elements. The first matter of importance is that we do not start out as Britain did, at 8.25 per cent, and we do not start out like some other countries—we go straight to 15 per cent. There is no messing around. We also find that there will be massive tax cuts, but just how massive will they be? Somebody on \$75 000 a year will be \$90 a week better off, and somebody on \$90 000 a year will be \$97.90 a week better off—and it does not stop there. The tax cuts are scaled so that anyone on about \$15 000 a year is \$12 a week better off. Of course, they are not used to the money; they would not know how to handle it. The Opposition has gone quiet for the last couple of minutes, because this is the bit they do not like: there will be a \$100 a week tax cut for those people who do not need it.

We find that there will be a \$10 billion reduction in Government services—an astronomical figure. That amount is twice the sum used to pay for the dole; it is the defence personnel budget; it represents about 18 per cent of total Commonwealth outlays.

Dr Armitage: What about the health aspect?

Mr QUIRKE: It represents 90 per cent of the Federal Government's contribution to the health budget, to which the member for Adelaide referred. One wonders where these cuts will be applied. We hear the member for Adelaide protecting his specialised constituency, bleating about the Health Commission and hospital waiting lists. Members should consider what will happen to hospital waiting lists with a \$10 billion across-the-board cut—18 per cent of Commonwealth outlays in one hit.

The consumption tax package sounds very good. However, there is another problem. This is a pay as you earn tax: you pay the tax now and they give you the tax cuts further down the line. I think that some members opposite will be a bit glum about this, because this will mean they will get the worst of all worlds. There will be a consumption tax up front and, a couple of years later, their constituents will do very nicely out of it. However, the question is: will they really?

How many times have conservative Governments promised fists full of dollars, and it has not quite worked out that way. I remember a very famous fist full of dollars campaign, and that did not work out too well. What we find is that this 15 per cent tax will be implemented first off, but that the staggered tax cuts will take a considerable time to be implemented. In the meantime, a whole range of other things will have a detrimental effect on the ordinary wage and salary earners in this country.

The *Advertiser* has been running a fairly nice campaign so far for the Opposition, helping it to try to sell its tax. It also believes in a tax-led recovery. The front page of this morning's *Advertiser* shows a diagram of two shopping trolleys: Dr Hewson's trolley would cost \$62.64 and would include foodstuffs, fruit and vegetables, biscuits, Uncle Toby's muesli bars, cordials and so on. But, in that trolley we do not find a whole range of other products which have never attracted any kind of wholesale sales tax but which, under this proposal, will. It is a very selective list of goods;

many items are not in the trolley.

I would bet that, if members went to any supermarket today, they would find very few of Dr Hewson's items in the trolleys of the shoppers: they would, instead, find other items such as meat, items that will cost a lot more. Even with this selective list of goods, there is a \$4 difference. However, that will not make any difference to the member for Adelaide and his constituents, but it will make a lot of difference to my constituents and the constituents of other members on this side of the Chamber.

Today's *Advertiser* also outlines the very typical case of a Payneham mother of one who allows \$120 a fortnight for groceries. I wonder whether this trolley of goods shown on the front page of the *Advertiser* would represent the sorts of things she would buy. If it did, it would be minus any kind of meat and a whole range of other goods that had never carried any tax. Unfortunately for her, she has already broken her budget of \$120 a fortnight; even under this selective *Advertiser* list she has already broken her budget. Last night's *News* contains a very good list of the winners and losers in relation to the tax on products. We find that certain items will become much more expensive.

Mr Ferguson: The Mercedes.

Mr QUIRKE: I will come to the Mercedes later, for the member for Henley Beach. The following items will be more expensive: apples, baby clothes, biscuits, books, bread, carrots, clothing, cots, gas and power, matches, milk, potatoes and shoes. Train and bus tickets will be dearer. Now let us look at what will be cheaper—the usual things that every supermarket trolley is full of every week: air fresheners, bicycles, boats, cameras and cars! The member for Henley Beach said something about a Mercedes—a \$30 000 cheaper Mercedes. Other things that will be cheaper are guns. Gun collectors will be very pleased with that. However, one thing is wrong: the mathematics do not add up. Guns will be dearer, but we will allow the *News* to make its mistake. Other things that will become cheaper include jewellery, lawnmowers, pet food, soft drinks and televisions.

The last time I spoke about this matter I was berated by members opposite because I did not mention that toilet paper would be cheaper in the supermarkets, that we would have a backside-led recovery.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: I can understand that the member for Culance is worried about toilet paper. That is why he is bleating. He may have a problem that we do not know about. The reality is that not every supermarket trolley is full of toilet paper—well, not those in my electorate, anyway. Where these lists are concerned, members opposite are very selective.

Mr Groom: What about Ferraris?

Mr QUIRKE: I imagine that Ferraris will become very much cheaper. Sadly, that will hurt the Federal Leader of the Opposition, because he will be selling his secondhand Ferrari in a market that may be depressed because the price of top range cars will decrease. For that reason, we should not pick on him. The exercise in relation to the consumption tax is simple: tax cuts for the rich and a general across-the-board regressive taxation that will hit the average wage and salary earner of this country. There are some disgusting parts to this package. It is another attack by the Opposition on single mums who have a hard enough cross to bear.

Members opposite come in here and bleat about the rural sector and about all their constituents, who have all these products. However, I have never heard a Liberal come in here and talk about the single mums out there in the community. I have never heard them come in here and demand more public housing to alleviate the enormous waiting list

that exists—and we are trying to do something about that. I have never seen them trying to get the Federal Government to get a housing package on the agenda. We get further proposed cuts in Government services.

We hear from members opposite that waiting lists are too long or that this, that or the other is too long, but that when they take over there will be a tax-led recovery, with two million more jobs—only one million people are unemployed now. However, two million more jobs will be created according to them, and then they expect people to cop a 15 per cent tax, up front. It is interesting that they say that they will tax people now and give them the money later on. However, they will make sure of one thing: they will give it to the rich first, because that is what they are really all on about.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I do not support the motion. I think one could say, "Knock knock who's there?" and, in response, one would have to say that it is a member who wants to continue with a lot of unemployment, suffering and despair. I think that the member who has just spoken would fall into that category, if he believes that Australia does not need a major restructuring to solve some of its problems. The reform package that has been brought out by the Hewson Federal Opposition is based on a realistic assessment of Australia's problems and deals with them quickly, sensibly and fairly.

The challenge for all of us, including the member for Playford, is that we need major reform. We know why that is needed: living standards have been seriously eroded, under the current ALP socialist Governments, Federal and State. Nearly one million Australians are unemployed. Some 30 per cent of young Australians are unemployed at the moment. We have a massive foreign debt. Incentive is stifled by a heavy tax burden on individuals and, in particular, on business. There has been a falling in education standards and in the quality of training. Also, there is an inefficient national infrastructure between all three tiers of government and departments. That is the reason why we need a change and why we need to take up the challenge.

The policy objectives of the future Hewson Liberal Government are to regenerate the economy, increase national productivity and reduce foreign debt; to create jobs, particularly for young Australians; to improve living standards and restore financial security for all; to promote international competitiveness so that Australia can again match the best in the world; to improve incentives for individuals and business by lowering the tax burden; to raise the quality of education and training; to give Australians a chance to take more personal responsibility for themselves and their families; to ensure that the genuinely needy are cared for; and to match our commitment to economic growth with a commitment to high environmental standards.

They are the policy objectives, and I believe that the reform package will achieve those. The member for Playford said that some of these benefits would be down the track a little. That is obvious. A country that has been plunged into such a crisis situation as ours cannot expect to get out of it quickly. There must be a new direction, and it is offered. The benefits for Australians, over a period of time—and that is admitted—include the fact that two million jobs will be created, with unemployment halved by the end of the decade.

National savings will be boosted through better deals for low and middle income Australians. More Australians will have access to quality health care. Our export capability will be boosted by removing taxes on exports. Elderly Australians will enjoy peace of mind and a more secure financial

and personal future. That is vital to those who are in the older age group. Young Australians will have a chance to get ahead through significant increases in national investment in education. This is also very important. Further, families will benefit from increased allowances, lower taxes and cheaper fuel.

In relation to the personal income tax cuts, in that field the tax-free threshold will be raised from \$5 400 to \$7 000. An additional 320 000 low income earners will no longer pay tax. This is a consideration of those in the lower tax bracket: they will no longer pay income tax. Marginal tax rates will be cut across the board and targeted to middle income earners. Some 95 per cent of taxpayers will face a marginal tax rate of 30 per cent or less, compared with Labor's policies where over half of all taxpayers face a rate of 38c or more, up to 47c. Average taxpayers will be able to double their taxable income and still pay a marginal rate of 30c.

The indirect taxation reforms are as follows: the introduction of a single rate 15 per cent goods and services tax (GST) on 1 October 1994. The rate will be guaranteed not to increase beyond 15 per cent. That guarantee would be embodied formally in legislation. It could not be changed without Parliament's considering it, whichever Government is in power in the future. Tobacco excise would be increased by 25 per cent, and automatic indexation of excise would be abolished. GST would be zero rated. No goods and services tax would be collected on sales and all GST paid on business production costs would be rebated. It includes health and education services. That would be zero rated, so there would be no 15 per cent on health and education services. This also includes Government provision of non-commercial activities, including local government rates. It also includes sale of a business as a 'going concern', welfare, religious and charitable institutions, and exports. All of those would be zero rated, with no goods and services tax. Yet, the member for Playford was raving on about health services, etc.

As to the GST exempt area, meaning no GST collected on sales but no rebates on GST on production costs, this includes residential rents and construction, other building construction and financial services, as well as gambling and lotteries. There would be no goods and services tax on those. These areas have been of concern to some people, but they are exempt. Further, in relation to indirect taxation reforms, the resources of the Prices Surveillance Authority are to be increased to ensure price fairness to consumers. I am sure that everyone would appreciate that that is a benefit.

The business incentives proposed are: to abolish \$9.4 billion wholesale sales tax; to abolish \$5.8 billion payroll tax; to abolish \$6.6 billion excise on petroleum products—55 per cent of which falls on business; to abolish customs duty; to reduce tax on exports by \$1.7 billion; to rebate GST on goods and services used in business; to abolish the training guarantee levy; to align the corporate and top personal income tax rate at 42 per cent from January 1996; to lower and revise capital gains tax, with an additional allowance for goodwill; to allow full capital gains tax exemption on capital gains under \$3 000; to provide full capital gains tax relief on rollover of a business into a like business, where the disposal price does not exceed \$5 million—to be available once every five years; to abolish capital gains tax on sale of a business up to the value of 10 times average annual earnings, provided that the funds are placed in an approved deposit fund; to ensure that, after election, there would be no compulsory increases in employer contributions to employee superannuation—with increases on the basis of choice, negotiation and tax incentives; to review

current depreciation allowances; to promote new links between industry and universities; to align fringe benefits tax with a top marginal tax rate of 42 per cent, with anomalies to be reviewed; and to increase the income tax free discount to \$500 on shares issued to or bought by employees through an employees' share ownership scheme of the business in which they work.

These are all positive measures to encourage business and, at the same time, with it comes employment, because unless businesses start to flourish there will be no increase in the number of employed. Presently Federal and State Governments are cutting the number of employed; they have to, because they have got themselves into such a mess. As to the family package, the family allowance is doubled for families with combined incomes below \$30 000; there is a 50 per cent increase in family allowance for families with a combined income of \$30 000 to \$40 000; and there is an increase of 6 per cent for families on combined incomes of over \$40 000. The family allowance supplement will be increased by 6 per cent. The dependent spouse rebate is increased by \$300 a year to \$1 679 for eligible families with children (single income up to \$75 000).

There is an additional \$90 million for increased child-care support, and zone rebates are increased by at least 25 per cent with \$10 million in subsidies being provided for boarding arrangements for isolated children. That would be a great boost to people who live in the outback and who are the backbone of this country. Families will also benefit from the Coalition's health and education reforms, lower petrol prices (19c a litre cheaper) and increased funding of \$50 million to welfare agencies to assist families who are suffering because this Labor—State and Federal—recession has been imposed on people. The new first home owners scheme provides \$2 000 to first home buyers with an annual household income of up to \$40 000. There are also substantial benefits for pensioners that I do not have time to refer to.

I say to the member for Playford and members of the ALP: wake up, Australia is in trouble, and there is a person in Hewson and those people who back him who can give us an opportunity to encourage people to save, to help those who are disadvantaged and to provide opportunities to those who want to use initiative to go ahead and make Australia prosperous again.

Mr HOLLOWAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

CAMDEN PRIMARY SCHOOL COUNCIL

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Becker:

That this House commends the Camden Primary School Council on its proposals submitted to the Adelaide Area Directorate relating to the change for the West Torrens cluster as part of the primary schools review, western suburbs, and calls on the Minister of Education to reject any decision to amalgamate, transfer or close Camden Primary School.

(Continued from 24 October. Page 1409.)

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I move:

Delete all words after 'western suburbs'.

I have no problem with what the member for Hanson is on about in the main thrust of his motion. It is fair to say that all members of Parliament, when reviews are undertaken on the number of declining enrolments in our areas, react to concern by constituents. Both you and I, Mr Deputy Speaker, had personal involvement in the exercise carried out in our combined electorates. In fact you, Sir, on behalf

of both of us, played an active role in pursuing rationalisation of education in our electorates.

It is fair to say that the one school that suffered closure was in your electorate, and I do not believe that you, Mr Deputy Speaker, in any way shirked support for the role of that steering committee headed by John Joel. I do not wish to embarrass you in any way, Mr Deputy Speaker, but not only did you keep me informed and determined as to my attitude at all times but also you relayed your own views and often our combined views to the Minister of Education not to push a barrow and not with an axe to grind but simply to ensure the bottom line—that better secondary education facilities were available in our combined electorates.

Therefore, I have no problems with the member for Hanson's concerns about this primary school. Where the member for Hanson has gone wrong and where I dispute his motion—hence my amendment—is his trying to use the political process to overrule the community consultation that has occurred with the Adelaide Office of Education. That is wrong.

There comes a time when all members of Parliament have to accept falling enrolments in certain suburbs that they represent. The example in Elizabeth West and Munno Para stands as a beacon for the way it should be handled, and I would have thought that the member for Hanson, who is not only an intelligent member but also has integrity, suffered a slight loss of that integrity and intelligence in terms of his motion.

If the member for Hanson just wants to say to his constituents through the motion, 'Sure, I am picking up your concerns and I will raise them in the House,' That is okay, because the bulk of the motion, which I still retain in my amendment, is perfectly valid, as we are here as individual members. One of the schools in the district of Albert Park was closed recently because of declining enrolments and as part of a long-range strategy to improve the level of education in that area. The member for Albert Park was upset, and I do not think he would mind my saying so, because some parents turned on their local member in that matter.

No-one can deny that the member for Albert Park, as does the member for Hanson, services his electorate well. Indeed, I recall that in the late 1970s the Labor Party believed it had a chance of unseating the member for Hanson. Within two hours of the election being called, the member for Hanson had all the major thoroughfares in his electorate signed 'You are now entering Becker territory' or the like. I was working for the Party office at the time, and we recognised the problem of unseating the honourable member. We went close that year to beating the member for Hanson, but the point is that we did not.

I use that as an illustration of how the member for Hanson has served his electorate diligently, but this is not the way to go. There has been a review and adequate consultation, and that is the correct and proper way. The member for Hanson can use all the avenues open to him as a member of Parliament to voice the concerns of his community. I may be wrong, but he might have been a member of the consultative committee or the steering committee, as were you, Sir, representing both our interests. But, this is not the way to go.

I remind the House, particularly the member for Hanson, of the success of the consultation process in our area. As a result of rationalisation, one high school was taken out of the system and the Inbarendi College was established. You and I, Mr Deputy Speaker, had some disagreement about the name of the college, but my view did not stop us

working towards a better provision of education in our combined areas.

That community consultation is continuing. We are now in the second stage of involving the whole of the community in having a say in the education that should be provided in our areas. I use that example to highlight for the member for Hanson the fact that we cannot use the political process to usurp a community consultation process working outside the Parliament. Sure, we can write letters and take deputations to the Minister, but this is not the place to try to achieve the aims of those people in the electorate that one represents. No-one from the Education Department has picked out the Camden Primary School or that part of Adelaide to reduce the number of buildings or whatever. It is not a direct attack on the member for Hanson; it is in the context of providing education for the twenty-first century, following the approved recommendations of the primary education review and this Government's social justice strategy.

I hope the member for Hanson can take my advice as it is given, in a very kindly way. He should consider that review and those aspects of the Government's social justice strategy and ask whether it fits in with the concerns of his constituents. If the member for Hanson sat down and talked to people in the department who did the primary school review and if he went through the terms of reference, he would find that in the long term better facilities for students will be available in primary schools in his area. It happened at Inbarendi at the secondary school level and it will result in a better rationalisation of teacher resources so that the kids who live in our area and go through tertiary education will get a better chance in life and pick up some of the programs emanating from TAFE.

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

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I thank the member for Napier for his comments and advice and wish to place on record my appreciation of the community involvement of the people in Camden because they not only rallied strongly behind their school and worked extremely hard to put their views with the submission to the review but also used every means available to them to lobby. When I introduced this motion, I called on the Minister of Education, having previously had correspondence with him, to visit this unique school. Constructed entirely in Demac and costing \$700 000 some 15 or 16 years ago to build and landscape, it is probably one of the finest small schools in the western suburbs. With landscaping, it blends in with the residential environment and, to a degree, with the light and heavy industry that we unfortunately have in the area. Heavy industry has constructed a large concrete wall to block some of the noise, but the area was located and purchased by the department many years ago to provide Camden school students with a larger school and an oval. By so doing, it has provided an outstanding opportunity for young people.

The school council has been most diligent in looking after this school and has raised a lot of money over the years building a multi-purpose hall and providing an untold amount of equipment to create opportunities for students. The school council even pays for a music teacher for the school. Since the motion was introduced the Minister has not visited the school but the Premier has. He was approached by some parents who were visiting the school at Port Adelaide and they asked him to visit the Camden school to have morning tea, which he did. It gave him the opportunity to meet the students and view their activities and community involvement, including a special project for

the 1998 Adelaide Commonwealth Games bid. They are also collecting books for Zimbabwe. The school is paired with Zimbabwe and will be working closely with the bid committee on that project. We hope that a Zimbabwe delegate will visit Adelaide. Naturally, he will be welcomed and encouraged by children from the Camden Primary School.

Last Monday afternoon I received a message from the Minister's office advising me that the review had decided that the Camden school would be retained as it is on its present site, and that confirms that the school will be saved. I am delighted with that news and have advised the school council and community that they must work harder to ensure that the numbers grow and to promote the school and keep up its worthy community involvement. With that advice from the Minister's office, I am prepared to accept the member for Napier's amendment.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

ECONOMY

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr S.J. Baker:

That this House condemns the Government for its disregard of the misery caused by its economic policies and financial negligence and demands that it give prime consideration to the future of South Australian business in order to provide jobs.

(Continued from 24 October. Page 1412.)

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I speak to this motion with little pleasure because there is no pleasure in talking about the sad situation in which we find ourselves in this State. Those who govern the State have to carry the can. It is no good trying to pass the buck, although members opposite will attempt to do that. The member for Napier made a nasty cynical speech in response to the Deputy Leader's comments on this issue, but that has become the honourable member's accepted practice in his retiring days in this Parliament. Everybody understands and accepts that and knows that he will do this on an ongoing basis, only more viciously as we get closer to the end of this Parliament.

The Deputy Leader's motion condemns the Government for its disregard of the misery caused by its economic policies and financial negligence and demands that it give prime consideration to the future of South Australian business in order to provide jobs. The finding of jobs is a critical goal for us to aim at. The ALP members are ashamed of the large number of people who have been forced upon the State. I know that those people who normally vote for them are absolutely disgusted that a Labor Government could show such total disregard for those people who are unemployed.

It is all very well for the Premier to say that the State has a massive financial problem and that we should live with the circumstances until they resolve themselves to some degree in the future. We all know that he was the key person in charge of the State when that financial disaster was allowed to be imposed upon us. He should stand up and say, 'It is my fault.' He has failed to do that on the many occasions and opportunities he has had to do it. He always wanted to be seen as Mr Nice Guy. If there were tough things to be said, he got some departmental officer or spokesperson to say it. He would not front up himself, and he still does not. It is a very sneaky way of conducting a leadership. At least, when the Hon. D.A. Dunstan was Premier, he would front—and he did so at the Hindmarsh Building Society and to push the sea back at Glenelg to stop the threatened tidal wave. He would front up and he

had the courage, as did the person who served for a short while after him, the Hon. Des Corcoran.

What has this Government done for business? That is what this motion is all about because, unless business flourishes, jobs will not be created. Our people cannot have the standard of living they expect in a country or a State that is so well served with resources, whether they be mineral or other. In our country we can produce any sort of crop and any mineral, and we have all forms of energy.

Mr McKee interjecting:

Mr S.G. EVANS: We have all of that, and let me remind the member for Gilles, who makes a comment, of the big shots who have bled this country dry with this Australian Labor Party, socialist Government. Let him ask his mate Mr Hawke in Canberra who his friends were, with whom he went yachting, with whom he dined and with whom he went into special deals. We know where it all came from, and his colleagues did not have the courage of their own convictions to stand up and say to their Leader, 'Stop urinating in the pockets of these so-called exploiters of our society.' We know what happened, so let us not go down that track.

Let us look at what has been offered now, and I will go into a little more detail in relation to the goods and services tax and incentives for business. Before I do that, I ask members: where is the sense in increasing payroll tax, because it penalises the people who employ? If an employer takes someone on, this tax will penalise them. Members should go and ask people whether they want to employ today. We have an apprenticeship scheme in the community where, by the time all the penalties and the time off to go to school—nine days a fortnight in some trades—are taken off, employee apprentices do not work one day in two. The employers have to pick up the tab and quite often do not benefit, so they avoid offering employment. That is what they have to do and that is why we do not have many apprentices.

We also have WorkCover applying severe penalties to people, with the employee taking no responsibility if they make an error. In the beginning, we did not even have the opportunity to have alcohol tests to determine whether they had been drinking when they had an accident at work. All the responsibility is back on the employer so the employer—especially the small employer—cannot be bothered with the humbug. They are better off to forget about it and battle on, doing extra hours themselves and employing members of their family. Then they are condemned for not employing.

The member for Stuart and the member for Gilles show by their interjections that they have a hatred for employers and for those who are able to work and create jobs for the unemployed. If more people were employed, they would be paying taxes and they would be able to buy more goods, including Australian goods, and would not be hypocrites like the Government which imports from overseas yet stands up here and says that we should buy Australian, yet its own agencies buy more from overseas than they do from State sources.

I now refer to the business incentives that have been offered, including the abolition of wholesale sales tax which will save \$9.4 billion and which will help not only business but also private individuals. In addition, payroll tax will be abolished, saving \$5.8 billion. Surely, abolishing payroll tax will help employers, as there will be less bookwork for them to do and it will encourage more people to employ. Further, the excise on petroleum will be abolished, saving \$6.6 billion. We should be doing that. The revenue gained from this impost has grown each year as the Government has

increased the excise, even though in this country the greatest problem we have—almost the only problem we have—compared with other countries is the distance between communities.

The communication problem is the only disadvantage Australia has. We should be concerned about Australia's distance from other countries and the distances we must travel within the country, and transport and fuel costs are important factors. For rural producers, fuel is a dramatic part of their costs in getting goods to market and so on. I ask members to compare that situation with countries such as France, England and Germany where one can ride a bicycle across them in one day. In this country it is much more difficult, and we should be conscious of that fact.

Tax on exports will be reduced by \$1.7 billion to try to get the customers from overseas to come back. If we are successful, we will not be losing as we are at the moment. I will finish by saying that this Government has not shown at any time that it really wants to see business prosper in this State. Under the Playford Government—the last Liberal Government that governed for any length of time under a conservative philosophy—we had quite a considerable cost advantage over all other States. This Government has slung that away in most areas so that we now have one of the highest unemployment levels in the country, the biggest percentage of businesses becoming insolvent and people losing not just their business but also their homes and everything, including their furniture and car, and many of them have young families. Members opposite do not really care a darn what happens to them. They sit back and say that, one day, they hope things will get better.

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

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): When I looked at the terms of the proposition that is in front of us I tried very hard in a bipartisan way to see whether there was any way that I could agree with its sentiments. Not only that, but I looked at it very carefully to see whether I could accept even some of the motion and perhaps amend parts of it to make it more acceptable. However, after careful consideration I am afraid that there is no way in the world that I can support it in any way. One of the reasons that I am unable to support it is that this proposition is from the Liberal Party, the members of which I am sure are suffering from bad memories. I remember the time when this State last had a Liberal Government in charge of the Treasury benches. In 1981 and 1982, I used to pick up the *Advertiser* when I was eating my Weeties at breakfast and day after day the headlines were, 'Factory closing down' and 'Retrenchments'; one factory after another. This was when the Tonkin Government had control of the Treasury benches. I am sure that the Liberal Party must have forgotten what happened in those days when it put together this proposition.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: The honourable member raises the issue of the factories that were closed at Elizabeth. Do you know, Mr Deputy Speaker, that Sir Thomas Playford, who was a closet socialist, carefully planned the City of Elizabeth. He carefully planned the area so that space would be left for production and, through the Housing Trust, he encouraged the setting up of businesses in Elizabeth. Along came the Tonkin Government together with its friend in Canberra and factory after factory was closed down. If you were to walk around the streets of Singapore's industrial areas—and I know that you are an inveterate traveller, Sir—you would see the familiar names of the factories which were once set

up in Elizabeth and which closed down and went to Singapore. They were closed down by the Tonkin Liberal Government.

I find it just a little impertinent that we should see before us this proposition from the Liberal Opposition. In fact, I remember the day when the then Premier of South Australia, the Hon. Mr Tonkin, stood up in this House and told us that we were going backwards more slowly than any other State. That is a quote that will never be forgotten. When the Liberal Party puts up a proposition such as this, I tend to remember the lack of support this Government has received when major projects have been put up for this State. It would be very difficult to forget the opposition that faced this Government when we first started to set up the Grand Prix. You may remember, Sir, because you were in the House. We had to sit through all-night sessions because, night after night, the other place (which I am not allowed to name), held up the legislation in the hope that something would go wrong and the Grand Prix would never get started.

Who can forget the Liberal Party's opposition to the Entertainment Centre? Who can forget that, on the Public Works Standing Committee, the members of the Liberal Party actually created history by voting against the establishment of the Entertainment Centre. Do you know, Sir, that the member for Heysen had a lapse of memory, and he could not remember that he voted against the Entertainment Centre? However, at the gala opening of the Entertainment Centre, when all the free seats were available, who do you think was there?

An honourable member: The same as the Casino.

Mr FERGUSON: Similarly, in respect of those Liberal members who voted against the Casino (and I have a photograph in my establishment of those Liberal members who voted against it), when the Casino's free, opening gala night was held, who was there with their bow ties and tails?

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: And the chardonnay.

Mr FERGUSON: The chardonnay people from the other side were first in the queue at the Casino's opening night. We have heard the sniping about the multifunction polis. The member for Bragg has been on radio sniping at the MFP. He got a slap on the wrist from other members of his Party but, when the opportunity for development comes in this State, members of the Opposition surreptitiously and otherwise, try to cut the ground from under the feet of the Government. What about the development at Golden Grove? Look at the way in which Golden Grove is generating jobs for South Australia, and who do you think opposed it? Members of the Liberal Party.

How dare the Opposition put up a proposition such as this when every piece of development that we bring into this Chamber for approval is opposed? Who could forget the opposition from the Liberal Party when we put up the proposition for development in the Flinders Ranges? It was a very tasteful development that would have fitted in with everything up there, and it received approval from the conservationists. Yet in this House the Opposition's little Aussie battler opposed it all the way.

I cannot see how any member opposite can support this motion and still stand up straight. Some of them could hide behind a corkscrew. The pilot training project at Parafield is another scheme that was opposed by the Opposition, yet one has only to look at the amount of money that it is generating for this State.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: The member for Bragg, who is supposed to represent small business, was one of those people who actually tried to undermine the project when we were talking about it in here.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: Sir, the member for Bragg is shouting. I find that despicable. I want to see the member who represents small business on the other side—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Who is it?

Mr FERGUSON: The member for Bragg. I want to see the member for Bragg stand up in this House and shout his disapproval at Hewson's proposal to increase taxation on small business to the rate of 42 per cent. Only Labor Governments reduce taxation so far as small business is concerned. The Opposition has a very poor record so far as looking after small business is concerned. In fact, in the whole history of this State the only Party that has been prepared to reduce taxes for small business has been the Labor Party. The Hewson proposals that have been so proudly talked about will increase taxation on small business. Under the Hewson proposals, taxation relating to chemist shops, in which the member for Bragg has an interest, will increase from 39 per cent to 42 per cent. I find that disgraceful. This is the time when members of the Opposition should stand up and be counted.

The other matter that disappoints me in respect of this proposition is that the Opposition could not resist attacking the labour movement. Members opposite could not get through their speeches without attacking the labour movement, and the last speaker had another go. He wants to reduce—

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

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

HILLCREST HOSPITAL

Adjourned debate on motion of Dr Armitage:

That this House condemns plans to close Hillcrest Hospital in the absence of specific information with regard to factors such as the locations to which long-term beds will be transferred, the facilities which will be provided for the care of the mentally ill in the community, and other features necessary for the provision of a first-class mental health service.

(Continued from 10 October. Page 1068.)

Mr McKEE (Gilles): I oppose this motion and, in doing so, I want to give some background to the proposition. The proposal to reorganise mental health services in South Australia is the result of many years of planning, review and consultation. The strongest supporters of the changes are the consumers and their carers who, for many years, have been demanding services that are more accessible, more responsive, less stigmatised and are directed towards providing a more extensive range of community services.

For a number of years admission rates to psychiatric hospitals have been declining, yet there has been no comparable decrease in the incidence of mental illness. Improvements in treatment regimes have resulted in a vast majority of those people with mental illness now being able to live in the community. That is not to say that they do not require input for mental health services: rather, services have to be redesigned with an emphasis on community support. Essential components of a comprehensive mental health service include a range of 24-hour crisis services, supported accommodation, rehabilitation, and vocational and treatment services.

It is interesting to note that in New South Wales there were major problems in relation to the introduction of this policy, because those services were not provided in the

community at the same time as the people were being sent out into the community. Officers of the South Australian Health Commission and the Government have learned from the mistakes in New South Wales, and there will be no movement of patients into the community until those support services have been provided.

It is interesting to note that in New South Wales over the past three or four weeks there was a precedent-making strike by health and hospital workers against the policies of the Greiner Liberal Government. Fifteen thousand health and hospital workers took to the streets of New South Wales in opposition to the Greiner Liberal health policies. A large group of consumers, carers, service delivery staff, unions and administrators debated these matters at great length, and there was strong support for all the major directions of the proposal.

Contrary to the views of the honourable member, there is a shared vision for community-based support in the mainstreaming of services wherever possible. With the devolution of services from Hillcrest Hospital, we have an important opportunity to end the discrimination against people with acute mental illness by providing care in general hospitals. Sixty beds will be relocated from Hillcrest to general hospitals. As stated in the Estimates Committee, negotiations about the actual site for the wards at the Lyell McEwin and Queen Elizabeth Hospitals, and terms and conditions of employment for staff, are currently being negotiated.

Dr Armitage: Tell us about the Repatriation Hospital.

Mr McKEE: It is interesting to hear from the member for Adelaide, the shadow spokesman for health. The only time I have heard him talking about health has been in the last couple of weeks, when private insurance companies realised that they were losing numbers by about 23 per cent. Who leads the charge for them—the member for Adelaide. I heard him on the radio talking about getting people back into private health and—

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr McKEE: Actually, I have not heard the policies. In fact, I mentioned this the other day. It is interesting that the Liberal Party should talk about health when it has a total lack of policy. In the southern metropolitan area, three options are available. Careful consideration needs to be given to issues of access and equity prior to a decision being made. An amount of \$16 million—not \$5.7 million as cited by the honourable member—will be expended on capital works for the development of appropriate services, and trained staff to be relocated to the new operation.

To ensure that mental health services are developed in a comprehensive and integrated manner, a new organisation—the South Australian Mental Health Service—has been established, commencing operation on 12 August 1991. The first responsibility of the board will be to appoint a CEO and executive support staff who will be required to develop a detailed operational plan for the reorganisation of services in consultation with consumers, unions, staff and administrators. Change is always destabilising, and I realise that staff and consumers are anxious about the proposed reorganisation. It is important to realise that the proposal is in its early planning phase and that the detail will be fleshed out by those responsible for its development, with full discussion and consultation. I am confident that the end result will be a first-class, comprehensive and integrated mental health service which will be strongly supported by the community as a whole.

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I wish to make a couple of further points about this very important matter. I am pleased

to hear the honourable member opposite indicate—as I am confident I heard him say—that there would be no closure until support services are put into the community. That is the first time we have heard that from any member opposite. In fact, until that statement was made, the procedure has been that a closure date has been identified, and hang the consequences. That clearly would not work, because many people would be affected, not only the patients but also the carers.

It is interesting to hear the honourable member opposite say that there has been opposition to New South Wales health policies. In fact, there was opposition not so much to the health policies as such but to the area health management section of the Liberal Party, and that is exactly what the Minister of Health's green paper is all about. The problem in New South Wales arose because an area was underbedded according to all criteria, and that criteria is also followed by the South Australian Health Commission. In fact, the area that was underbedded was to the west of Sydney—the type of area that members opposite so proudly represent.

In fact, what happened was that beds were taken from other more populous areas and moved to that area. Therefore, the people whom members opposite maintain we represent and about whom they continually complain themselves complained. Beds were distributed more equally. I am very surprised to hear members opposite complaining about such a thing. This would normally be regarded as a policy of great equity. I would have thought people who parrot social justice would be out there complaining about it as well.

Regarding the gravamen of the motion, the honourable member opposite indicated that 60 beds are to be relocated and that we heard all about it in the Estimates Committee. In fact, we heard very little about it in the Estimate Committee. We heard of all sorts of potential areas where the beds might go. My motion relates to there being some certainty about where long-term beds will be transferred and to specific information. The member for Gilles said that during the Estimates Committee we heard where all these beds would go. If he actually looked at the *Hansard* report of the Estimate Committee, he would see that what we heard was that it was quite possible that some of the beds in the southern area may go to the Repatriation Hospital.

I ask the member for Gilles to look at yesterday's *Hansard* to see what was said by a member of his Party (the member for Mitchell) in relation to what might happen, the Government's opposition and the changes proposed for the Repatriation Hospital. There is absolutely no certainty about the Repatriation Hospital being able to take beds. The member for Gilles has cleared up not one of the dilemmas; in fact, all he has done is make the waters even muddier. He referred to the South Australian Mental Health Service. I have heard about the dilemmas and difficulties being experienced by many of the well-meaning and capable members of that board. I have heard about their concern in relation to the directions in which the board is going. It still has not appointed a chief executive officer for this grand design, and surely that is a prerequisite to having some of these specific details put before us.

If the concerns that those people are passing on to me are valid, the South Australian Mental Health Service Board and the service in general has a long way to go before it can clarify, to the satisfaction of patients, carers and all South Australians, that this potential move, particularly given the haste in which it may now happen, ought to occur. I repeat categorically that the Liberal Party is not against the devolution, if that is best for the patients, but

we demand that the Government provide us with specific details about it before we buy yet another pig in a poke.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Messrs Allison, Armitage (teller), P.B. Arnold, S.J. Baker, Becker, Blacker and Brindal, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn and Ingerson, Mrs Kotz, Messrs Lewis, Meier, Oswald, Venning and Wotton.

Noes (20)—Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Atkinson, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Heron, Holloway and Hopgood, Mrs Hutchison, Mr Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McKee (teller), Quirke, Rann and Trainer.

The SPEAKER: There being 20 Ayes and 20 Noes, and, as the Chair has the casting vote, I would like to make a statement before voting on the motion. I represent an area that has a serious problem with the normalisation of mental health patients and, in principle, I support anything that will improve the lot of those people. However, I do not believe that this motion as such does that. Just a straight condemnation will not bring about any action to make the lot of those people better. I therefore cast my vote for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

SOUTHERN SPORTS COMPLEX

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Oswald:

That this House calls on the Government to dedicate for its long-term recreational and sporting use the land at Noarlunga Centre near Colonnades which was identified in the report of the ministerial working party established to investigate and report on the establishment of a multipurpose sports complex south of Adelaide, known as the Crome report,

which Mr Holloway had moved to amend by leaving out 'dedicate for its long-term' and inserting in lieu thereof 'report on the feasibility of retaining for'.

(Continued from 29 August. Page 617.)

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): In seeking to amend my motion the Government seeks to put this proposal on the back burner. This of course was never the intention of my motion. The original motion was to put clearly on the record of this House that the Parliament urges the Government to set aside the land at Noarlunga Centre near Colonnades for the purposes of recreation and sport. We all know that, once another department shows interest in that land, the Government of the day can then turn around and have that land set aside for that other department. For example, the Housing Trust could show an interest in that land, so the land would then be dedicated for the purposes of housing. This debate is not about what type of sporting complex should be built on that land. We are not debating whether it should be for football, cricket, tennis, harness racing or dogs. This motion is a statement that the land should be dedicated to sport whilst, indeed, land is available in the southern region for this purpose.

This would be an acknowledgment by the House that the south is a growing area. By 2010 or 2015 we will see a third of Adelaide's population living in that area. This would be an acknowledgment that there is a lack of major sporting facilities south of Darlington. Indeed, the only sporting facility with a grandstand is the Glenelg oval; there is nothing south of Glenelg oval. I freely acknowledge that in districts south of Darlington there are many sporting facilities of a small nature, and some are very good ones which the local councils have put in. However, there is no land

set aside on which a large sporting complex could be built in the future.

As I have said, the grave danger is that, if the land is not set aside for recreation and sporting facilities now, at some time in the future it could be subsumed by another agency and, once again, people in the south, in this very rapidly expanding area, would be disadvantaged and would miss out. So, I urge members to look to the future and to not agree to put this proposal on the back burner by saying, as the Government has done, that we will just have another study to report on the feasibility of retaining the land for sporting purposes. That has been occurring now in the southern region for many years.

The Crome committee was commissioned by the Government to look into the possibilities in that region. That committee had representatives from local government, the Government and sporting organisations. It recommended to the Government that land be set aside. The Government and the Minister could argue that at the moment finances do not warrant setting aside that land. The trough will bottom out eventually, and finances will become available, but we must never create a situation where land is lost that could be held for the future. There is no question about this. The Government is fudging the motion, and I ask the House to come back to the principle that land must be dedicated for sport in that region. I ask all members to support the motion.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

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

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The SPEAKER: An apology is not required: proper conduct is required.

Amendment carried.

The House divided on the motion as amended:

Ayes (20)—Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Atkinson, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Heron, Holloway (teller) and Hopgood, Mrs Hutchison, Mr Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McKee, Quirke, Rann and Trainer.

Noes (20)—Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, S.J. Baker, Becker, Blacker and Brindal, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy and Ingerson, Mrs Kotz, Messrs Lewis, Matthew, Meier, Oswald (teller), Such, Venning and Wotton.

The SPEAKER: There are 20 Ayes and 20 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I cast my vote for the Ayes.

Motion as amended thus carried.

SCHOOL WATCH

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.H. Hemmings:

That this House recognises the valuable role that School Watch plays in deterring vandalism in schools and, further, that this House congratulates those school communities currently involved in the program for their enthusiastic support.

(Continued from 14 November. Page 1927.)

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): It is only on very rare occasions that the member for Napier moves a motion that has any merit. It pleases me to say that this is one of those rare occasions. I know it must give the member for Napier some glee to think he has been successful, although deep down I think he is disappointed, because he usually moves motions knowing that he will hear a view different to his. It is a particular attribute of his to be provocative. I believe that every member of the House would support the views contained in this motion. There is no doubt that the damage

done to schools, whether through fire or by sheer vandalism, has been immense in recent years.

In my own area, the Belair school had a spate of broken windows, and only a week ago this coming Sunday one of the schools had a family gathering, and many people attended that wonderful afternoon; however, one student who had left the primary school (not a primary school student), because the school had left the doors open so that people could use the school toilets, carried out terrible vandalism with paint and other things, causing much work for the staff and a few other people.

That was not stopped because there was no Neighbourhood Watch or School Watch: it was a matter of somebody grabbing a quick opportunity to do a lot of damage in a short time. I am sure that those communities that have taken up the idea of School Watch find it an extra burden, but they do it because they believe in the school and believe in their community having better standards. They know that by showing that interest the other pupils at the school, or even those who have done the damage, will gain by what is involved, with Mum and Dad, uncles and aunts carrying out School Watch. This motion is worthy of the full support of this House, and I am sure that it will receive it. I am sure that the Liberal and National Party members fully support the efforts of the volunteers to protect not only a public asset but an asset for their children's education. I commend the motion to the House and congratulate the member for Napier on bringing the motion before us.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMING (Napier): I thank the member for Davenport for his support on behalf of the Opposition. I was a little hurt by his opening remarks as they displayed an unknown side of the honourable member. He is not usually regarded as a cynical man when it comes to motions before this House. You, Sir, know that all motions that I have placed before the House are entirely serious and come from the heart. The problem is that sometimes the Liberal Party, with its attitude to all things material rather than philosophical or emotional, tends to lose sight of what my motions are all about.

What the member for Davenport said is very true. In some of those schools that have not yet had the benefit of being incorporated into the School Watch program, there is some form of policing of those premises. The question that I pose concerning those parents is that, unless it comes under the organisational role of the Police and Education Departments, they will go down the track of vigilante groups. It is very important that parents and children do not do that. I thank all members opposite for their support and for the support that I expect to get from colleagues on my side.

Motion carried.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY 1

Adjourned debate on motion of Mrs Hutchison:

That this House notes the benefits that will flow to the rural community with the improvements to National Highway 1; namely, the duplication of the Port Wakefield Road from Two Wells to Port Wakefield and the reconstruction work between Port Pirie and Snowtown.

(Continued from 14 November. Page 1928.)

Mr VENNING (Custance): I rise briefly to support the motion moved by the member for Stuart. Much of this road goes right past my property and is in my electorate. I wish to pick up a couple of points made by the honourable member. She referred to the Crystal Brook creek: it is not a creek but is, in fact, Crystal Brook. She also referred to

the Crystal Brook bypass as being 'just on the edge of my electorate'. It is almost 27 km from the honourable member's electorate and is in fact on the edge of my farm, so I know where it is. These roads are of great benefit to the rural community and its safety and can generate much work when being built or upgraded. Such road projects mean that rural contractors benefit because Crystal Brook and surrounding areas have their fair share of contractors and, with the downscaling of council work, they are looking for employment.

I congratulate McMahon's on its work and on the fact that it utilised much of the local infrastructure, in particular contractors, and created much work. Many people were able to increase and improve their plant whilst roadworks were under way. It has an ongoing benefit. McMahon's has only just moved away with its work force but it provided up to two years work for many itinerant workers in the area, which was of great benefit. I pay a tribute to McMahon's for using the local work force. That firm brought a fair share of expertise with it but for tractor and roller drivers it used the locals, which was good. The big benefit is to the travelling public and the people who live there. Anyone driving to the city, particularly on the Two Wells to Port Wakefield section of that road, knows that it is extremely dangerous. It is a very bad section of road, in particular for those wanting to overtake, with the number of bends that occur south of Port Wakefield.

The accident rate is very high and I will breathe a sigh of relief on holiday weekends when this road is open. It has been a fairly long project and I look forward to the time when it will be completed, I understand within two years. Like the member for Stuart, I travel on this road considerably. I use it at least half the time when going back home to my electorate. I am amazed that many people do not use the alternative route when the road is busy; they do not use the Two Wells-Mallala-Balaklava road, even though it is a good highway. I am absolutely amazed when I go off on that road on the Friday of a busy long weekend that there is nobody on it.

To assist this project, I would like to see the road sealed from Balaklava right through to Snowtown and also the Blyth section of that road. It is a very good highway. When I go to Clare I go from Two Wells to Balaklava to Blyth. If the section north of Blyth through to Brinkworth were fully bituminised—half of it is, and there is only about six kilometres left—it would provide a full alternative north-south corridor in that area. So, I hope that the Government will attend to that shortly. I have spoken to the Minister about it, because when that road is wet it is dangerous. We had some particularly bad accidents there last year; that small Brinkworth section is not good. This is all covered by this motion; it is all part of the north-south corridor.

I would like to see the Government put more emphasis on the east-west corridors, particularly in the middle of the State. We have very few sealed east-west corridors but we now have almost three major north-south corridors. We do not have an east-west corridor, and that is very important to me. I hope that on completion of these projects the Government will look immediately at the question of these east-west corridors. There is now a brand new section of road between Port Pirie and Snowtown, and this has been two years in the making. Crystal Brook has not suffered from the bypass and I would congratulate the Crystal Brook council and the Crystal Brook community on promoting their town, with promotional material at the two entrances to the town and with the concept of having a forested area at the southern entrance. We are waiting on the Minister for Environment and Planning for an announcement on

this matter, and I hope she will give the okay for that area to revert to the council so it can proceed with the local native plants afforestation program there.

To the community's credit, the bypass has not been to the detriment of Crystal Brook. Many travellers come in for the beautiful pasties that are available at Crystal Brook. Travellers from Adelaide who have been on the road for two hours take the opportunity to go into Crystal Brook for a necessary break, and all concerned should be commended for the upgrading of the town's main street. As the honourable member said, the bridge work at Merriton was done with much local subcontract work. In particular, the Crystal Brook/Red Hill council did the earthworks a long time prior to the start of the project so that the earth could settle. That provided valuable income for the council. I was on that council then; it gave a valuable fillip when the financial situation was down, and I congratulate the Government and the contractor on using local people. I will be very glad when the S-bends at Red Hill are removed. Like the member for Stuart, I have been through that very dangerous section of road and I am amazed those bends have been left as they were for this length of time.

I am a little annoyed that Red Hill has only one entrance to the town, and there has been some argument about that. If possible, I would like to see two entrances, as is the case now. We need capital works such as these to get our economy going again, as I think all members would agree. We need those east-west corridors and I hope they will come next.

In this category I would also like to include the Darwin-Alice Springs railway line as a major important capital works project. It is almost reaching the stage where I can hear the Premier making the right noises on this subject. We almost have a common, bipartisan approach on it, and it might eventually happen, because the whole State will benefit, not only from constructing the project but also afterwards. The member for Stuart and I know that it will give our respective electorates a tremendous fillip. The Spalding-Burra-Morgan road is a major road link, and I note that the Government is working on it a little at a time. The locals are quite ecstatic that more is being done, but I would welcome a great push to see this major capital works program continued and completed within the next couple of years. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I will be brief in summing up. I would like to thank the member for Custance for his comments and for his support for this motion. I would also like to say that, whilst Crystal Brook might not be in my electorate now, who knows where it will be after the distribution. I would also like to make some comment in regard to the benefits to local contractors in regard to the work and also to add my congratulations to the major contractors on using local subcontractors because, as the member for Custance has rightly pointed out, jobs are very scarce in that area. For the local subcontractors to be used for that sort of work is most beneficial for the communities in which they live, and may this happen on more occasions in the future, because it is work that is badly needed and we do appreciate it.

The upgraded roads, as the honourable member said—and as I said in moving the motion—are of great benefit to us in the areas of business and tourism and, generally, in making those roads so much safer for the people who travel on them. I note his comment with regard to the alternative road; I too have used that alternative road, and sometimes it is very beneficial to do so on long weekends. His comments with regard to six kilometres which remain unsealed have certainly been taken into account.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mrs HUTCHISON: As my colleague says, we will have to put up another notice of motion about that. I agree wholeheartedly that Crystal Brook has not suffered in any way from the detour that went around the town, and that is because of the hard work that was done by the Crystal Brook council, which is to be commended. I realise that the member for Custance was on that council for some time prior to entering Parliament. I am aware of the work the council did in upgrading the main shopping area, and it certainly promoted it very well. If people travel on that road, they will see the goannas that are at the beginning of both access roads to Crystal Brook. They are extremely well done and attract the eye as one goes past, so there is a lot of incentive to go into Crystal Brook, even though the road bypasses it. That is all I need to say in closing my remarks and I would appreciate the support of the House for my motion.

Motion carried.

BERRI BRIDGE

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. P.B. Arnold:

That this House believes that the first priority for a bridge across the Murray River should be at Berri, in accordance with the undertaking of the Tonkin Government in 1981, and condemns the Premier for abandoning this commitment by diverting funds allocated for the Berri bridge to other projects and by committing funds to a bridge between Goolwa and Hindmarsh Island, thus dishonouring his promise made on coming to Government that the next bridge to be built over the Murray River would be at Berri.

(Continued from 14 November. Page 1929.)

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I oppose this motion. I think the member for Chaffey was not forthcoming when he moved this motion. A petition, signed by 459 visitors to Hindmarsh Island, was read out in the House. We also had a rather belated defence of the Tonkin Government when it said it would build the bridge. Unfortunately, when this awful Labor Government came to power, it refused to meet the pledges that were made by the Tonkin Government so, because one community has a bridge, another wants one, too—that is basically the thrust of the motion. What the member for Chaffey did not tell the House is that the Government's decision to support the construction of a bridge between Goolwa and Hindmarsh Island ahead of one at Berri had to be considered in the context of the very large differences in the nature of the two proposals.

I know that, I understand that you know that, Sir, and I know that the member for Chaffey knows that. The Hindmarsh Island bridge was not a bridge in its own right; it was merely one element of a major canal, marina and residential development proposal that was submitted for planning approval by a private developer trading under the name of Binalong Pty Ltd. The bridge was incorporated in the developer's proposal simply because of the Government's refusal to meet the cost of such a facility and a recognition on the part of the developer—a member of the private sector that members opposite are supposed to support—that the success of the proposal was dependent upon improved access to the island.

I could give a nine minute speech about this being yet another anti-development approach by the member for Chaffey on behalf of his colleagues, but, Sir, I will not; I will stick to the main thrust of the motion. The Berri proposal and the Hindmarsh bridge proposal are totally different—chalk and cheese, nothing like a level playing

field. Unfortunately, that is what members opposite do not understand.

Notwithstanding the Government's refusal—the refusal to build the bridge using funds from consolidated revenue—it did acknowledge the fact that the existence of a bridge at Goolwa would make the ferry service redundant with the result that the Department of Road Transport would save in excess of \$350 000 per year. A saving, Sir—something we hear parroted from the other side time and again. It is a classic case of the Government getting the developer to put some money in and the Government putting some money in, which would result in net savings, but the Liberal Party, through the member for Chaffey, ridicules the idea. Accordingly the Government, after due consideration, and following representations from the developer, agreed to make a contribution of the lesser amount of \$3 million, or half the cost of the bridge. For that \$3 million capital investment there will be an annual saving forever and a day of \$350 000.

With that kind of deal I would have expected the member for Chaffey to stand up and move a motion congratulating the Government and the Minister of Transport on making a very good deal on behalf of the taxpayers of this State—but, no, we do not get that. This cost-sharing arrangement, which was initially agreed to, remains unaltered even though a subsequent decision has seen the Government, through the Department of Road Transport, assume responsibility for the developer to manage and develop a scheme for the construction of the bridge. The situation at Berri is quite different. First—and I remind members opposite that they supposedly represent the private sector; they keep telling us that they want to sell off the public sector—the private sector has not, as in the case at Goolwa, volunteered a contribution towards the cost of a bridge. Sir, where are they?

Secondly, the capital cost of a bridge at Berri is much higher than at Goolwa. Planning investigations carried out by the Department of Road Transport indicate that a facility providing year-round access across the Murray, even in times of flooding and satisfying all environmental and navigational requirements, would be very expensive, probably of the order of \$30 million as opposed to the \$3 million the Government is putting into the Hindmarsh Island proposal with its resultant annual saving, forever and a day, in excess of \$350 000.

The member for Chaffey stands up and cries foul and says, 'We said we were going to do it when we were in Government but we somehow forgot, so now you should pick up the tab.' I find that rather hard to swallow, and I am sure that all real thinking members in this House would agree with me. Even a lower standard facility involving the use of the existing causeway and suffering the disadvantage of occasional but lengthy closure due to flooding is likely to cost \$20 million. So, even the second best option will cost \$20 million. Where are the businessmen over on the other side? They might be driving their BMWs or their Mercedes—they know how to do all of that—but where are they when, on the one hand, there is a proposal which will cost the taxpayer \$30 million with no return at all and, on the other hand, a \$3 million development at Hindmarsh Island with resultant annual savings of \$350 000? The mind boggles.

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

PETITION: MODBURY DOMICILIARY CARE

A petition signed by 776 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to

relocate Modbury Domiciliary Care to the Lyell McEwin Health Service was presented by Mrs Kotz.
Petition received.

STATE BANK ANNUAL REPORT

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I table the annual report for 1990-91 for the State Bank of South Australia.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: STATE BANK

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Members will recall that in presenting the 1991-92 budget the Premier also tabled the accounts for 1990-91 of the State Bank of South Australia. He indicated that, while the statutory accounts were in strict compliance with the Corporations Law, the bank intended to also release accounts which fully consolidate all off balance sheet companies in accordance with the new accounting standard AAS 24. At that time the Premier indicated that these accounts were expected to be prepared in advance of most other corporations and that the new accounts would not make a material difference to the bank's results. I am pleased today to be able to present to the Parliament the State Bank of South Australia's annual report which has been prepared under the requirements of the Corporation Law and the Australian Accounting Standard AAS 24.

In summary, the new accounts consolidate all off balance sheet entities on to the group's accounts. The AAS 24 standard has broadened the scope of what constitutes the subsidiary to include previously excluded entities such as trusts, partnerships and joint ventures controlled by the group. As the Premier indicated, there are no material changes to the bank's result as a result of complying to this new accounting standard. The impact is detailed in note 28 to the accounts. The major changes were an increase in land and buildings of \$170 million and reductions in loans of \$120 million and a reduction in investments of \$60 million. I am happy to report that the State Bank is the first Australian bank to comply with this new accounting standard, and I believe this achievement is a reflection of the new direction and focus of the State Bank management and board.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister of Forests (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder)—
South Australian Timber Corporation—Report, 1990-91.

QUESTION TIME

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Minister of Employment and Further Education support Dr Hewson's proposal for a GST as a realistic way of abolishing payroll tax and creating jobs?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am certainly delighted to get a question from the Leader of the Opposition—or from anyone—particularly at a time when he confronts his own job, and we hear that the member for Bragg is one vote short,

just one vote short. He is trying to work on the member for Kavel. He is waiting to see whether the Leader of the Opposition has the guts to call for the reshuffle that he planned for June and postponed until December.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is well aware of the Standing Order that stipulates that responses cannot be debated. I draw his attention to that Standing Order.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am sorry, Sir, I was over-excited by getting a question. In this morning's radio and in this morning's news, the Premier has made very detailed comments about payroll tax, as he has done on many occasions, about how he would like to get rid of payroll tax. We should all want to get rid of payroll tax, as long as we have the revenue. However, we do not want to do what the Liberals propose, which is to sack policemen and nurses—and with all the rest of the cuts that they intend to impose.

Before the Leader of the Opposition gets too excited about the GST, I suggest that everyone have a look at the situation in New Zealand, my old country, if they think that is the panacea. The fact is that it needs more than a coat of paint; it is ground zero in terms of the economy over there at the moment. Let me say this to the Leader of the Opposition before he gets too cocky. We know that he has hung his banner on a State consumption tax. We will fight members opposite in the delis, in the supermarkets and on the housing estates. When people realise that \$100 000 is going to cost them \$115 000, we will find out how phoney the Leader of the Opposition is.

GLENELG RECYCLING

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Can the Minister of Environment and Planning inform the House whether the Government is handballing recycling programs to local councils, as claimed by a member of the Glenelg council? *The Messenger Guardian* of 20 November 1991 carried a front page article reporting that Susan Lenehan had written to the Glenelg council in her private capacity as a ratepayer, asking the council to consider making recycling a priority. The article states that Alderman Dave Potter said that he was sick and tired of the Government handballing any idea to another council.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I did get to read that article about midnight last night when I removed the paper from my front garden.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am sorry the honourable member did not share that with me: I would have been very pleased. I thank the honourable member for his question. As I said, I did read these remarks and I note that, in spite of the remarks by Alderman Potter, the council did agree to move forward by seeking a report on what recycling schemes are being operated in other adjoining councils and the associated costs. Also, I am pleased to note that, in spite of Alderman Potter's views, commonsense has prevailed with the Glenelg council, and I congratulate Mayor Nadilo and other councillors and aldermen on their hard work and the cooperative way in which they work with the State Government to advance the needs of the community.

In particular, I would like to congratulate and recognise the role that Alderman Mikki Bouchee has played in supporting what I thought was my very gentle request to the council to look at a recycling kerbside collection scheme for Glenelg. She is quoted as saying that it was time the council became leaders and not followers in recycling. I am sure other members of the House who are also residents of the Glenelg council area would support my calling for what is

just a kerbside collection scheme that does exist in other council areas and other parts of the world.

It is important that I clearly spell out that there has been a deal of communication with the Glenelg council about what is available, and I thought I should share that with the House. I can inform the House that, as many members know, there is a recycling fund, which was initially advertised in the press. A letter dated 7 May 1990 was then sent to all councils, including Glenelg council.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am wearing the Glenelg colours today, so it is quite appropriate.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I do not get out of bed and dress according to the various football teams in Adelaide. I am sorry to disappoint members, but that is not how I get ready for the day's work. In fact, councils, including the Glenelg council, pay into the recycling fund yearly through a levy on councils. The establishment of the fund was reported on page 24 of the Waste Management Commission's annual report 1989-90 and in two circular newsletters sent out by the commission entitled 'Waste Lines'. Issues Nos 5 and 6 were both sent to Glenelg council and these contain details of the fund.

A copy of the fund guidelines was sent to all councils, and technical officers discussed the levy and the fund when undertaking inspections. It is interesting to note that Alderman Potter was suggesting that there is nothing available for councils in terms of support if councils wish to introduce initiatives such as kerbside collection schemes. As I have just clearly outlined, the council has been notified on numerous occasions of some of the supports available through the Waste Management Commission.

In concluding, it is important to point out that recycling and reuse become a joint effort involving everyone in the community. It should be addressed at all levels of government. I am sure that members of this House are only too aware of what the State Government is doing with respect to waste minimisation, reuse and recycling, because on many occasions I have informed the House of initiatives as we have undertaken them. I do not wish to involve myself with some kind of name calling with Alderman Potter. I would like cooperation and a spirit of working together, as other members of the Glenelg council have demonstrated. I look forward to the support of my colleagues on both sides of the House in working to get absolutely adequate kerbside collection schemes and recycling programs in place in South Australia.

PAYROLL TAX

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister of Unemployment and Further Education.

The SPEAKER: Order! The 'Minister of Employment and Further Education' is the correct title and must be used.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Does the Minister believe that the abolition of payroll tax would be the single best policy reform to create jobs in Australia and, if so, why has not the Premier led the national campaign against payroll tax that he first promised more than 10 years ago? Why has not the Government sought an undertaking from the Hawke Government for sufficient revenue to enable the States to abolish payroll tax?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I understand that the Deputy Leader is also about to get the flick as well. He lives by the policy and his credo: 'Always be sincere, even if you have

to fake it.' The answer is that that is a load of rubbish. He knows what we have just spelt out in terms of payroll tax. He should come up with a solution that does not involve what the Liberals want to do, namely, to smash the unemployed, to cut back on nursing, education and social security, and to do what has been done in New Zealand, where my mum has to pay \$75 to go to the doctor.

NATIONAL GEOSCIENCE MAPPING ACCORD

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Mines and Energy inform the House what progress is being made in South Australia under the national geoscience mapping accord? The recently tabled annual report of the Department of Mines and Energy makes a number of references to the accord and its objectives. However, any information that the Minister has available on specific projects under way or planned would be of interest.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on the Minister, I ask all members to cease conversation across the Chamber. The Minister of Mines and Energy.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for her question on this important agreement, which, as all members would be aware, involves a joint effort by the Commonwealth and the States to improve our geological understanding of this continent. The geoscientific programs being undertaken as part of the accord are important not only to help maximise the return to the community from the nation's petroleum, mineral and water resources but also to provide an integrated approach to conservation and sustainable development. I inform the House that the major airborne geophysical survey, funded by the Commonwealth, has begun in the far north of South Australia as part of the accord.

The survey is investigating the North Gawler craton, a vast geological province in central South Australia, extending from Tarcoola towards the Northern Territory border. That craton includes the Roxby Downs or Olympic Dam deposit, and is believed by geologists to be of great economic potential. As part of the State's contribution to the accord, we have already committed substantial resources to mapping of the province, including a major drilling program by the department in progress near Tarcoola. The new survey, over approximately 16 500 square kms, is being carried out by the Commonwealth Bureau of Mineral Resources, using an Aero Commander aircraft equipped with the latest geophysical and navigation equipment.

The aircraft is based at Coober Pedy while it flies the first half of the survey, east of the Stuart Highway. The second half will be flown next year. High resolution data from the airborne surveys are an essential element in the production of geophysical maps and datasets to guide mineral exploration. This is particularly important in this section of South Australia, because much of the underlying rock is hidden by soil and various other cover. This survey is important and, when the data it yields is combined with the data being gathered by the Department of Mines and Energy, I am optimistic that it will stimulate an increased exploration effort in this province, as indeed it did in the previous province where such geophysical surveys were undertaken.

INCOME TAX SHARING

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I address my question to the Minister of Finance. Does the Govern-

ment welcome and endorse the Federal Coalition's State income tax sharing policy commitment? This morning the Leader of the Opposition held discussions with John Hewson, who is in Canberra, and the Federal Coalition Leader has now written to him stating that 'the Coalition would be prepared to make room to provide the States with a permanent share of income tax revenue while also protecting equalisation top-up grants for the less prosperous States'. This offer is in all major respects what the States had proposed before it was rejected by Mr Keating and the Prime Minister.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am very flattered to be asked this question. I am not the Acting Treasurer; we have the Acting Treasurer here, and he deals with these matters as a matter of course. However, I welcome the invitation to make some remarks to the House about the Federal Liberal Party's proposal, which is strongly supported by all members opposite. I have read that the Leader suggests that he is the greatest supporter of John Hewson.

A lot of things alarmed me about the package when I woke up this morning and read it, and they will be detailed in the days, weeks and months to come, because there are great flaws in the package. It will give a great deal of pleasure to members on this side to point them out to the House and all members of the South Australian community. What did alarm me—and I have heard it before—was the statement that there would be massive cuts in the public sector. Where will they fall?

Dr ARMITAGE: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. I draw your attention to Standing Order 98, headed 'No debate allowed'. It provides that in answer to a question the Minister may not debate the matter to which the question refers. Clearly, the Minister was debating the matter to which the question refers.

The SPEAKER: I think that in answering any question a pure 'Yes' or 'No' is not always the answer. As I recall it, the question was whether the Minister would comment on the income tax sharing and the new goods and services tax proposals, and I would ask the Minister to direct his remarks to that matter.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I have, I suppose, set the scene. But it does make me cross when the member for Adelaide stops me from speaking in this way. If a question as broad and political as this is asked, one tends to give an answer which encompasses a broad field, but the member for Adelaide—the big baby—gets up and squeals. If members opposite do not like it, then do not ask the question.

As regards the specific question, when I read this morning that there would be significant cuts to the public sector and significant cuts to the States, I thought, 'Here we go again. I have heard this before.' What we can guarantee, virtually of any Federal Government, is that it will balance its budget and fix up its deficit at the expense of the States. We have made no secret of the fact that we are very cross that over recent years, if our share of Federal taxation had been maintained in this State, we would be \$400 million better off each year in grants from the Federal Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: What I cannot see is a Federal Government under John Hewson—although it has to get there yet; there is a long way to go—being any more generous to the States than any other Federal Government.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Well, of course I have not, because that is for the Treasurer; you asked me. I can only respond to you in terms of the responsibilities of the Minister of Finance. If you seek an answer on tax sharing

between the States and the Federal Government, you will have to ask the Treasurer. You have been here long enough to know that.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to direct his response through the Chair.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: To summarise the position, the Federal Government, whether it be Liberal or Labor, appears to be bent on policies that solve its problems at the expense of the States which deliver to the people services such as health, education and law and order. So, all I can see from a Federal Liberal Government, if it were elected, would be more unhappiness and misery for State Governments and the people to whom they supply those services.

AERIAL FIREFIGHTING APPLIANCE

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Emergency Services say whether the Port Adelaide fire station will retain the use of an aerial appliance for the purpose of fighting certain types of fires and for rescue work? I have been informed that the Port Adelaide station has had a 'Sky Jet' aerial appliance for the past 13 years but that it is to be transferred to another station and will not be replaced. Concern has been expressed to me over the possible loss of this invaluable piece of equipment in an area of very high fire risk.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Based on the honourable member's information, he is perfectly right to be concerned, because aerial appliances are, of course, very valuable and useful pieces of firefighting equipment. I understand that this appliance, which is usually stationed at Port Adelaide, is currently undergoing a major overhaul and is not expected to be back in service for some time. Regardless of the physical location of the various units around the State and the city of Adelaide, and throughout the period of maintenance and overhaul of this particular unit, the MFS has assured me that the recommendations of the Cox report will be complied with. The relevant recommendation is that there will be a six to nine minute response time for all units, including the aerial unit, and that will be maintained 24 hours a day.

EXAMINATION PAPERS

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): Will the Minister of Education investigate whether year 12 exam papers have been sold prior to examination day and take action to ensure that no honest students are disadvantaged? Yesterday, I was contacted by a constituent whose daughter witnessed the apparent sale of a year 12 mathematics 1 exam paper for \$250 while she was doing some history revision in the State Library on Tuesday. The student was crouching down to take a history book from a bottom shelf in the library when she overheard and saw, while she herself was not seen by those involved, two matriculation-age males in the adjoining corridor swap a mathematics 1 exam paper for what she heard was \$250. The student also heard the males involved say that the paper was one to be examined the next day.

Checks with SABSA have confirmed that both mathematics 1 and mathematics IS exams were held yesterday morning; I therefore feel confident in raising this important matter publicly now without causing anxiety among students sitting the exams. I can supply the Minister with further details in the hope that the parties can be appre-

hended and dealt with, together with anyone else who has benefited from such cheating.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: When I arrived at the House this afternoon, there was a letter on my desk indicating that the honourable member had received this allegation at his electorate office. I understand that the information that was passed to him is hearsay; it is the view of someone else who spoke to someone else who said that they heard this was so. I point out that this is a very serious allegation as it involves criminal behaviour. However, it also involves the confidence of every student in this State who will undertake public examinations in the examination system. So, the honourable member has put at risk the confidence of students who are currently undertaking examinations in this State in our examination system.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Why did he raise it in the House? He has harmed irreparably any proper investigation of this allegation. The honourable member has made it incredibly difficult to conduct an investigation of this matter, which could have been done effectively, efficiently and quickly if he had held his counsel. When I arrived in the House, I also received a note from the press saying that they had been contacted previously by the honourable member and asking for comment from me on this issue. Clearly, this House is being used in a very cheap, political way to gain publicity for the honourable member.

I can see no other reason why he would want to deal with it in this way, releasing it to the press and then raising this matter in the House. Here we have hearsay evidence of this matter being used in this forum to get publicity in the middle of the public examination period in this State. Every student, every teacher and every parent has now been put in some form of doubt about the validity of the examination system and the security of these papers. I can tell honourable members that the Senior Secondary Assessment Board of this State—

The Hon. H. ALLISON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I believe the Minister has been attributing improper motives to the honourable member in his answer to this question.

The SPEAKER: This situation has arisen before in this Parliament and the ruling has been made (and it is one that I uphold) that it must be the member concerned who takes offence at the remarks made; points of order may not be taken on behalf of any other member.

Mr MATTHEW: On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

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

Mr MATTHEW: Improper motives were attributed to me and an incorrect allegation was made. I made no contact with the press, and I ask the Minister to withdraw that remark.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I withdraw the comment that the honourable member may have contacted the press. The reality is that someone has contacted the press and the Opposition has asked me to comment on the allegations that, surprisingly, the honourable member raised in the House a moment ago. Perhaps there is mental telepathy abroad amongst the media in the community or they have some other mysterious way of finding out this information. If that is so, I deeply regret any inference the honourable member has taken for his coincidental raising of this matter, isolated from any contact the press may have had with him and with his constituent about this matter.

I will certainly have the matter investigated by the police this afternoon. They can interview the honourable member and his constituent to get to the bottom of this matter

quickly. The Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia jealously guards the public examination process of this State. This State has an excellent record in the conduct of public examinations; I think it is well regarded right around this country. There is very little complaint about these matters in this State, given the thousands and thousands of examination papers that are issued each year right around South Australia, and the very complex way examinations are conducted in the senior secondary years. I am most distressed and disappointed that this matter has been raised in this way, and I want to reassure every student who is sitting for public examinations, every teacher, all those students' parents and the community at large that I have great confidence in our public examination system.

SMOKE-FREE ZONES

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): My question is directed to the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Labor. Will the Minister advise Parliament whether discussions have been held between health authorities and shopping centre owners with a view to declaring shopping centres smoke-free zones? I have received a letter from a Seaton constituent who advises me in the following terms:

Arising from a family discussion we decided to write to you requesting that you take up with your ministerial colleague the issue of banning smoking in all regional shopping centres as a first step to making all enclosed shopping centres smoke-free.

Our reason for this request is the attached newspaper article we found in an interstate newspaper. Our family finds it offensive to have our health, clothes etc. invaded by cigarette smokers—even worse when we eat our meals at these centres.

The article which was enclosed refers to the decision that was made in this year's Federal court case between the Australian Federation of Consumer Organisations and the Tobacco Industry of Australia in which Justice Morling ruled that passive smoking could be harmful.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will refer the question to my colleague and get him to reply to the member for Albert Park.

OPERATION HYGIENE

Mr SUCH (Fisher): My question is directed to the Minister of Emergency Services. Following the reported statements in the *News* yesterday by former convicted policeman, Glen Hunt, about the alleged illegal activities of some of his former police colleagues, which mirror statements made by other former policemen, and the reported comments of Mr Justice Stewart regarding Moyes, and others, will the Minister persuade the Police Commissioner to reverse his intention to wind down the activities of Operation Hygiene, and will he say whether adequate resources will be provided for it to maintain a high level of investigation?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The Commissioner set up Operation Hygiene to respond to a particular set of allegations. The operation was successful in that it found that a number of people had in fact behaved very badly some years ago, and, since those needs have petered out, the operation is now being slowly wound up. If there are further allegations that need to be investigated, I am quite certain that that will be done by the police with the same amount of energy and the same amount of dedication as was shown in Operation Hygiene. Whether that is done under a reconstituted Operation Hygiene or under another operation is quite irrelevant. What really matters is that operations are pursued and pursued effectively.

CROYDON PARK COLLEGE OF TAFE

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education explain why he has approved the closure of the Hairdressing and Cosmetology School at the Croydon college of TAFE? The hairdressing school at Croydon Park TAFE is well respected by employers and well patronised by apprentices. Many women from the Parks and from West Croydon enjoy serving as models for the apprentices. I have been approached by models and by members of the council of Croydon Park TAFE who cannot understand why the decision has been taken and they are worried that instructors will lose their jobs and that apprentices will be unable to complete their training.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I very much appreciate the strong support of members of Parliament for our TAFE network. I know that the honourable member has a very strong commitment to the Croydon Park college of TAFE. The hairdressing and cosmetology facility at the Croydon Park college of TAFE is indeed to be closed. This is certainly in no way a reflection on the quality of the staff. We certainly appreciate the support and input of everyone who is involved in the hairdressing school, and that includes the lecturers, the students and the models who come in to the college. However, in looking at the best training needs for our young people, we need to look more widely than the Croydon Park college and consider how we deliver our programs and where we deliver them across the changing needs of the whole Adelaide area.

In general terms, the great strength of TAFE in South Australia is its ability to respond to changing circumstances. No school can see itself in isolation from the rest of the colleges; no college can see itself in isolation from the rest of the metropolitan area and of the State; and indeed no State can see itself in isolation from the concept of national goals with local responsiveness. So, the energy that is put into preserving local concerns to the detriment of the wider issues is wasted energy. TAFE must maintain its service to the whole of the hairdressing and cosmetology industry.

Hairdressing training is currently offered at Adelaide, Croydon Park, Elizabeth, Noarlunga and Tea Tree Gully colleges. TAFE has an over-supply of facilities, particularly in the metropolitan area. The facilities at Croydon Park are now inadequate and out of date, as the members who have visited the school would realise. In this difficult financial environment, TAFE cannot afford to have some of its most modern, efficient and purpose-built facilities, such as those at Adelaide College, not fully used, while maintaining an inadequate facility. It cannot afford to have some of its staff serving the outer metropolitan area not fully used, and it cannot afford to ignore the needs of the industry in the south-western suburbs and in some outer metropolitan areas.

Whilst this is a rationalisation of the facilities, it will not result in a reduction in service to the industry. Without this closure it is unlikely that the department would be able to maintain the service at current levels. It is a difficult decision, but one that is taking into account the longer term interests of the industry, the staff and the students. Indeed, a survey of local industries showed that fewer than a third had any concerns about the course at Croydon Park being closed. I emphasise that no apprentices will be unable to finish their training.

I understand the local member's concern in this area, but I can indicate that it is likely that most of the Croydon Park apprentices will go to Adelaide College. Enrolments will be guided by home post-codes, to minimise travel. Some apprentices will find their new college less convenient to get to, while others will find it more convenient. Many

of the students who now attend Croydon and have to catch public transport that passes Adelaide College will have to change buses to reach Croydon.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Because members are interjecting, I point out that there were no protests when we took away commercial photography from Elizabeth college and brought it down to Croydon College in the middle of the year. We saw no demonstrations in the streets outside Parliament. There were no protests when the State Government spent over \$1 million upgrading the Kilkenny branch of Croydon TAFE to provide for community services training and to make Croydon TAFE the major provider of community services training in South Australia. There were no protests when the State and Federal Governments put in millions of dollars for the magnificent printing and visual communication centre, which opened yesterday. Change is unnerving, but it must be embraced for the betterment of TAFE and our industry.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY STUDY

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): My question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. Who are the consultants who have been commissioned for the Government's economic development strategy study and what progress have they made? What is the final contract price? More than two months ago the Premier announced that the economic situation was so grave that his Government was as a matter of priority undertaking an economic development strategy study which would be completed by May 1992.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: A.R. Little and Company are the selected consultants. I will have to get information on the actual contract price for that consultancy. I am due to see representatives of the consultants in the next week or so. They have already had an initial briefing from the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology and I anticipate that the original schedule indicated by the Premier will be adhered to.

IMMIGRATION

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Can the Minister of Ethnic Affairs advise the House on the progress of his request to the Bureau of Immigration Research for analytical work on South Australia's immigration patterns?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I can advise that 2½ years ago at a meeting with the then newly appointed Director of the Bureau of Immigration Research, Dr John Nieuwenham, I had discussions with him about the motivation of people in selecting various parts of Australia when settling from overseas. It was clear that South Australia had not had a reasonable share of the settlement in Australia compared to some other States. I believe that was an area worthy of further research.

Of course, part of the bureau's charter is to undertake precisely that. That issue was taken on board by Dr Nieuwenham and he put in place a research program. I am pleased to say that that has been completed and yesterday I was invited officially to launch the outcome of that program in the form of a book. In fact, the program was expanded slightly—although in a way, I suppose, significantly—to take into account two other States. One was Tasmania, which has had a small share of Australia's migration, and the other was Western Australia, which has had

a larger share than its population share might indicate.

The bureau tried to draw some themes from those three States to determine what it is that policy makers at either Federal or State levels can do to effect future migration flows, remembering that in some cases there would be the desire to reduce migration flows—for example, in New South Wales where the infrastructure is already significantly under pressure as a result of its receiving about 40 per cent of Australia's new settlers—while other States (like South Australia) are eager to increase and even double their share. It is pleasing to note that, while we have not yet reached our population share, we have seen it grow from less than 4 per cent to about 5.2 or 5.3 per cent.

However, there are two areas of the book about which comment needs to be made. One is a correction, a misunderstanding, where, at about page 81, reference is made to the business migration figures in South Australia. It claims that the Business Migration unit of South Australia can claim no credit for the good achievements South Australia had from 1984-85 to 1989-90 because, according to the book, it was established only in July 1990.

That, of course, is wrong. The Business Migration Unit was established in 1984 and can take credit for the massive improvement in the BMP figures, until the impact of Federal Government policy changes in 1989-90 effectively disadvantaged smaller States like South Australia. The authors were probably referring to the establishment of the Immigration Promotion Unit within the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology, which took place only in July 1990. Whilst putting aside that error, I point out that for the most part the book is based on factual data. The analysis of it is certainly very sound. Of course, data is only a statistical snapshot of circumstances at a point in time. Some of the data is quite recent, but other data is not.

It makes comments about interstate movements and identifies that South Australia has been a losing State in terms of people moving out more frequently than people moving in but, by their own statistical tables, the authors acknowledge that the figures were based on the period 1981 to 1985. As I have said previously, we have seen a turnabout in that area in the last half of the decade, and South Australia is now one of the three States of Australia that gains in net terms from interstate migration.

It is a useful document. I congratulate the bureau on the work it has done, in particular Meredith Baker and Francis Robinson from the National Institute of Labour Studies in Adelaide, along with their colleagues in Western Australia and Tasmania. It will be very useful for policy making, but further statistics should be taken into account in analysing the conclusions of this useful document.

DEPARTMENTAL ADVISORY SERVICES

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): Will the Minister of Education confirm that the Minister of Finance has stopped proposals by the Minister of Education to charge schools for departmental advisory services currently provided at no cost to schools? On 27 August 1991 the Minister of Education released the Education Department's submission to GARG. In that release the Minister said:

Specialist consultants, appointed on fixed term contracts, will operate from these teacher and student support centres to provide schools with advice on issues such as curriculum, special education, Aboriginal education, equal opportunity and school management. Schools will be able to purchase these services from the support centres or elsewhere.

A senior Government source has confirmed that, at a recent meeting with the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Edu-

cation, the Director-General of Education and others, the Minister of Finance rejected this proposal with the comment that it sounded like a 'proposal from the H.R. Nicholls Society, not a Labor Government'.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I know nothing of this matter. I will make some inquiries.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I am reliably advised by my colleague on my right that he knows nothing about it, either. I can only assume that the honourable member has once again been picking up gossip. He is only too keen to ascertain who says what at which meeting, to whom, and where, whether the story has been told three or four times to someone else's grandmother. He picks it up and gleefully rushes into the Parliament and, with all the authority of the Parliament, he raises it in the House as though it were fact. He does not care a damn about the damage it does to the reputation of officers in the department or to negotiations that have been proceeding on these matters. It is all good grist to the mill.

The honourable member has found another opportunity to have a cheap shot at State schools in this State. It has been revealed in statements of the Federal Opposition today and yesterday that it will implement a voucher system for education under its education policy, and that is the beginning of the end for State school systems in this country and for equity of opportunity in education. The honourable member may like to explain to the House at some appropriate stage how he can defend a voucher system for education. Like his colleague who asked me a question previously, the honourable member, I suggest, should reflect a little before getting up in this place and making allegations, seeking cheap publicity in this way.

WATER RATES

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Is the Minister of Water Resources aware of concerns that have been expressed by the Spencer Gulf Cities Association with regard to a total user-pays system for water rates? If not, will the Minister undertake to allay the concerns of the Spencer Gulf Cities Association with assurances that this Government will not use such a system, which the association considers will seriously discriminate against non-metropolitan residents?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for bringing this matter to the attention of the Parliament on behalf of her constituents.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: And mine.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Yes, and on behalf of other members who have constituencies in the Spencer Gulf area. It has always been the policy of this Government that the price it charges for water should be the same in both the country and the metropolitan areas. I remind the House that the deficit on country operations was some \$36.161 million for 1990-91, and that is made up from subsidies from metropolitan operations. For example, during 1990-91 the price of water applied to all consumers throughout the State was 80c per kilolitre. However, the cost to the Engineering and Water Supply Department of providing water to the northern regions of the State, including the Spencer Gulf cities, was \$1.57 per kilolitre. I would like to reassure the Spencer Gulf Cities Association and members of this House, particularly the member for Stuart—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: And the member for Whyalla.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN:—and the Minister of Transport, that the Government policy of subsidising the cost of providing water to country areas will not be affected by the

introduction of a new residential water rating system. I believe it is important that South Australians, right across the length and breadth of the State, recognise that water is a scarce resource which must be conserved if we are to ensure adequate supplies for future South Australians and to keep the cost of providing it to the lowest reasonable level. The introduction of a significant user-pays component will, for the first time in this State, indicate to water users the magnitude of the costs relating to the volume of water used. Therefore, I reiterate that we will certainly continue the system of cross-subsidising from the metropolitan to country areas to provide safe and available water.

MYPONGA WATER FILTRATION PLANT

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Can the Minister of Water Resources confirm that the only reason why a Victorian company won the E&WS tender at the Myponga water filtration plant site was that the E&WS specified 820 hours to do the work rather than specifying the completion of the job, and will she explain why she told the House that the local tenderer also lost out because the contractor had the wrong class of equipment? Last week the Minister explained that her department's failure to give the Myponga job to a South Australian company was based on cost and the E&WS specification of a particular class of earth-moving machinery, not on E&WS bureaucratic attitudes.

I have been advised that the E&WS specified 820 hours of work instead of completion of the job, which meant that an efficient local contractor who could finish the work in about 300 hours lost the tender. I have also been informed that the Minister's answer wrongly suggested that local contractors were excluded because their equipment was too large. In fact the tender specified a minimum size of equipment and stated that 'it is not intended to preclude tenderers from offering a machine of a higher classification'.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: In answering the honourable member's question, I would like to make two points very clear. As I understood it, one of the questions that was asked by the Opposition concerned the rate per hour. The member for Kavel in particular kept shouting across the Chamber, 'But what was their rate per hour?' I indicated that the information that had been provided to me by the department concerned the total cost for the job. I had in front of me a list of the quotations for the completed cost of the job. I think from memory there were about six or seven tenderers for the work at Myponga. Looking closely at the seven tender prices, I see that the cost associated with the successful tenderer was almost half that of the tenderer to whom the honourable member referred, and I had asked the department what was the total cost of the job.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The honourable member just cannot help himself. It is quite amazing! Obviously, he has a self-discipline problem: he just cannot contain himself.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: My colleagues have reflected on the member for Heysen's manners, but I have to say that he is not always quite this ill-mannered. At times, he shows that he has quite good manners.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: As I was trying to say before I was so rudely interrupted, I would be very pleased to look at the question that the honourable member has raised. I obtained information on the total cost for the completion

of the job, but I would be very pleased to instigate further investigations to see whether the department specified a certain number of hours. I have given very clear instructions to my three departments that where the tender pricing is very close we should look very favourably at South Australian contractors. I remind the honourable member to pick up on an answer that my colleague the Minister of Employment and Further Education has given: we are not living in some kind of vacuum. Although we are South Australian, we are part of Australia; we are not talking about someone who has dropped in from the moon or who has arrived from some outer part of the earth getting a contract. We are talking about fellow Australians; yet, the parochialness—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The kind of ridiculous behaviour with which the Opposition is carrying on amazes me. I have indicated that I would be pleased to get the information for the honourable member, but in so doing I remind him that perhaps he needs to take a broader look at this whole issue and to put things into some kind of perspective and not to react in this very childish way with respect to this matter.

TAXI PLATES

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Will the Minister of Finance advise the House whether it is his policy to levy stamp duty on contracts for the transfer of taxi plates executed before 8 November 1991? Why has stamp duty not hitherto been levied on such transfers before they were registered with the Metropolitan Taxi Cab Board? A newsletter issued by the Associated Independent Taxi Cab Operators complains that a taxi owner, Mr Severino Barbaro, has been summonsed for failure to pay stamp duty (and a penalty for non-payment) on a contract he wrote to buy a taxi plate. Most taxi owners sell their plates by oral contract and the transfers are then registered by the Metropolitan Taxi Cab Board.

Some taxi owners have now received a circular from the Commissioner of Stamps telling them they are liable for duty on their plate transfers past, present and to come and declaring a moratorium on penalties for non-payment provided the taxi owners confess and pay duty on their transfers of the past four years. The newsletter complains that the Metropolitan Taxi Cab Board, a State Government agency required by law to register transfers, has never made mention of stamp duty, even though section 27 of the Stamp Duties Act requires that a person whose office it is to register instruments shall not register one unless it is stamped. In conclusion, I would like to acknowledge the member for Hanson's vigorous pursuit of this matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Finance.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: In response to the first question about whether it is my policy to do whatever it was the honourable member was detailing, the answer is that it is irrelevant whether or not it is my policy; it just happens to be the law, which was passed by this Parliament. I know the member for Spence, as would every other member of this House, would agree that people ought to obey the law, and I am sure that he would not want his question misinterpreted as encouraging me to intervene in the law on behalf of somebody so that they did not have to pay a legally liable tax. I cannot believe for one minute that the member for Spence would advocate such a thing; I am sure that he does not and I am sure that he would be happy to know that I would do no such thing.

The law of the land is as written; anybody is entitled to go to the courts and have an interpretation of it and that is what the courts are there for. Mr Barbaro's name was raised here but, as that matter is before the courts, I will not go into any great detail. If it is *sub judice* now in the answer, I think it ought to have been *sub judice* in the question. I do not want to go into Mr Barbaro's case, as it is before the courts, and that is the proper place for it to be resolved. Suffice to say, I will certainly not issue any instructions to the State Taxation Office or the Commissioner of State Taxation, one way or another. I stay right out of these matters—as far away from them as I can possibly get—and I am sure every member in the same position would want to do the same thing.

In his question the member for Spence was factually incorrect when he suggested that, where there has been a transfer of a taxi business since 1987, no stamp duty has been paid. That is incorrect. Stamp duty has been paid on the transfer of several taxi businesses. It is clear that compliance is not as high as it ought to be in this area of transferring taxi businesses; nevertheless, surely those taxi owners who have purchased the business—which clearly attracts stamp duty—and have paid the duty are entitled to see those people who have not paid dealt with in an appropriate manner.

An appropriate manner, as far as I am concerned, is that people who have purchased a taxi business and who feel they have not fully complied with the law, as some of their colleagues have, should contact the State Taxation Office and, in particular, the Commissioner of State Taxation and discuss the problem with him. They will find, as have many other South Australians who have found themselves in the same or a similar position working in other industries, that the Commissioner of State Taxation is a very reasonable person. He has already offered an amnesty as regards penalties to these people who have not yet complied with the law.

In addition, he has offered a time payment process so that, if people are financially embarrassed by paying a significant lump sum, they can make some arrangements to pay a meaningful amount that would be agreed between the taxpayer and the Commissioner of State Taxation. So, I believe that the State Taxation Office has been extraordinarily reasonable. I think the majority of taxpayers in South Australia would agree with that, and I will certainly not in any way intervene in the business of the State Taxation Office, for taxi drivers or anybody else.

RURAL PRICES

Mr MEIER (Goyder): What is the Minister of Agriculture's estimate of how many South Australian farmers will be forced off their properties by July next year, and what new measures does his Government plan to reduce this number? The Minister will have read a report in the *Advertiser* this morning, quoting from a study by the Bureau of Agriculture and Resources Economics, in which it predicts that 10 000 more farmers throughout Australia will quit the land this financial year because of plunging farm profits.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Crystal ball gazing is a very difficult art and is not one in which I would want to claim any particular ability, and I think also that there is a particular danger in speculating figures without knowing what the impact of those speculations might be. I have said on previous occasions that there can be such a thing as talking down a situation and, if one were to take those sorts of figures of 10 000 farms and take the South Australian share

of that, that could result in a figure, depending on which base one uses, whether it be a population base or a farm enterprise base, that could be anywhere between 800 and 1 200 farms, in relation to farms that would go in South Australia. I do not think that is a reasonable assessment to be speculating on, when there are so many things as yet unknown about the outcome of the current season.

In any event, my gut feeling is that that figure would be way too high, in terms of those farmers that might be in real difficulties by the middle of next year. However, we are still awaiting the receipt of details of various figures, including details of what this harvest will bring. As the honourable member would know, the harvest is in the process of being taken at the moment, and in the case of South Australia some very good results are being achieved in a number of areas. Indeed, I am told that in some areas record results are being achieved.

The next factor that is clearly important with respect to cereal growers relates to the price that they will achieve. Again, recent news indicates that the earlier pessimistic forecasts at the start of the year are not going to materialise, that it is likely that a much higher return will be achieved. I remind the honourable member of the information that I gave to this House some time ago, that the work done by the Department of Agriculture has indicated, in the case of wheat, for example, that wheat farmers could make a go of it in terms of not seeing their fixed debt increase if the price of wheat was in excess of \$135 per tonne. We are now looking at a situation where the price is in excess of \$150 and, possibly, \$155 per tonne.

The next factor relates to the impact of weather conditions. We know that the north part of the east coast has had disastrous conditions and it is highly likely that many of the farm numbers referred to by the author of the article relate to that part of Australia, rather than to South Australia. The recent changes to rural assistance, announced by the Federal Government after consultation with the States, are to be applauded. I believe that they will offer an effective means of supporting farmers in Australia. We in South Australia, for our part, will not use the savings that are given back to us as a result of the change in Commonwealth-State funding of Part B. Instead, I have committed myself to maintaining those State funds in the rural assistance area, possibly in the area, for example, of financial counselling. Whatever the case, there will be ongoing discussions with the Federal Minister about those matters.

POTATO BACTERIAL WILT

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Can the Minister of Agriculture provide any information to the House in regard to the containment of bacterial wilt in potatoes and advise what action should be taken by growers to reduce the likelihood of infestation? The Minister will be aware that, on behalf of potato growers in my electorate, I have already queried this matter of the spread of potato cyst nematode and, as a result of the Minister's answer, I have been able to reassure the potato growers in this regard. However, I have had raised with me the spectre of widespread infestation, through bacterial wilt of potatoes, which could result in severe loss of income.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question, which is apparently the subject of conversation around the shopping malls of Munno Para and Elizabeth. Certainly, of course, there are potato growers within that area, so I am aware that bacterial wilt is of concern to those growers, and of course it should be of

concern to anyone who has concern for our rural sector in South Australia. For the benefit of members who may not be aware, I point out that bacterial wilt is caused by a bacterium, *pseudomonas solanacearum*, which is endemic in Victoria, New South Wales and Tasmania, but it is restricted in South Australia and absent in Western Australia. It can wipe out a total crop.

As Western Australia is a major market for South Australia in terms of export of our potatoes interstate, and worth over \$13 million, clearly we have to be concerned that we do not see bacterial wilt proliferate in this State. Within the past five years outbreaks of bacterial wilt have been detected in the areas of Swan Reach, Murray Bridge, Kalangadoo and Woodside—but not in the area of the electorate of Napier. Since Western Australia does not have bacterial wilt, restrictions have been placed on South Australian potatoes entering Western Australia. There is no restriction on the movement of potatoes within South Australia.

The current situation is that to maintain access to the Western Australian market and to preserve that \$13 million export potential, and to reduce the likelihood of bacterial wilt infestation, South Australian potato growers need to constantly monitor and improve, where possible, their farm hygiene practices; they need to use only certified seed; and they need to adopt long-term rotations, such as five year breaks between potato crops. A major extension and grower awareness program is being carried out by field officers and by industry groups to improve potato production management, in an effort to avoid further infestations of bacterial wilt.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ECONOMIC STUDY

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In the context of the question that I was asked by the member for Bragg earlier in my role as Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, I was unable to turn up the relevant briefing page that did contain further information. The estimated cost is \$500 000. I believe I told the House that the consultant was Arthur R. Little and Company, whereas it is Arthur D. Little and Company.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: I pose the question that the House note grievances.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): I asked a question of the Minister of Employment and Further Education today—a very simple question: would the proposal for a GST be a realistic way of abolishing payroll tax and creating jobs? The Minister immediately got into the gutter, which is his usual form, and of course would not answer the question at all. For a moment, I want the House to consider the position of South Australia since the Minister has been involved with the Government. He joined the Premier's staff in 1983, and he oiled and greased his way up through the staffing levels, writing fabrication whenever he could, which is why he became known as 'the fabricator'.

Finally, because of his loyalty in pushing forward poor little Johnny, who has broken South Australia—

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The words 'fabricator' and 'fabrication' clearly refer to another member's veracity or alleged lack thereof and are in complete contradiction of Standing Orders regarding reflection on another member.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The choice of words in general in Parliament is up to the members, I suppose. The word used by the Leader is obviously not in any of the records that we refer to generally. The word has been used in this Parliament frequently, and I do not recall that it was objected to. Personally, I do not like it but so far Parliament has accepted it and, therefore, I do not uphold the point of order.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Of course, today details of this country's greatest tax package ever were announced, and it will do much for South Australia, but all the Minister for 'unemployment' can do is get down into the gutter. He says that he will fight it on the floor of the Parliament, in the streets and in the delis. He had better be careful when he comes out of a deli because, if the wind springs up, it will blow him away, and everyone in South Australia should know that.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is a point that I have often raised: members should be referred to by their portfolio or by the electorate they represent.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The point of order is taken. That is absolutely correct: all members will be referred to by the electorate they represent or the office they hold in this Parliament. The Leader.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

An honourable member: The member for Briggs will be blown away.

Mr D.S. BAKER: He probably already has been blown away. We have had the greatest tax reform package that we have ever seen in Australia, and the benefits for South Australia are quite clear. Seven taxes will be abolished. What the Minister does not recognise is that suddenly what we have been saying for 18 months is about to take place. We will get a share of the goods and services tax in order to abolish payroll tax—not another goods and services tax but a share of the Commonwealth's goods and services tax. The Minister and the Premier cannot quite comprehend what this means.

Set out in a letter to me today—and this is being enunciated at the Premiers Conference—is the fact that a share of income tax is being offered to the States. That is what the Prime Minister wanted six months ago, but the world's former greatest Treasurer managed to shoot it down. South Australia is being offered a share of the goods and services tax to enable us to get rid of payroll tax, and we will have the power to spend that money as it is best spent in South Australia.

It is being offered to South Australia. I call on the Premier and Treasurer of this State to get behind this package in a bipartisan way, because it is the only way we will get this State out of the mire. It is universally accepted that this Government got us into the worst financial problems that we have ever known. Get behind us Mr Premier and Treasurer and help us turn South Australia and Australia around by providing the incentive that is not there at present.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): From time to time Liberal Leaders of the Opposition display quite appalling

irresponsibility as part of their grab for power. However, the way that the current Leader has tried to exploit the displeasure of Mr Lawrence Lee regarding the circumstances of the Marineland project would be one of the worst examples of a Leader seeking political advantage whilst paying little regard to the commercial damage that might be inflicted upon the State. It is true that our local community, like other communities in Australia and elsewhere in the world, is still gradually evolving ways to satisfactorily resolve the conflicting demands of business development and environmental conservation. The square mile of the city of Adelaide is no exception in that respect.

All around the world, including the liberated areas of eastern Europe, communities are seeking that balance. Most entrepreneurs understand that ongoing problem. I will not say much about Mr Lee, who is involved in a legal dispute in this matter, nor will I say much about any misunderstandings that might have arisen from the different cultural backgrounds of Australian and Chinese negotiators, except to point out that one of the roles of the South Australian Chinese Chamber of Commerce (of which Mr Lee is not a member) is to assist businesses in achieving that cultural understanding during business negotiations.

However, Mr Lawrence Lee has apparently made some remarks stemming from personal animosity arising from disappointment concerning his venture. Because he is not part of our South Australian community, it could be understood if Mr Lee paid little heed to what effect his remarks were to have on the South Australian economy in general and on investment confidence in particular. However, no such excuse can be made for the Leader of the Opposition, playing Party politics with business trade and investment in the way that he has over this controversy.

I am pleased to be one of the patrons of the Chinese Chamber of Commerce and to have helped it become inaugurated last year, and I am quite happy to be wearing the chamber's badge today. I invite the House to contrast the way in which Government members made sure that Liberal members of Parliament would also be invited to be patrons of the Chinese Chamber of Commerce—

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Sir, the honourable member referred to a display which he has in the House presently in the course of his remarks, the display being the badge that he is wearing on his lapel.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is a little pedantic and I do not uphold it.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I invite the House to contrast the way that Government members made sure that Liberal members would also be invited to be patrons of the Chinese Chamber of Commerce, with the way the Leader is playing Party politics with Chinese trade and investment in South Australia. We sought to protect the Chinese Chamber of Commerce and Chinese business from being dragged into the political arena. The Chamber is concerned about this controversy, but naturally is reticent about being dragged into it. Chinese businessmen hope that it will soon die down so that they can go about their business of generating business. If asked, however, I am sure that the chamber would tell us that the Marineland controversy was a commercial dispute in which the chamber was not involved and that it sincerely hopes that it will be resolved as soon as possible.

This House has been advised by the Premier of his reassurance from the Chinese Ambassador, and I am sure that the Chinese Chamber of Commerce of South Australia is not aware of any formal impediment to investment in South Australia. As well as assisting Chinese business people living in our State, one of the chamber's aims is to encourage

trade and investment between Chinese businessmen and South Australia and to encourage Chinese investment in South Australia. They have already stated to the press that they are confident that environmentally friendly projects can go ahead if they are commercially viable.

However, they are not helped by a reckless, feckless Leader of the Opposition who sets out to drag delicate business dealings down to the level of political squabbles. Whilst the Chinese Chamber of Commerce is seeking to draw us together, the Leader is pulling things apart and damaging business confidence. For several months, Mr Nobby Clark has been trying to get the State Bank back on the rails and has had to contend with rash public comments by the Leader. Now he has moved on from trying to nobble Nobby's bank to being the bull in the china shop so far as undermining investment confidence is concerned. The Leader stands condemned for being as reckless and irresponsible as the hapless Jeff Kennett in Victoria and he ought to be ashamed of himself.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I put clearly to rest once and for all that the Labor Party's catch cry of 'one vote one value' is a fair electoral system and that it guarantees the election to Government of the Party that receive 50 per cent of the vote. Recently in the *IPA Review* the hard facts were clearly displayed for all who wanted to analyse them. The article states:

How many Australians are aware that at the last Federal election the Coalition gained nearly 400 000 first preference votes more than the Labor Party and a popular majority after the distribution of preferences? Despite being preferred by more voters in 1990, the Liberal and National Parties still need a swing in their favour at the next election to win enough seats to take Government.

As well as the Hawke 'triumph', sitting Labor Governments retained office at the last election in Western Australia, South Australia and Victoria with just 47.5 per cent, 48.1 per cent and 49.5 per cent shares respectively of the two-Party preferred vote.

And what of Queensland? Well, contrary to a view widely propagated, Labor was never kept out of power there because of the 'gerrymander'. (The 'electoral unfairness' actually resulted from the system favouring one non-Labor Party at the expense of the other.) The ALP were kept out of power in Queensland because of their failure to win a majority of the vote. Following their disastrous showing in 1974 (when their share of the two-Party vote crashed to 38.5 per cent), and prior to 1989, the ALP consistently gained only about 45-46 per cent of the two-Party vote in Queensland. At the last State election when they finally won the popular vote, Labor gained a convincing parliamentary majority.

That clearly puts paid to the nonsense that one vote one value Labor Party style—that is, if you have equal numbers in all electorates—will enable a fair result. We know that that is not a fact because, if it was, members on this side would be sitting on the Government benches. The article continues:

When moving the new Labor Government's 'electoral reform' package in 1983, the responsible Minister (Mick Young) assured the Parliament that 'the laws that will be . . . approved by this Government will mean that if the Conservative Parties of this country get 50 per cent of the vote plus one they will be the Government but if the Labor Party gets 50 per cent plus one, it will be the Government . . .'

We know that that has not taken place, and it clearly demonstrates the need to closely examine the electoral system not only in this State but across the nation. It is obvious that, the way we are going, the single member electoral system has just about run its race. It will do two things: keep in power minority Governments and create a situation where isolated communities have little or no ability to be properly represented because the electorates will be too large and cumbersome. There is a clear need to have a different system. I hope that the new boundaries, when they are announced, will alleviate the current unfair situation.

The second matter I raise is the concern that has been expressed by constituents of mine who belong to the Central Flinders Ranges Soil Conservation Board. I refer to the problem of rabbits and the damage they are doing to the environment, and the need for the Government to spend adequate amounts of money on research into the best way to control them. A letter signed by the Chairman of that board, Mr Malcolm Byerlee, dated 3 October and addressed to me, states:

The members of the Central Flinders Ranges Soil Conservation Board are extremely concerned at the huge environmental destruction being caused by rabbits. The problem has received little public attention because it occurs mainly in the less populated and vast pastoral areas of Australia, as well as many national parks. We believe that the valuable time and money being spent on revegetation projects in these areas will be wasted unless rabbits are first controlled.

Older members of the board can remember the destruction caused by rabbits in the Carrieton/Quorn area, in the earlier part of the century. About 40 years ago, many landowners in this area were able to eliminate the rabbits on their properties by ripping and fumigation of warrens. This process was greatly aided by the release of the myxoma virus (myxomatosis). Members have seen a great improvement in the natural revegetation with a consequent reduction in soil erosion.

The improvements continue to be seen in this area except for isolated patches, where rabbits have not been controlled. The rabbits are still out of control in the adjacent pastoral areas, partly due to the lessening affect of myxomatosis and the prohibitive cost of using mechanical means on such large areas.

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

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): This afternoon I want to say a few words about local crime prevention committees and also commend the Attorney-General for setting up the Crime Prevention Unit and funding it to the tune of \$10 million over a period of three years. The committees which have been set up in my electorate are already working quite industriously in the area of crime prevention and are having an immense benefit. I am extremely pleased at the way they have been operating. The crime prevention committees in both Port Augusta and Port Pirie have appointed project officers who are currently looking at existing crime prevention mechanisms within those cities and consulting with local groups and individuals to find out where they think the gaps are in relation to preventing crime, setting priorities to cover those gaps and looking at measures to improve, if necessary, what already exists in the area of crime prevention.

Port Augusta recently set up a number of Neighbourhood Watch schemes. I feel that this is always the basic starting point for any community crime prevention program. I cannot speak too highly of the benefits of Neighbourhood Watch being set up in any South Australian community. Far be it from me to mention all the benefits that result from that, because I am sure that all members of this Parliament would know those benefits and would support totally Neighbourhood Watch. Hospital Watch has also been set up in Port Augusta and I think, although I am not sure, that this may be the first country hospital outside the metropolitan area that has set up Hospital Watch.

This program is similar to Neighbourhood Watch, but is concentrated within hospitals and on hospital grounds. I am very pleased to see that it is up and running and, I believe, doing quite good things for hospitals. There is also a committee looking at School Watch and Business Watch. The member for Napier had some very good things to say about the benefits of School Watch, and I look forward to that being set up in my electorate.

The committee in Port Augusta has a number of subcommittees which operate very effectively and get a lot of

feedback from the community in the various areas they need to look at. One of those areas is the watch programs I just mentioned. There is also a subcommittee that deals with property and related damage as a result of crime, and another subcommittee that looks at substance and alcohol abuse. I am sure that they are very good subcommittees that probably all crime prevention committees should look at setting up in their areas.

The crime prevention committees have substantially reduced their membership since they began. I think that the Port Augusta committee began with 49 members which, in retrospect, was probably much too big, but people indicated a willingness to work on it. As members can see, it did generate a lot of enthusiasm in Port Augusta. That committee now has about 22 very hardworking members who are doing a lot of good in the area of crime prevention. Although a lot of mechanisms have not yet been set up, the fact that the committee exists and its members go around the community and investigate matters has encouraged some of the department's—for example, the Department for Family and Community Services—to start programs that are very beneficial to the Aboriginal community in Port Augusta (and I will talk about that when I get more time in the House). As a result fewer Aboriginal youths from Port Augusta are being screened through the police, and that can only be applauded. I believe that that began because of community concern about crime prevention in the City of Port Augusta. That crime prevention committee is actually working—

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

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): This afternoon, I would like to bring to the attention of the House a matter of great concern to restaurant owners, particularly in my electorate, following an approach by a Glenelg restaurateur to my office. I also contacted other restaurants and received the same message about the concern of restaurateurs at the proliferation of restaurant licences. It is quite difficult to obtain a licence for a bottle shop; there is no proliferation of bottle shop licences. On the other hand, it seems that one can get a restaurant licence with ease.

What is happening, as I understand it, is that some very good restaurants have been set up over the years. Such restaurants are not cheap to establish or to run, being high quality restaurants. The Licensing Court has then granted licences for other restaurants around these existing restaurants. No-one is against free competition in this world, but the clientele of restaurants have been diluted: in other words, the same number of clients are being spread over more restaurants. Restaurants into which families and individual business persons have put their savings are becoming uneconomical, and it is not healthy for the restaurant industry to have uneconomic restaurants.

I have been informed by the proprietor of the Glenelg restaurant to which I referred that the goodwill that was quite substantial in many good restaurants in Adelaide has been reduced by almost two-thirds and, in some cases, is almost unobtainable. I repeat: no-one is against free enterprise and no one is against the initiative of a restaurateur to open a new restaurant. However, in Adelaide at the moment there is a proliferation of restaurants to the extent that dozens of older, established restaurants that have been operating for years are becoming unviable not because of inefficiency but only because of the proliferation of other restaurants in the vicinity, where people try to ride in on the back of an established restaurant.

At the end of the day, restaurants will close, and that will impact on the tourist industry, on the social life of Adelaideans who like to frequent restaurants and, indeed, on the restaurant atmosphere that has been built up in Adelaide over the past 15 or 20 years so that Adelaide is renowned Australia-wide for its high quality restaurants. That reputation will be lost. This trend has escaped the notice of many members. I have discussed this matter with many members of Parliament over the past couple of weeks since it was brought to my attention by the Glenelg restaurateur to whom I have referred.

This afternoon, I bring this matter to the attention of the Government, and I trust that it will take it on board and discuss it with the Attorney and the Licensing Court. The principles involved in obtaining a bottle shop licence should flow through to restaurants. No-one wants to see the demise of Adelaide's top quality restaurants; certainly, no-one wants to see the demise of restaurants at Glenelg. However, if the demise of restaurants is brought about through the proliferation of licences, the controlling authorities (the Government and the Licensing Court) must look inward to see what has gone wrong. I think it is an unhealthy trend and a matter which the Government ought to address with great urgency.

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I would like to address what the Leader of the Opposition described a few moments ago as 'the greatest tax package ever'. He said that this new coalition policy would turn us around. I suggest that it is more likely to turn us upside down. The main part of this coalition package is the consumption or value added tax. It is interesting to look at the history of this tax. The value added tax originated in Argentina in 1935. It has often been said that Australia suffers from the Argentinian disease. If this policy of the coalition is put into effect, we could finally say that we have caught the Argentinian disease.

It is interesting to hear that members of the Federal Coalition were apparently euphoric in their support for this package when it was read to them. I am sure that members were waiting with great interest to see the details of this package in order to find out what the euphoria was about. I was particularly interested to see what Mr Wilson Tuckey would find to be euphoric about, because he has been outspoken against this tax. A recent article in the *Australian* noted that, when this new coalition policy was discussed in the Liberal Party's party room, one of the questions asked by Mr Wilson Tuckey was why the spending cuts in the Aboriginal affairs portfolio were not bigger. We can now understand why Wilson Tuckey is very euphoric about this policy.

In this morning's *Advertiser* the new coalition policy is being sold as 'the Hewson Manifesto'. The article states:

[Opposition strategists] say that in the past the coalition has been seen as lacking in compassion and ideology, while Dr Hewson has a one-dimensional, economist image.

I thought that perhaps this was a new Dr Hewson and that perhaps he had some compassion. So, I looked through the policy to see where this compassion was. It is true that I did find some areas of compassion. Dr Hewson has been very compassionate to the business sector, according to this policy—\$20 billion worth of compassion. One thing he has done is to weaken the capital gains tax; so, again, plenty of compassion has been shown to that section of the community.

The tax on superannuation lump sums would be reduced. Again, that is very generous to those who are fortunate enough to be in that position. Of course, there is plenty of compassion for those who purchase lots of luxury goods. If people buy imported cars, such as a Mercedes, or if they

purchase jewellery, there is plenty of compassion for them in this policy, I refer to private schools. I note from the article in this morning's newspaper that about \$162 million will be given to non-government schools in recognition of the serious deterioration in the quality of infrastructure in the non-government schools sector. So, all of those dilapidated buildings at St Peters College and Scotch College will be upgraded. That is something to look forward to. It is pleasing to see that Dr Hewson has showed so much compassion in that area.

I thought that I would look to see how much compassion would be shown to my constituents. What sort of compassion will Dr Hewson show to pensioners? Of course, pensioners will have to pay a 15 per cent tax on all the goods which they purchase and which were not previously subject to a wholesale tax. Of course, that would account for the vast majority of goods that pensioners purchase. Pensioners do not receive a great deal of money. However, they certainly have got a lot more since the Hawke Government came into office. I think pensions have been increased to 25 per cent of average weekly earnings, which is a lot more than pensioners received a few years ago. Certainly they would not get enough to replace the cost of this new tax.

What about the unemployed, the most disadvantaged group in our community? Where is the compassion for them? They are to lose their unemployment benefits after nine months—gone forever. Their compensation rate will be six per cent. I think it is generally agreed that a consumption tax will increase the cost of goods by between 7 and 10 per cent. It will be more like 10 per cent for those on lower incomes who purchase a larger proportion of goods such as food that previously were not subject to wholesale tax. So, the unemployed are the ones who will really suffer; there is not much compassion for them. In his statement, Dr Hewson criticised the present system, because it reduces the incentive to work.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (WATERWORKS AND SEWERAGE) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

MOTOR VEHICLES (HISTORIC VEHICLES AND DISABLED PERSONS' PARKING) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ROAD TRAFFIC (SAFETY HELMET EXEMPTION) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STAMP DUTIES (ASSESSMENTS AND FORMS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 30 October. Page 1557.)

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): This is an interesting measure, which, as most members would appreciate, imposes a duty on a range of instruments which previously have not been caught by the net and which would therefore place the burden of revenue on those who have been making their legitimate contribution. There are currently no penalty provisions relating to applications to transfer a motor vehicle. However, that needs to be rectified to ensure that people who breach the provisions that should apply find themselves compelled to pay, by virtue of the penalty which will apply once the Bill has been given the force of law. There are other aspects of the measure although, since I am not the lead speaker for the Opposition on this measure, I will leave a clearer exposition of our views to our Deputy Leader, the member for Mitcham.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition opposes the Bill, and I thank my colleague the member for Murray-Mallee for his exposition of the Bill before us. I know he has concerns about stamp duty because he has expressed them in this House. He has particular regard to the problems facing rural people who have to refinance under very difficult economic conditions. One of the problems that occur under these circumstances is that, when finance is amalgamated or consolidated and different institutions are involved, those people who can ill afford it are charged stamp duty. I know that the member for Murray-Mallee and all my rural colleagues have serious concerns about that issue. That is not what this legislation is about: it is about imposing draconian conditions on the hire industry. It is not a Bill that the Opposition can comfortably accommodate, as the Minister would appreciate.

Mr Groom interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: If you had listened to the beginning of the sentence, you might understand it.

Mr Groom: It didn't make sense.

Mr S.J. BAKER: It did, actually. Taxation is a serious issue and stamp duty is a major money raiser for the Government. We would note that in the current budget, for example, stamp duty is expected to increase by \$30 million during the 1991-92 financial year from \$300 million to \$330 million. That is a very large sum to be provided for the State budget, and it means fewer dollars for employment at a time when the employers need all the help they can get. So, against a background of very difficult economic circumstances; against a background of increased revenue, which far exceeds the rate of inflation (we are getting an extra 10 per cent this year compared with an inflation rate of 3 per cent to 4 per cent), I would expect the Government to be reasonably judicious in the way it looked at the taxation laws, particularly in areas where there is blatant tax evasion. That is not the case here. What we have is what I would call fundamental dishonesty.

I would recommend that members read the second reading explanation, which sets out the reasons why stamp duty is to be broadened. There has been an effort by people in the hire industry to reduce the amount that is subject to stamp duty by increasing costs or defraying certain elements of hire revenue in order to reduce the duty to be paid. What he did not say (and I do not know who has been advising him) is that there was a court case earlier this year in which the Government was found wanting. It was found that the Government was incorrect in the way it was applying stamp duty. A hire business was taken before the courts by the Commissioner of Stamps, who failed, the court ruling in favour of the hire firm.

It is absolutely dishonest for a Minister of the Crown to introduce a Bill on the basis of reducing tax avoidance

when it is all about a company that operates honestly and straightforwardly in the marketplace, and with the endorsement of a court. The Government now wishes to change the rules, and that is just a little smelly. That is the reason why we are debating this Bill today; that is the major thrust. There are some other elements of this but that is the main thrust. I would remind all members that this Bill not only broadens the scope of stamp duty assessments but also increases the penalties for non-payment in a way that we must all question because, out there in the work force today, when industry is suffering and bleeding, we have an unemployment rate of 10.8 per cent in this State, I would expect the Government to do its absolute utmost to try to preserve every employment avenue. I do not expect the Government, because it has its nose out of joint, to bring in a measure to make life harder. Life is very hard out there in all parts of industry and it is particularly hard in the rental and hire business, in which area this Bill attempts to raise additional revenue.

It is hard; people are not hiring goods in the way they used to. Fewer people are hiring cars to go on intrastate and interstate trips. Fewer people are hiring equipment to do jobs around the house or for major construction work. The hire industry has previously enjoyed boom times, but they are gone, and we are really getting down to a restricted level of activity. The only part of the hire industry that is doing reasonably well, as far as I am aware, is video hire; the recession does not seem to have affected that area as much as others. One suspects that the video hire industry may well enjoy better times because of the lower cost compared with theatre tickets, and many people may be taking up that option rather than going to a theatre as it is seen as a means of reducing the impact on the household budget.

So, there is one boom sector, one area of activity where hiring has increased but, across the board in all the major areas that I have referred to here this afternoon, there is a depressed level of activity. Fewer dollars are going through the till and there are greater relative costs. I had hoped that, in relation to any doubt about the system, that doubt would be given to those people out there who are just trying to survive under very difficult conditions, but that has not happened.

I have very strong reservations about the Bill before us. Whilst some of the matters, in principle, may have been determined previously and I may not have raised any objection to them, due to the circumstances prevailing here today I intend to oppose a number of these measures. I am vehemently opposed to the right of the Commissioner of Stamps to determine his own forms. I am getting tired of taxation commissioners, and industry out there is getting tired of taxation commissioners, who make up the rules as they go and who say that if someone does not like it they can contest it. We have seen a great deal of this at the Commonwealth level—less at the State level. I get really upset that we are not trying to work together.

If someone should legitimately pay tax, let us tax them; if someone refuses to pay and can afford to pay, let us penalise them. But let us not use measures such as those we have in this legislation. I know that on at least five occasions previously, in various measures, we have agreed to allow the Commissioner to compile his own forms. However, I say 'No longer!' I will not have a Commissioner of Stamps who acts without reference to the Minister. I want someone who is responsible to the Minister. If the information collected by the Commissioner is unconscionable, then the Minister is responsible, not the commissioner, who is not beholden to this Parliament or the people of South Australia.

I oppose the proposition that stamp duty can be applied to the whole of a rental business. We are well aware that the rental component of a business quite often comprises only a small part of that business. For example, we know that some video hire shops have various lines of sweets. It is part of the rental business. The video shops point out that those lines of sweets and other items comprise, say, 10 or 20 per cent of their business. According to the way this legislation is constructed, it is possible for the Commissioner of Stamps to decide that those lines could be subject to stamp duty. There are no exemptions shown here in the Bill.

The Bill canvasses a wide ambit. Further, hire firms dealing with party equipment have all sorts of items. If one is having a wedding reception, one might wish to hire a tent, tressles and tables, and so on. Under this Bill, the whole of the business that is done through that rental hire business would be subject to stamp duty. This includes everything, like table clothes, glasses, paper doilies, paper plates—and all the things that go with it. If one uses a truck to deliver all this equipment, that may be all part of the rental hire business. Under this wide sweeping and broad definition of rental business it would all be included under that umbrella and would be subject to stamp duty.

One questions how legal the whole process is, given the rights of any State Government to tax goods and services. It appears that the Minister has started his own GST. I could refer to other areas of hiring and refer, for example, to the hire of fishing equipment or boats. In the boat hire business, we know that on the premises one finds a whole range of other equipment for hire as well, things such as fishing rods and lines—and a whole range of other items. Under the broad definition in this legislation, that is all part of the rental business and those figures have to be supplied to the Commissioner of Stamps.

Indeed, the way that this is constructed, one assumes that the Commissioner of Stamps will tax them accordingly. Also under the provisions of this legislation we see that the Commissioner is in a situation where he has increased power. We gave him increased power in the last Bill that we dealt with in relation to these matters, and that was the power to make an assessment and to impose that assessment. The provisions, of course, for these poor hirers and for these people who rent their equipment contain a fine that relates to this—and wait for it, it is a fine of \$2 000 plus twice the amount specified in the notice. If we do not get the poor fool that way, there is a further provision:

... where a person is liable to pay duty by virtue of an assessment under this section, the person is liable to pay further duty by way of penalty, of an amount equal to twice the amount of that duty.

We can get him four times around, the poor fool. I do not know why people are in business, if we have legislation such as this. I lose heart when I see legislation which does nothing to assist the businesses that are struggling out there and which does everything to impede them. In fact, it is quite immoral, and it is simply because the Commissioner of Stamps lost a case.

There is a whole range of other provisions in the Act which augment or supplement the prime conditions that I have raised here today. I raise another matter relating to the Motor Vehicles Act. Section 57 provides that a person who fails to pay stamp duty on the transfer of a motor vehicle or a fine, or underpays it, is liable to a penalty. So too within the clauses of this Bill there is a penalty for non-payment or late payment. So if a person is not caught the first time around we can get them the second time around. It is a never ending struggle.

We are not talking here about people who are going out and deliberately avoiding stamp duty; we are talking about people who are conducting business in a very difficult climate, people who are struggling to survive. If the Minister really wants to know what is happening out there, he should ring up some of these places who provide hire items. Why does he not ring up Rennicks or Wavals, or Richard Stevens? Why does he not ask people what it is like in trying to survive out there? They are not cheating at all. All that they have done has been done quite legitimately. I do not know whether in fact the Minister has shared some of the secrets that go on in the industry. I think there has been a failure to brief the Minister on the fact that many of the charges or many of the defrayed revenue items, the items that reduce the amount that is subject to stamp duty, have been agreed to by the Commissioner of Stamps over a long period.

I rang a number of firms and I asked them what they paid their stamp duty on. They said that they had had discussions with the Commissioner of Stamps and that the Commissioner had said that he wanted to levy duty on a certain amount of their business. Agreement has been reached. Normally a proprietor has said that he believed the hiring component was much lower, and the Commissioner of Stamps has said that the hiring component is much larger. Somewhere along the line agreement has been reached as to what is believed to be reasonably fair. So, the Commissioner can hardly say to us that artificial means are being used to reduce the amount that is subject to stamp duty.

I am going to be charitable and say I believe that the Minister is being conned. The Parliament should not pass this legislation. We should not pass it because of the increased range of measures contained in the Bill, particularly for the hiring industry. Also, we should not pass the Bill because of the penalties being imposed in this difficult climate. We should think about them again in a better climate and then look at the people who are transgressing the law. We should not impose these penalties in the current climate. Let us keep the penalties reasonable. I am happy to accept a 100 per cent penalty, but how much in penalties is paid by people in the community who have suddenly gone bankrupt because someone has not paid their bills?

One of the great problems of debates in this House is that members never relate to how businesses operate in the real world. How many times have we had brought to our attention businesses that have gone bankrupt or are on the way to going bankrupt because of the failure of people to pay bills, because of the domino effect? When one firm falls over the next one falls as well, because everyone owes someone money. When people fail to pay a bill in the business world there are two options: people can try quietly and judiciously to retrieve that money or they can sue for the funds owed.

But under these provisions there is no come-back. There is no judicious pursuit of the money concerned, there is 100 per cent penalty, and anyone who does not pass 'go' will go to gaol. While this may not be an earth shattering event for most members, for a whole range of reasons we should reject the measure. It can be seen as a watershed measure and the House should tell the Minister that fair is fair—let us give people a fair go and not muck around with the system. Instead, we should work out how we can assist people.

If for some reason people are not paying their just dues, let us examine the prevailing circumstances. We know that the Minister has a great deal of power and can command that money. If a business is going broke, the Minister can

probably line up a bit faster than anyone else and get his money. We know that the Minister is in a strong position and can take that person to court and quickly obtain judgment. But how does the person struggling out there who cannot afford to pay the Commissioner of Stamps get enough money when his debtors are not paying him, especially if his only way of obtaining money is through a long and tortuous system? The system is not fair, and any member who suggests that a person, simply because they have failed to pay these sums for whatever reasons, should be subject to the penalty provided needs to consider their place in this Parliament.

I refer, in passing, to the drafting of the legislation. The suggestion is that a failure to pay is an offence. I am not going into all the technicalities of the legislation but I do observe that, if a person fails to pay his or her just dues, that person should not automatically be deemed to be akin to a criminal. It is not a large point, because the Acts Interpretation Act gives that connotation anyway. It is inappropriate in legislation to provide that a person who for whatever reason cannot pay the sum due has committed an offence. We are making poverty an offence and we are making criminals of those people who are bankrupt or who cannot afford to pay.

That is not appropriate in this day and age and I will never accept it. As to the penalty for non-payment, the Minister is in a prime position to enforce that, but people should not be labelled as criminals, as provided in the Bill. I have been involved with a number of pieces of legislation containing similar connotations and we have raised this issue before, so there is consistency in the argument.

If it was not for the fact that the Commissioner of Stamps had been defeated in a case before the courts, I could have dealt with this matter a little less emotionally than I have today. Because someone has proved that they are doing the right thing the Minister sees fit to tax everything. That is unconscionable. Why should the Government have that power, when it has gone through the courts and been beaten and still have the right of redress through the Parliament? Is there no justice in the world? We saw that with the water rates, but that is another issue. We have seen the Government being beaten, albeit on a technicality as the Government claims, but then the Parliament redresses the situation.

Too often we find that the Government gets itself into difficulties and some person in the community contests and wins the case and the Government says, 'We do not like that result. We do not want it. We are going to make sure that it does not happen again.' The same principle applies in relation to the Heritage Act. For all those reasons I oppose the Bill.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I wish to speak briefly to the Bill. I seek information from the Minister about how the amendments relate to situations involving farmers on the land. What about farmers in financial difficulty who try to shop around the various banks and financial institutions to get cheaper interest rates on loans only to find heavy penalties because of the stamp duties required to re-register a mortgage and to release a mortgage? Even when it is possible for a farmer to obtain a loan at a cheaper interest rate, he is prevented from taking it up because of the cost of stamp duty on the registration of the mortgage.

Can the Minister explain that? If ever there was a need to resolve this issue, now is the time, because a great service could be provided to the rural community whereby, with reregistration of documents, there could be a reduction in the commitment for that farmer. Now is the opportunity for the Government to provide assistance in this area and

failure to do so in many cases will prevent farmers availing themselves of cheaper interest rates because of the cost of changing documentation.

I am not suggesting that this should apply in the case of a change of ownership, although probably another justifiable argument could apply there if a person is forced off the land. However, that is another argument. I am saying that, where a farmer is able to access cheaper finance through another institution, he should be able to do so without encountering additional charges.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: Yes, an administrative charge would do it. When a property simply changes hands, that is another question. Turning to another matter, what is the position in respect of farmers who might let out a farmhouse to people working in a nearby town? This happens on almost every property within 60 kilometres of any regional city where farm houses are let out at cheap rentals. In many cases schoolteachers prefer to live in farmhouses than in Teacher Housing Authority accommodation, principally because of the cost and, secondly, because of the lifestyle. This raises another question: does the amendment encompass all such transactions?

A further question arises as to the situation concerning the agistment of stock. We all know that, where, say, a fire or drought makes it necessary to agist stock to a neighbouring community or district, a transaction per head of stock per week for that agistment is involved. Does this amendment encompass such transactions? It opens up a whole new ball game if that is what we are talking about, because many farmers go to the aid of fire victims who lose all of their pasture. Such victims may have been able to save their stock but cannot feed them. On many occasions people have taken stock on agistment. Some take it voluntarily, which raises another question because it could legitimately be claimed that that is forgone income.

Secondly, where a charge is made for agistment another problem arises. It involves a form of farming, and many people prefer doing this to buying and owning stock. They agist stock onto the property. They have a bumper year and agist extra stock rather than go and buy it. These are the sorts of question that I hope the Minister can answer, because I would like to see on record a clear explanation that the measure does not apply in such circumstances.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Finance): I thank members opposite for their contributions to the second reading debate. The member for Murray-Mallee outlined some of the principal points of the Bill. The Deputy Leader had some questions, which I fear we will have to go through again in Committee, so I will be brief. The Deputy Leader was concerned about a court case lost by the Commissioner of Stamps. That was incorrect. There was no determination in that court case: it was settled out of court. Apparently the Deputy Leader had some argument with governments legislating to correct legislation that has been found wanting. If governments did not do that, the Parliament would sit less often than it does now. It is open to any citizen to test legislation or its interpretation, and the courts are full of such cases.

Governments almost daily correct legislation which the court may have determined does not allow them to do what they thought they could do and which in most cases the Parliament thought they could do. That is the normal way that things happen in a community. With regard to the rental or hire business, the Commissioner of Stamps is only interested in the part of the business relating to the hire of goods—nothing else. Lollies in the video shops are not hired

out but sold and consumed. To suggest otherwise is drawing a very long bow.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is not what the Act says. The problem is that with mixed functions in a hire shop it has been found, upon checking with compliance procedures, that some firms succumb to the temptation to apportion larger parts of their business to non-hiring than to hiring. That temptation is there and it ought to be removed. We are not attempting in any way to broaden the tax base. It is my understanding that we are merely trying to see that the correct tax is paid.

The member for Flinders has asked specific questions regarding stamp duty paid on refinancing of farms for primary producers. Only this morning the *Advertiser* reported the Treasurer as saying that he was looking at that aspect and I thank the member for Flinders for again bringing it to the Government's attention as a legitimate point warranting serious consideration. We are giving it such consideration. The member for Flinders asked about farmers who rent out farmhouses, sometimes cheaply. No duty is payable under this provision. It is a residential lease and as such is exempt from any of these provisions. The same applies to stock agistment. We are dealing here with goods, and live-stock is specifically excluded. The agistment of stock attracts no duty. All questions asked by the member for Flinders have been resolved in his favour. Although one matter is still under consideration, he has had a good afternoon.

This is essentially a Committee Bill and I am sure that the arguments will be canvassed again, albeit I hope briefly. In Committee I will be happy to respond to any points that I have overlooked in the second reading debate. I commend the Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Registration.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: As I said during the second reading debate I am unhappy and have lost faith in the Commissioner of Stamps exercising his jurisdiction with due care in the process. That means that the level of delegation that I may have willingly passed on to that position previously has changed. It is not only because of this case but it has also been in the forefront of my mind for some time because at the Federal level we have seen decisions made by the Commissioner of Taxation, on almost a unilateral basis, when the Act has been silent. The only way of contesting the decision, should you fail on the normal appeal to the Commissioner's good sense, is to go through an expensive court case. The same applies here. One can appeal to the Minister. If you believe that the Commissioner has not done the right and proper thing but the Minister upholds the Commissioner's ruling—as is the normal situation (I do not know of many instances otherwise)—that person has to go through an expensive court case. There is no cheap way of overcoming such problems.

For the reasons I have specified, it is about time the responsibility was placed with the Minister so that if something goes wrong the Minister is responsible to the Parliament and to the people. If the Commissioner gets a bit big for his or her boots and goes down a path inconsistent with wise and judicious management, that person can account to the constituency and, indeed, to the Parliament. For those reasons I oppose this clause.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I take strong exception to the remarks of the Deputy Leader. I thought they were uncalled for, unfair and unwarranted. The Commissioner of Stamps (or the Taxation Commissioner) is a public serv-

ant in this State who is highly regarded and who acts in good faith within the law. I think it is very bad form, to say the least, to make comments such as that. There is absolutely nothing on which the Deputy Leader could base such a remark.

This clause attempts to close a loophole. As far as I know there is no widespread dissatisfaction in the rental industry about this matter. The fact is that it has always worked in a certain way, and worked fairly. As I said in response to the second reading debate, compliance by certain hire firms was not perhaps as high as it ought to be, and that is fair enough. If somebody wishes to take it to court because they feel that they are being treated illegally, harshly or unfairly, they are free to do so. This in no way broadens the ambit of the principal Act. The clause does not include something that was previously excluded in the hire industry; it merely regularises what was done for many years until there was a suggestion that perhaps the legislation needed to be clarified. It does nothing else. I ask the Committee to support the clause.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—'Statement to be lodged by registered person.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I move:

Page 1—

Lines 26 and 27—Leave out 'in a manner and form approved by the Commissioner a statement' and substitute 'a statement in the prescribed form'.

Line 28—After 'in respect of' insert 'the use of goods as part of'.

Quite clearly the amendments isolate the area of business that can be subject to stamp duty, and that is the use of the goods. The Minister said that that is all he is interested in, and I was pleased to hear that. I remind the Minister that there was a court case—and I was pleased to hear him admit that—and that it was settled out of court to overcome the difficulties that the Crown would have faced if the court had found in favour of that firm, because that firm was right. It is not unusual for this to happen. Such a course of action does not set a precedent, and that is why this device was used—and we have seen it used in a number of cases in the medical and tobacco industries, and a whole range of other industries. The Government, quite wisely, settled out of court.

What I am trying to do is clarify, in exactly the terms the Minister used in the Parliament today—nothing more and nothing less—that it is for the use of the goods and not for the sale of other items and not for those items that are associated with the delivery of equipment or for replacement parts. If somebody has to put some cash into the business because they have broken a very important part of a compressor or lost a few glasses at a very rowdy party, they should not be included because it then becomes a goods and services tax. It should be only the component that relates to the use of the goods. That is why this is a clarifying amendment. I expect the full endorsement of the Minister.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Not for the first or last time in his life the Deputy Leader is going to be disappointed. It certainly does not have my endorsement. I am surprised at the opposition to the provision which seeks to compel the form to be prescribed by Parliament. I have not had time to research this, only having seen the amendments half an hour ago, but I seem to think the Tonkin Government started this, and very sensibly, as a deregulation measure rather than have an endless number of forms coming before the Parliament by way of regulation through the subordinate legislation process to be gazetted and so on. I may be wrong, and I will check that. However, I think my memory is correct.

I just cannot see what the fuss is about. We are asked to be more flexible, less bureaucratic and have less regulation. We have done that for many years now, as I believe the Tonkin Government did in this area without any query from anybody, because it is a very sensible thing to do. If the amendment to line 28 is carried it will take us back pretty well to where we started, with the area constantly under the threat of challenge in the courts. That is precisely the reason why we introduced this amending Bill. I am advised—and I am very happy to have this on the record—that it is not the intention of the State Taxation Office in any way to widen the ambit of what is considered to be part of the rental business.

By the same token, we are attempting to close what may have been a loophole—although that was not determined by the court—that enabled a very small minority of the hire industry to apportion part of its business to other than hire, and we believe improperly. As I said, I believe that the hire industry, with maybe one or two exceptions—but certainly one exception—is very happy and has no real objection to this. There has been extensive consultation about this measure. It is not a big issue other than for those few individuals who choose to apportion their business in such a way, as I said, to avoid the proper payment of tax.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister said, 'We think somebody out there is not doing the right thing.' In effect, he is saying, 'Somebody is using too many lollies when they are counting the till, and that we want to stop it.' He can stop it under the existing legislation. That is not a problem. So, why does he want all the money to be shown? Why does he want the whole lot for assessment? If the lollies are a problem, or if someone is putting a little too much on the delivery service, why does he need the whole lot? If somebody is not telling the truth, then he, the Commissioner and the inspectors have the capacity to sort it out very easily and quickly. What they should do is rely on the existing law and not spread the scope of it to include everything, which gives the Commissioner the power to come down on the whole lot.

The Commissioner has the power to do the whole lot, to say, 'I do not agree with what you are doing there, so I will have the whole lot.' If someone doesn't like that and objects, the first step in the process is an appeal to the Minister. The Minister will not overturn the decision of the Commissioner, so the matter will then go to the courts where a very lengthy and costly battle will be fought. If the courts correctly interpret what is written in this legislation, they will uphold the right of the Minister to apply stamp duty over the whole rental business, because it is not defined. There is nothing in the Bill that says that rental businesses comprise these items. It merely places a big umbrella over the whole business. Many of the items that are sold are complementary or supplementary to the hiring business, and it seems to be the express intention of the Minister to include them in the taxable forms. I commend my amendments to the Committee.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I think the debate is becoming a bit repetitive, and I do not want to join in that course. On the advice of the Crown Solicitor, the present legislation may be deficient. If the Crown Solicitor advises me that some legislation may be deficient, I have an obligation to fix it up. The Government is not in any way attempting to enlarge the scope of the measure. All we are attempting to do—something which all Governments do almost on a daily basis—is to correct legislation that has been interpreted by the Commissioner or some other Government body in a certain way that is not in accordance with the wishes of Parliament. The fact that Parliament has

not expressed its wishes quite correctly is not uncommon. I assure the Committee that there is no intention at all to widen the scope of goods that are dutiable.

The Committee divided on the amendments:

Ayes (20)—Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, S.J. Baker (teller), Becker, Blacker and Brindal, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn and Ingerson, Mrs Kotz, Messrs Lewis, Matthew, Meier, Oswald, Such, Venning and Wotton.

Noes (20)—Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Atkinson, Blevins (teller), Crafter, De Laine, Ferguson, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Heron, Holloway and Hopgood, Mrs Hutchison, Mr Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McKee, Peterson, Quirke, Rann and Trainer.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Armitage, D.S. Baker and Chapman. Noes—Messrs Bannon, Gregory and Mayes.

The CHAIRMAN: There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote for the Noes.

Amendments thus negatived; clause passed.

Clause 5—'Amounts to be included in statement.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: My previous remarks will have been noted by the Minister. What is included in the definition of 'rental business'? Does it include deliveries and replacements?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It means payments for the use of goods in respect of a person's rental business.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I think enough has been said on this subject. I have made the point a number of times that it is delightfully vague. It means that the Commissioner has the power ultimately to make up his mind on whatever he feels like doing, and I do not think that is appropriate, nor do I believe that many of the things the Commissioner will consider as hire and therefore subject to stamp duty are appropriate, because there are replacement goods and the cost of delivery which the Commissioner will obviously try to tax. Again, I express my reservation.

Clause passed.

Clause 6—'Default assessments.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I move:

Page 2—

Lines 28 to 31—Leave out subsection (3).

Line 34—Leave out 'twice'.

I mentioned this matter in the second reading debate. The issue of penalties is serious. I have already said that I do not believe it is appropriate for the Act to prescribe an offence for those people who are unable to pay. If someone deliberately avoids paying, I do not have a difficulty; if someone deliberately says, 'I will beat the Taxation Commissioner,' I do not have a difficulty. The Minister is quite entitled to say that the person has committed an offence but if, through impecunious circumstances the person is unable to pay, that person should not be subject to what is classed in this legislation as an offence.

The second point—and I have made it previously—is that I do not believe the level of penalty is appropriate for this day and age. I know there are other areas of the Act where the penalties have been beefed up and we have approved of them but, in the circumstances in which I find myself today, I see them as a product of a miscarriage of justice, and I cannot endorse the penalties in any way. Let us be quite clear on what is happening; the Commissioner can impose a penalty of \$2 000 plus twice the amount specified in the notice of assessment as a unilateral decision.

He does not have to refer to anyone; he can make up his mind whether a person owes \$1 000 or \$5 000. By notice the Commissioner may make a decision which financially embarrasses someone and impose a penalty of \$2 000 plus twice the amount. Then, just to ensure that the poor so-and-so is bankrupted, under subclause (4) where a person

is liable to pay duty by virtue of an assessment, the person is liable to pay further duty, by way of penalty, of an amount equal to twice the amount of that duty.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The penalty is imposed by the court, not by the Commissioner, and there is a further provision that the Commissioner may also remit any further duty by way of penalty.

Amendments negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 7 and 8 passed.

Clause 9—'Further duty by way of penalty.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: As the Minister would appreciate, I would normally call for a division on all these clauses. I will not do that on this occasion because we have other legislation before this House but, if members would like me to, I am quite capable of calling for a division on every one of these clauses right along the line. This matter has already been tested, but I formally oppose the clause.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I would urge the Committee to support the clause, but I do acknowledge the restraint that the Deputy Leader is showing in not calling for a division on these measures.

Clause passed.

Clause 10 passed.

Clause 11—'Stamp duty on application for motor vehicle registration.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: There are amendments to clauses 11, 12, 14 and 15 on file in my name but, given that these matters have already been tested earlier, it is inappropriate to proceed. I trust that justice will prevail in another place and that the decisions that are being taken under this Bill will be reversed. I do not intend to proceed with those amendments.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (12 to 17) and title passed.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Finance): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (20)—Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Atkinson, Blevins (teller), Crafter, De Laine, M.J. Evans, Ferguson, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Heron, Holloway and Hopgood, Mrs Hutchison, Mr Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McKee, Quirke, Rann and Trainer.

Noes (20)—Messrs Allison, Armitage, P.B. Arnold, S.J. Baker (teller), Becker, Blacker and Brindal, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Eastick, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn and Ingerson, Mrs Kotz, Messrs Lewis, Matthew, Meier, Such, Venning and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Bannon, Gregory and Mayes. Noes—Messrs D.S. Baker, Chapman and Oswald.

The SPEAKER: There being an equality of votes, I cast my vote for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

FISHERIES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

Clause 12—'Conditions of licences.'

Mr MEIER: I move:

Page 3, lines 35 to 43—Leave out all the words appearing after 'amended' and insert as follows:

(a) by inserting in subsection (1) 'with the approval of the Minister, by order published in the *Gazette*, after 'time';

(b) by inserting after subsection (1) the following subsection:

(1a) Where, in the opinion of the Director it is necessary on biological grounds to do so in order to conserve the living resources to which a fishery relates, the Director may, in accordance with this section, impose or vary a condition of a licence in respect of the fishery, notwithstanding that the effect of the condition imposed or as varied is to prevent—

(a) the taking of one or more species of fish that could otherwise be lawfully taken pursuant to the licence;

or

(b) the use of any device or equipment that could otherwise be lawfully used to take fish pursuant to the licence;

(c) by inserting 'with the approval of the Minister, by order published in the *Gazette*', in subsection (2) after 'time';

and

(d) by inserting after subsection (2) the following subsections:

(2a) Before approving the imposition of a condition that has the effect described in subsection (1a) (a) or (b), or the variation of a condition so that it has that effect, the Minister must:

(a) give the holder of the licence and the prescribed fishing industry body notice in writing setting out the condition to be imposed or the manner in which a condition is to be varied, as the case may be, and the reasons for the proposed action;

and

(b) not later than 14 days after giving notice, consult or use his or her best endeavours to consult with the holder of the licence and the prescribed fishing industry body in relation to the matter.

(2b) In subsection (2a):

'prescribed fishing industry body' means:

(a) the South Australian Fishing Industry Council;

or

(b) if the council ceases to exist, such fishing industry body as is prescribed by regulation for the purposes of this definition.

(2c) Section 10 of the Subordinate Legislation Act 1978 applies to an order under this section as if the order were a regulation made under this Act.

Members would be aware that this clause, which amends section 37, has been very contentious ever since the Bill was introduced earlier this year and then reintroduced later. I have had many discussions with people in the fishing industry and I have also received many representations, as I said in the second reading debate. I have also presented petitions from people opposed to the amendments to section 37. So, the Opposition is seeking, through this amendment to bring some semblance of responsibility and accountability to section 37 of the Fisheries Act. That section empowers the Director of Fisheries to impose, vary or revoke conditions of fishery licences. Proposed paragraphs (a) and (c), which we find in clause 12 of the Bill, amend subsections (1) and (2) of section 37 to require a condition of a fishery licence to be imposed, varied or revoked by order published in the *Government Gazette*. The order will set out the condition, the manner of its variation or the fact that a particular condition is revoked, as the case may be. Conditions will still require endorsement on the licence. It is to be noted that no amendment is made to subsection (3) of section 37.

Members would be aware that the Government's amendment to section 37 inserts a new subsection (1) (a), empowering the Director to impose the conditions that have the effect of preventing the taking of one or more species of fish that could otherwise be lawfully taken pursuant to the licence, or preventing the use of any device or equipment that could otherwise be lawfully used to take fish pursuant to the licence.

It needs to be pointed out that the Director already has the power to impose conditions that have the effect of

restricting, as opposed to preventing, the taking of one or more species of fish that could otherwise be lawfully taken pursuant to the licence or restricting the use of any device or equipment that otherwise could lawfully be used to take fish pursuant to the licence.

In the case of the *Director of Fisheries v Lukin Enterprises Pty Ltd* (19 December 1986) in the Full Supreme Court, Justice von Doussa said, in relation to the condition imposed in that case that prohibited the licensee absolutely from taking salmon:

It is also to be observed that it is the absolute nature of the prohibition imposed by condition 12 which renders it repugnant to the authority bestowed on the respondent by the grant of the licence. Quite different considerations might apply to a condition, short of a complete prohibition, which imposed a quota or which regulated the taking of salmon—even by imposing a prohibition against taking salmon of certain sizes or at certain times, or in certain localities. [at page 259]

Further in relation to the amendment I have just moved, we see that proposed paragraph (b), in clause 12, preserves the Government's proposed subsection (1a), but modifies it, firstly by requiring the Director to be of the opinion that a proposed condition that has the effect described in subsection (1a) (a) or (b) is necessary on biological grounds in order to conserve the living resources of the fishery and, secondly, by requiring the power to impose such a condition or vary a condition so as to have such an effect, to be exercised in accordance with the section, that is, with the Minister's approval and by order published in the *Gazette*.

Furthermore, proposed paragraph (d) inserts subsections (2a), (2b) and (2c). First, subsection (2a) requires the Minister, before approving the imposition of a condition that has the effect described in subsection (1a) (a) or (b), or the variation of a condition so that it has that effect: to give the holder of the licence and the prescribed fishing industry body notice in writing of the proposed action, setting out the condition to be imposed or the manner in which a condition is to be varied, as the case may be, and the reasons for the proposed action; and, not later than 14 days after giving notice, consult or use his or her best endeavours to consult with the holder of the licence and the prescribed fishing industry body in relation to the matter.

Subsection (2b) defines 'prescribed fishing industry body', to mean the South Australian Fishing Industry Council or, if the council ceases to exist, such fishing industry body as is prescribed by regulation for the purposes of the definition. Subsection (2c) provides that section 10 of the Subordinate Legislation Act 1978 applies to an order under the section as if the order were a regulation made under the Fisheries Act. The effect, therefore, of proposed subsection (2c) is that, like regulations made under the Act, an order under section 37 imposing, varying or revoking conditions of fishery licences will:

(a) take effect on the date on which it is published in the *Gazette* or on the date specified in the order;

(b) be required to be laid before both Houses of Parliament;

(c) be subject to disallowance by either House of Parliament; and

(d) be subject to the Joint Standing Orders relating to the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation.

I hope that the Minister will see his way clear to agreeing to these amendments, because I believe that they add responsibility and accountability to a section of the Act that has created an enormous amount of comment, an enormous amount of reaction from the fishing industry and from individual fishers. I feel that the Opposition has undertaken a very responsible course of action here. I know that we are imposing such conditions as will require more paperwork, but at the same time I firmly believe that it is absolutely

essential that any fisher who has his or her licence conditions varied by removing the option of taking a species of fish or by removing the net entitlement or equipment entitlement must have the maximum allowable opportunity to appeal. By making the appeal not only to the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation but, in the end, to Parliament itself, I believe we are doing the very best we can for the fishing industry. I hope that the Minister will accept this amendment.

Mr FERGUSON: I am very much afraid that I have to oppose this amendment. I know that the shadow Minister is a very conscientious person—

Members interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I say that in all seriousness. I had the opportunity to be on two select committees with him, and he analysed thoroughly every clause and every sentence of our report. I know that he is very conscientious but, with respect to this proposition, he is being overly conscientious. We must look after the environment, particularly specific species of fish. I know from my experience on the select committee that, once a species of fish comes under pressure, time is very precious. To delay by attempting to restrict the effort, time becomes paramount with respect to certain species of fish. Time is of the essence.

In his proposition, the shadow Minister has gone down every highway and every byway possible before action can be taken in respect of this matter. Not only that, the last part of the amendment really alarms me. It provides that section 10 of the Subordinate Legislation Act 1978 applies to an order under the section as if the order were a regulation made under the Act. Members would know that this means that either House of Parliament could challenge the order that had been made and, if that challenge was successful in either House, that order would go out the door.

We know from experience how good some members of the fishing industry are at lobbying their parliamentary representatives. They do not often consider—and I say this not in an unkind way—what should be happening in relation to special species of fish. There are commercial considerations and pressures on these fishermen that make them take certain attitudes. Where we had an evenly-balanced Parliament, every time an order was made, we could be faced with the difficulty of either House of Parliament challenging it by resolution, not only taking up the time of the Parliament but endangering the species themselves.

If this proposition was accepted, it would become an administrative nightmare. We are talking about more than 1 000 licences in some instances and, although the shadow Minister stated that there would be more paperwork if this proposition were accepted, there would be mountains of paperwork—absolutely mountains. So, I am afraid that we as backbench members, having carefully considered this legislation and the proposed amendment, cannot accept it. I praise the member for Goyder, however, because he is one of the few members opposite who provides us with his amendments in time for us to consider them. Quite often members opposite give us only five minutes to look at their propositions, but the member for Goyder always provides Government members with the opportunity to give due consideration to his amendments.

I am afraid that this time I cannot support him. I know how conscientious he is and, in normal times, I would support him, but I am afraid that this amendment is too draconian. The paperwork would be too great. The red tape, if you like, would be continuous. It would leave the orders open to be destroyed by either side of the House. That is democracy, but the problem is that the species of fish we

are trying to protect would be destroyed in the meantime. We cannot accept this amendment.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: As the member for Henley Beach just said, a thousand licences could be involved at any one time. A thousand licences could mean a thousand livelihoods, with all the implications that that entails, were changes to be made within the fishing industry that were sufficiently severe. Of course, that is taking an extreme viewpoint. I rise to represent the many fishermen who have been in contact with me over the past several months to express their fears that, to give the Director increased and unilateral statutory rights to vary a licence in any way, would be giving that one person extreme powers that are not necessary.

The fishermen are afraid that by bringing in this legislation the Minister may be expressing a personal intention to destroy what has been fought for, with the Minister's support, I acknowledge, over the past two or three years; that is, the existence of a fishing licence as a property and, more importantly, as an equity for loans from banks and financial organisations. As the existence of a licence as a property is not peculiar only to fishing, I will place on record one or two cases that have confirmed that right.

The first one to which I refer concerned a liquor licence. That South Australian case was *Rosetto v. Superintendent of Licensed Premises* [1982], 29 SASR 338. Under the State licensing legislation, an application was granted subject to a condition inconsistent with the statutory characteristics of the licence. In that case the Licensing Court sought to change an old form of wholesale storekeeper's licence to a new form of licence, and Justice Sangster said:

The Licensing Court is clearly not empowered under the guise of imposing conditions to abrogate the basic characteristics of a particular licence as though laid down by the Act itself.

In that same case Justice Mohr said:

The plain fact is that the appellant's licence is a protected one by the statute with its advantages, and those advantages cannot be derogated from when the licence is to be renewed, transferred, or removed. It may be that some conditions could be imposed on an application for renewal, transfer, or removal, but not so as to fundamentally change the character of the licence. Not only do I agree that there was no power to impose the conditions sought to be imposed here on the hearing of the application in this case, but for the reasons given such conditions could never be applied to this licence.

Those views became more significant with regard to the fishing industry when they were quoted in the Full Court of the South Australian Supreme Court in the *Lukin* case and also in Victoria in the *Manias* case. In *Lukin Enterprises Pty Ltd v. Director of Fisheries* [1986] 42/SASR 337 (this case has a great deal of relevance to today's legislation and may be one of the initiating factors), the Director, as many members would know, chose to remove the right to fish for salmon from an indivisible tuna and salmon licence. Justice White said:

However many different ways the proposition may be put, the principle as applied here comes down to this: where the Act empowers the Director to grant a licence of an indivisible kind, he is not, in the absence of express power, entitled to impose a condition which deprives the licensee of an integral part of the indivisible licence originally granted.

A little further on (I will not absorb the time of the Committee, because this material is available for perusal) Justice White continued:

It follows from the above that the condition subsequently imposed by the Director purporting to prohibit this applicant from taking any salmon at all during the continuance of his licence is void and of no effect.

In *Manias v. Crabb* (Crabb being the Victorian Minister of Fisheries) 7374 of 1991 in the Victorian Supreme Court, the issue was whether the defendant, the Minister of Fisheries, had the power to prohibit or prevent the licence holder

from dredging for scallops in Port Phillip Bay. Interestingly in this case, Judge Marks found with regard to the regulation:

A regulation which frustrates or denies a fundamental right conferred by the Act takes away what the Act gives and cannot be said to be authorised by it. In *G. Rossetto & Co Pty Ltd v. Superintendent of Licensed Premises* [1982] 29 SASR 337 the South Australian Full Court held that a condition of a licence which had the effect of abrogating its basic characteristics was not authorised and invalid.

There again the judgment was quite extensive, but it came down in favour of the fishermen. I know that the Minister and his officers are well acquainted with those pieces of legislation because they are behind the introduction of the legislation that is before the Committee. If there is any doubt about what I say, I also advert to correspondence dated 22 July 1991 that I believe was sent by the Director of Fisheries to the South Australian Fishing Industry Council advising, *inter alia*:

(a) previous actions by the Director acting under the purported power of section 37 of the Fisheries Act 1982 may have been illegal;

and this was coming from the Director—

(b) the purpose of a proposed amendment to s 37—

the amendment currently under discussion—

currently before the House in the Fisheries (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 1991, is to ensure a condition may lawfully be applied to a licence by the Director to change its basic characteristics;

(c) the Crown Solicitor is of the view that previous conditions imposed on licences before and after the Lukin judgment of the Supreme Court at 1986 may not have been legally tenable;

(d) the background to the proposed amendment originated from litigation;

(e) following the Lukin judgment of 1986, the Crown Solicitor advised that section 37 should be amended.

The scene is set, the drama is in place before the Committee. Section 37 is to be amended. The unfortunate aspect of the legislation is that there appears to be an intent on the part of the Minister and his Director to negate previous judgments of the Supreme Courts of South Australia and Victoria—an unfortunate outcome of any legislation. Hence, one can fully understand the fears being expressed by fishermen within South Australia at the prospect of what might ensue, given that the Director is soliciting this change to give him the power to do what the Supreme Court has already refused him the right to do. Once he has that power, they fear what he will do with it. If he intends to do nothing, why is he soliciting that power?

Only the Minister and his Director can give the reassurances that the fishing industry seek. The Minister is fully aware of the implications because, in a letter to the South Australian Fishing Industry Council in 1990, he stated:

With regard to fishery licences as property, I wish to advise that until such time as this matter is clarified in the High Court, the SA Government will be guided by the decision of the Full Court of the Supreme Court of SA in the *Pennington v. McGovern* case which determined that licences granted under the Fisheries Act 1982 constitute a form of property . . . it is the most pertinent legal interpretation available . . . the Department of Fisheries will take cognisance of this interpretation with regard to fisheries matters as the Commissioner of Stamps appears to have done.

The Minister's correspondence shows that he is a man of honour and integrity and that he understands the implications of the legislation. I wonder whether he fully understands the implication of the amendment to the Bill currently before us—an amendment which is, to some degree, negated by the further amendment moved by the shadow Minister of Fisheries (John Meier) and by further amendments still to be moved.

In light of the comments that I have made on behalf of the fishermen, I ask the Minister to seriously consider accepting the amendment currently before the Committee

because it is more comprehensive than a further amendment to be moved and satisfies the currently expressed needs of fishermen throughout South Australia. I commend the amendment to the Minister and also ask him to respond in relation to whether it is his intention, by amending section 37, to destroy licences as property and to remove them as equity for borrowings through banks and financial institutions.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: My colleague the member for Henley Beach described the member for Goyder as overly cautious in regard to all the checks and balances and going down this highway, that byway, that lane and around this maze in an attempt to protect the fishing industry. I liken his amendment to someone who wears a belt and braces but who still worries constantly about his trousers falling down. It is complete overkill.

Like the member for Henley Beach, I also have a lot of respect for the member for Goyder for the way in which he handles his shadow portfolio, and I say that quite sincerely. However, after listening to the member for Mount Gambier's contribution I could be forgiven for suspecting that the member for Goyder has become the lackey for the fishing industry. I do not say that that is true. But, if it means that the only reason this amendment is being moved is that the fishing industry has put pressure on the shadow Minister—the member for Goyder, my very good friend—I am duty bound to oppose it, because we all have a responsibility in this House, in effect, to discharge our parliamentary duties without fear or favour.

It is for that reason that I would like some assurance from the member for Goyder that he is not just acting as a mouthpiece for the commercial fishing industry. It is not the kind of amendment that the Government could support. The member for Mount Gambier can talk about all the court cases he likes. He then says that the only reason this amendment has been moved is that it has been requested by the Director, for whom I have a great deal of respect. I also have a great deal of respect for the Minister, who I am sure will be able to adequately respond to that allegation. Do not let me hear the member for Mount Gambier say that he has sold his soul to the commercial fishing industry.

Mr MEIER: I am staggered by the comments from the member for Napier. I would have thought that the honourable member, as a former Minister, would appreciate that it is a shadow Minister's responsibility and certainly a Minister's responsibility to endeavour to seek out and to obtain information from the relevant sources to the best of his ability. Yet, we have heard statements from the member for Napier about his wanting an assurance that I am not the mouthpiece of the commercial fishing industry. I am happy to represent the commercial fishing industry and any section of the industry, be it recreational, commercial or whatever, at any time and on any occasion in this House, and I make no apology for doing so.

I am absolutely amazed that the member for Napier has indicated that there seems to be something inherently wrong if I take the view of one section of the fishing industry more to heart than that of another section—and I am not saying that I have. I said earlier that I have had many discussions with representatives of the fishing industry. I wish that we had more time to deal with this Bill, but perhaps the Parliament has had the measure before it for a long time. As long as we can get some commonsense in relation to this section, for a start, we will see how things go. I guess the Upper House is a law unto itself and it will make its decision in due course. The Opposition and I have been concerned about the whole issue of licences as prop-

erty. The Commissioner of Stamps Circular No. 9, amongst other things, states:

The Stamp Duties Office has long held the view that a fishing licence is property for the purposes of the Stamp Duties Act and that a conveyance on sale of a licence is liable for *ad valorem* duty.

The circular then addresses quite a few other items and indicates that the office will continue to monitor compliance in the area of the exchange of fishing licences and impose penalties on unstamped documentation. It is quite clear from that that fishing licences are regarded as property. I hope that the members for Napier and Henley Beach recognise the implications of the Bill in that the Minister, through his department, and as a result of my amendment, may at some time in the future interfere with the property rights of fishing licences, and we have to weigh up those fishing rights against the limited and finite resource we have in the fishing industry.

It has been put to me that it is wrong for the Parliament and the Government to seek to interfere by taking away any aspect of property. I can see that argument. However, there is a counter argument that if appropriate controls are not placed on the fishery as a whole it is possible that licences could become worthless, in other words, that the property could become worthless. It is a catch 22 situation from the point of view that there is property in licences: that is quite clear.

The Commissioner of Stamps recognises it; I hope that the Government recognises it. The banks and the financial institutions need to recognise property rights. At the same time, because it is a fishery and different from other areas, it will always be difficult to obtain a clear black and white picture of the situation. There is the need for some control, and that is why the Opposition's amendments, whilst recognising the need for control, provide every possible avenue of appeal to fishermen who feel that they have been wrongly done by.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will not be proposing that we accept the amendment of the shadow Minister, and there are a number of reasons for that. The first part of the amendment, where the honourable member wants to insert requirements that the Director can make decisions only on biological grounds in order to conserve the living resources, is quite clearly repetitious and suffers from the problem of being somewhat unnecessarily restrictive, especially when one takes into account section 20 of Part III of the principal Act which provides the basis upon which all decisions—the Minister's as well as the Director's—should be made. That section provides:

In the administration of this Act, the Minister and the Director shall have as their principal objectives:

(a) ensuring, through proper conservation and management measures, that the living resources of the waters to which this Act applies are not endangered or over-exploited;

and

(b) achieving the optimum utilisation and equitable distribution of those resources.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I appreciate that the member for Napier said something similar. That amendment is repetitious and not well worded. The shadow Minister has put clumsy wording before the Committee. If we were to start adding definition clauses throughout the Bill, we would not achieve a great deal. The other section to which I take particular exception is the last one that proposes to make each order effectively a regulation. It is a clumsy way of dealing with the administration of Government. This has not been attempted before in relation to fisheries, and it is not something that this Committee would want to have

before it, given the fact that the shadow Minister seems to have a bent on putting forward ceaseless disallowance motions in private members' time. Each order could then become a *de facto* regulation, which could then become the subject of an individual disallowance motion.

The intent of this provision is to allow not just the creation of orders of a more general category but perhaps of a more limited nature that may apply to individual licences. Given the charter of the Director and the Minister, that will be done in meeting the objectives of the Act, but administratively it will be very cumbersome, not to say perhaps verging on the unworkable—and that may, in fact, be the intent of the shadow Minister. Therefore, I strongly oppose the addition of this provision.

A number of comments have been made about licences as property. I refer members to the comments I made in my second reading reply and last night in Committee to bring members up to date on where the Government is moving on that matter. In regard to the Lukin case, referred to by the member for Mount Gambier, I make the point that, rather than this Bill attempting to negate the judgment of the Supreme Court, it is our intent to uphold the original intention that failed because of drafting deficiencies. We are not trying to change the original intent that allowed this legislature to use its quite legitimate authority to pass an Act of Parliament on related matters.

I want to make a point that is quite important in this particular case because the Lukin case revolved around some licences containing an order preventing the taking of salmon and allowing only the taking of tuna, while other licences allowed the taking of salmon and tuna. That situation was appealed and the order was overthrown. In other words, that result had the potential of exposing the salmon fishery to more exploitation than in the considered view of the department and the Government it could sustain. Surely, if the intent of the Act is to properly manage fisheries, that is what we should be trying to do, not putting at risk the marine ecosystem for want of a drafting deficiency in an earlier piece of legislation. I do not think that any member opposite would say that that was a successful outcome which put at greater risk and exposed even more the salmon fishery in this State. I know that the shadow Minister wants to make many contributions, so I will not comment further. Suffice to say, that the Government will not accept this amendment. However, there is another amendment on file on which I hope I will be able to comment favourably.

Mr MEIER: I wish to take up the Minister's comment that perhaps it is my intent to make the Act unworkable. I refute that comment out of hand. The Minister should have appreciated from the way in which I put this amendment that the whole intent is to give people in the fishing industry the opportunity to consider every right of appeal. If a similar order were to be imposed again on Lukin Enterprises, would the Minister want to deny Mr Lukin the right to every right of appeal? I hope not. I believe that the matter could be sorted out more quickly and in a much less expensive way if, in the first instance, evidence were given to the Subordinate Legislation Committee arguing the case for or against restrictions being imposed. If that fails, Lukin Enterprises and anyone else who has suffered can appeal to Parliament through their local members.

If a majority in either House agree that they have had a situation apply that will halve their licence value or make conditions unworkable, I believe that Parliamentarians can ascertain and decide whether that is or is not the case. We see it happen regularly through the select committees. Is anyone going to suggest that Parliamentarians are not the appropriate people to make judgments in select committees?

I hope not. You, Mr Chairman, and all members here recognise that in those select committees expert evidence is sought and given. The Parliamentarians do not simply make judgments on their own whims or fancies; they have to weigh up reams of evidence in most cases. A similar situation would apply if the appeal came before Parliament. I realise that the guillotine will apply at six and there are other issues that I want to raise. I acknowledge that at this stage the Minister is not prepared to accept the amendment, and that disappoints me, but we will see whether that occurs when the vote is called.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Section 58 provides ample opportunity for decisions of the Minister or the Director to be appealed through the proper process, and I believe that the protections offered are adequate. The inherent proposal of the shadow Minister to add the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation to the list of appeal mechanisms does not add anything of merit. That is not to say that there is no legitimate role for that committee to play in the normal process of Government regulations and the review of those regulations as classes of activity, but not with respect to individual matters of administration. If the legislature is now to move into a situation where each individual area is to be the subject of the potential of going before this appeal mechanism, clearly it will be used and, if it is used, it will clog up the work of this Parliament, whose proper job is the making of laws and regulations for the good government of this State.

The other point that we need to make is that there would be an inherent danger if there were an opportunity for an individual to claim a grievance. Only one of the Houses need make a decision. As the member for Henley Beach said, if there is a finely balanced situation, sometimes good decision-making is not necessarily at the forefront in terms of the final decision that may be made on the floor of the Chamber. I have no doubt that the Joint Committee may see ultimate wisdom in making its decisions, but it is possible, in the nature of the body politic, that political decision-making, namely, political opportunistic decision-making, may take place from time to time, and that could put the marine environment at real risk. I come back to the salmon decision. Is the member for Goyder saying that if that had come before the committee and been disallowed and the salmon fishing had been put at more risk of exploitation, that would have been a good outcome? I would argue that it would not have been a good outcome.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—Messrs Allison, Armitage, P.B. Arnold, S.J. Baker, Becker, Blacker and Brindal, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick and Ingerson, Mrs Kotz, Messrs Lewis, Matthew, Meier (teller), Oswald, Such, Venning and Wotton.

Noes (19)—Messrs L.M.F. Arnold (teller), Atkinson, Crafter, De Laine, Ferguson, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Heron, Holloway and Hopgood, Mrs Hutchison, Mr Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs McKee, Peterson, Quirke, Rann and Trainer.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs D.S. Baker, S.G. Evans, Goldsworthy and Gunn. Noes—Messrs Bannon, Blevins, Gregory and Mayes.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 23 Ayes and 23 Noes. I give my casting vote for the Noes.
Amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. N.T. PETERSON: I move:

Page 3—

Line 35—After 'amended' insert:

(a) by striking out 'The' being the first word of subsection (1) and substituting 'Subject to subsection (2a), the';

(b)

Line 38—after 'prevent' insert 'for a specified period'.

After line 43—Insert:

(c) by striking out 'The' being the first word of subsection (2) and substituting 'Subject to subsection (2a), the';

and

(d) by inserting after subsection (2a), the following subsections:

(2a) The Director must not—

(a) impose a condition that has the effect described in subsection (1a) (a) or (b);

or

(b) vary a condition so that it has that effect, except with the approval of the Minister.

(2b) Before giving his or her approval under subsection (2a), the Minister must—

(a) give the holder of the licence and the prescribed fishing industry body notice in writing setting out the condition to be imposed or the manner in which a condition is to be varied, as the case may be, and the reasons for the proposed action;

and

(b) not later than 14 days after giving notice, consult or use his or her best endeavours to consult with the holder of the licence and the prescribed fishing industry body in relation to the matter.

(2c) In subsection (2b)—

'prescribed fishing industry body' means—

(a) the South Australian Fishing Industry Council;

or

(b) if the Council ceases to exist, such fishing industry body as is prescribed by regulation for the purposes of this definition.

As members of the Committee will know, I have a long-standing interest in fisheries. There are many fishers in my area who service the diverse range of fisheries. When the Bill was first proposed, I canvassed the people in my electorate who were involved in the fishing industry, and also outside the electorate, together with some of the organisations that serviced the industry. I have letters to attest to the fact that the only clause that is of concern to the fishers who contacted me is the one that proposes changes to section 37.

The general concern of the fishermen and the other people involved, including the administrators, relates to the power that is given to the Director. It should be the Minister and there should be some period of consultation before any restriction is put into place. My amendments provide for that, and this was also raised in debate previously. However, I felt that that went too far. It concerned me that a shadow Minister should move an amendment that really threw a reflection on a current Minister. The possibility there is that the shadow Minister will one day be the Minister and not feel that he should be trusted. That is the implication in an amendment like that, where the appeal provision brings it back before the Parliament. There is still the ability for a Minister to be censured in this Parliament, in either House, at any time over any matter. So, it seemed to me that that amendment went too far. I have moved the amendments in the true belief that they cover all the points made to me by the majority of people who have contacted me. That is not to say that people have not disagreed and wanted them

to go further, not as far or not at all, but the vast majority agreed with the context of the amendments.

The amendments lay it down very clearly: the responsibility is the Minister's and there is a period of consultation with the prescribed fishing body. One point made earlier by the member for Napier about the responsibilities of the shadow Minister needs to be taken up. I fully support the shadow Minister in his application to his job. I certainly do not envy him. I know how diverse the opinions are in small select fisheries, let alone trying to service the whole State. Let me put this on the record: the shadow Minister certainly has my sympathy in trying to keep a fairly rugged group of individuals, who all believe they are right, in line. I have never met a fisherman yet who believes he is wrong—much the same as politicians, I guess. I sympathise with him. I think that he has tried to pick his path based on the input he received. However, I think he went a little too far and hence my amendments which I think suit the requirements as they have been put to me.

Mr FERGUSON: I will be extremely brief. I support the proposition in front of us and congratulate the member for Semaphore for bringing the amendments before the Committee.

Members interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I am sorry, Mr Chairman. I cannot make myself heard. There is no doubt about it; the proposition put forward by the shadow Minister did go a bit too far. The member for Semaphore has clarified the situation and has provided all the appropriate rights that are necessary. The Minister must notify the licence holders and consult with them within 14 days. What could be fairer than that? This proposition has my full support.

Mr MEIER: As members have recognised, the amendments of the member for Semaphore include the things incorporated in my amendment. Therefore, the Opposition will support that as far as it goes. I am sorry that the member for Semaphore was not able to see his way clear to ensure that the fishermen have the full rights of appeal as detailed earlier. At least it is a step in the right direction and provides a mechanism that is a little more constraining than the current situation. For that reason, the Opposition is happy to support the amendments.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Government accepts the amendments.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Well, I appreciated the comments made by the shadow Minister, compared with some of the relatively unseemly comments of other members opposite who reflected on an individual member's right to move amendments in this place. This Chamber would have to acknowledge that I have a very good record of accepting amendments, regardless of from what quarter they come. Over the years I have been inclined to accept amendments that are sound and that go in a proper direction. I believe very firmly that these amendments do just that.

I, too, have received representations from people in the fishing industry—from the South Australian Fishing Industry Council, for example—about a number of concerns with respect to section 37. It seemed to me that I was hearing the message strongly that the industry wished to see at the very least a couple of things built into that. One is a move to bring in a body politic, namely, through the Minister rather than having it built into law as a power direct to the Director and, secondly, to have some requirement and consultation mechanism built in as well.

A further positive inclusion here will only strengthen the Bill, and that is the insertion of the phrase 'for a specified period'. That takes into account the most recent concerns

that have been expressed to me as well as to the member for Semaphore and other members, for example, by SAFIC, which believes that there could still be the potential for it not to work well if something like that is not included. I would have to acknowledge that the advice I have had from SAFIC is that it is not perfectly happy with the wording but, for the purposes of my responsibility, in looking at the charter to which I am answerable under the Act of Parliament, this is the best way to address that and I am pleased to accept the amendments.

The Hon. N.T. PETERSON: I am deeply hurt by the attitude of the Opposition. Once again the eloquent case that I put before the Minister in private in this place has been accepted, but I am deeply hurt that comments such as 'the tail wagging the dog' should be used in this place in debate. I am appalled. I believe the amendments make sense and I believe they honour the undertaking that I gave the fishermen who approached me. While I am in this place, the people in my electorate and the people I represent are the ones I will look after to the best of my ability. This is what they wanted; it is what they have got; and this is what will apply.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 13 and 14 passed.

Clause 15—'Offences with respect to sale, purchase or possession of fish.'

Mr MEIER: This clause amends section 44 to make the possession of declared protected fish an offence. My question relates to retrospectivity. What will be the position faced by a person who has a mounted or stuffed protected fish on their desk? Will it become an offence to possess that or will appropriate safeguards apply so that those people are not prosecuted under this provision?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I understand that there are defence provisions within the principal Act that cover that situation where, in good faith, people adhered to the legislation that applied at the time. That is the most appropriate way of doing it, rather than some more regulatory way of requiring people to register pre-existing stuffed fish or other ornaments on their desk or on walls (I add that I do not have any). The defence mechanism is not unusual in legislation but I just cannot quickly draw to mind the exact provision, but I will have that information provided in the other place. In fact, the second reading explanation states:

It is recognised that in some instances persons would be in possession of fish that were not taken unlawfully at the time, for example, a leafy sea dragon taken prior to such fish being declared as a protected species. Defence provisions have been included to cover such situations.

Clause passed.

Clause 16 passed.

Clause 17—'Substitution of s. 48.'

Mr MEIER: This clause amends section 48 of the Act so that 'marine parks' rather than 'aquatic reserves' will be designated and managed by regulations to give a higher degree of security and tenure, according to the Minister. As I highlighted last night, we see the word 'preservation' added to the word 'conservation'. As I took up that point earlier, I will not seek further information. However, I have concerns and foresee problems in giving priority to 'marine parks' as they relate to the arbitrariness of their location and the interpretation of whether or not they cover viable fishing areas or whether such other activities as power boating, diving and angling will be allowed.

I am also wary of the need to have a legislative framework within the Fisheries Act which is compatible with the requirements of other Government managers of parks and wildlife, since I fear that such red tape may severely restrict many activities that could presently be pursued in those

other areas to be proclaimed as marine parks. I seek further explanation from the Minister on why we need to go from 'aquatic reserves' to 'marine parks' and, incorporated in that, what safeguards will exist for the commercial and recreational fishing sectors to see that fish stock that may be abundant in those areas is not excluded from being caught.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Government has decided to raise the status of aquatic reserves by bringing them into the legislative arena with the creation of marine parks. However, I point out that this comes under the Fisheries Act, and I again come back to the charter of the objectives of the Fisheries Act. It could have been included in another Act where it may have been more difficult immediately to define the optimum utilisation of the resource sympathetically with the creation of a marine park.

It is a detailed clause that goes on at some length. Those provisions look at management plans that would have to be put in place. Those management plans would be subject to consideration by the Legislature and would have to be dealt with by both Houses. In those plans of management would be the very question of looking at the use of a resource that was not at risk. That situation is handled by that means; otherwise, the other provisions of the marine park are essentially as for land provisions under National Parks and Wildlife. As we do not have fish swimming on land, it is not relevant to have such management plans for fisheries in that legislation.

Mr MEIER: I seek further clarification from the Minister on why we need to use the term 'marine park' rather than 'aquatic reserve'. Why could not we have amended the Act with the various stipulations that now come in? The Minister rightly pointed out that there are several pages of amendments relating to the constitution, controlling and administration of marine parks, and so on. Why was it not possible simply to bring in those extra regulatory provisions under 'aquatic reserves'? Is there some magical concept in 'marine parks'?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: No more magical than there is any magic in the word 'aquatic reserve'. It does have an element of symbolism or status to raise the title to 'marine park', just as we have 'national parks' on land. In terms of the consistency of approach, we think it not unreasonable that there be such parks in the marine environment in those waters under the control of the State. The title 'marine park' seems to sit happily alongside 'national park'. 'Aquatic reserve' is a corollary of, I suppose, a 'terra reserve' or a 'land reserve', but we do not have them; that is not the way we operate. There is nothing magical about having it; nor is there anything magical about not having it.

Clause passed.

Clause 18—'Substitution of s. 51.'

Mr MEIER: This clause, which relates to persons engaged in fish farming, indicates that they will have to be licensed. It is a worry to me and to the Opposition as to what effect licences will have on fish farming, not so much from the point of view of a licence being issued, but in relation to the cost involved. During the second reading debate I highlighted the fiasco that currently exists with respect to oyster farming, where not only the department seeks and requires a registration fee, but also various other Government departments seek to do the same. Why does the Minister see the need to have a licence? What difference does he see in, perhaps, having a fish farmer registered? I acknowledge that for health requirements there may be a need to be a registration ration. What sort of fee does the Minister envisage for this licensing of fish farmers? Will it be a sliding

scale depending on the type of fish farming that is undertaken?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: First, it is not new to the fisheries legislation to have the power to require licences to farm fish. That already appears under division IV of the principal Act, and I draw the honourable member's attention to that. This amending legislation defines more exactly the relationship of licence granting to management plans and to actual organised fishing activities. So, it is more a case of fleshing it out rather than introducing a new requirement.

In relation to the fee, clearly this will be subject to a number of factors in decision making, just as is the setting of licences in other fisheries. There will be a requirement that research be done into fish farming. Research is already being undertaken in fish farming, and it is being funded by the research fund of the Department of Fisheries. I remind the honourable member that the fund earns the substantial part of its revenue from licence fees; it earns a smaller part of its revenue from other grants that it is able to win from other places. Again, this would happen in this situation. It is not unreasonable to expect those who will be the beneficiaries of that research to pay for it.

Secondly, there are questions that I believe should also be examined in the longer term, and I refer to the cost of enforcement: who should be meeting those costs? If there is a fish farming situation that is a potential polluter of water, for example, as a result of improper management of a fish farm, that may involve wider costs which the community has to bear or for some of which the licence holder themselves should bear some responsibility. That is a personal view, which at this stage is not in the legislation because it limits the use of licence fee revenue. However, the exact setting of those fees would be different from the principles that apply for the setting of other licence fees. I cannot, at this stage, say what the licence fee will be. Clearly, as with others, it will be discussed with the industry.

The honourable member raised the issue of oyster farming and, certainly, there has been some difficulty in that area. However, I believe we are substantially on the way to working through those issues. I attended a conference of the Oyster Growers Association of Ceduna some months ago, at which there was lively discussion and a very positive attitude towards the fee setting mechanism of a number of different areas of oyster aquaculture. I see that same sort of thing applying in other areas. For the edification of the honourable member, I point out that the new sections are 51a (2) (a) to 51c (2) (i), and the remaining sections are already in the legislation in one form or another. I have been advised that they apply to other fishery schemes of management, so essentially they are standard items that apply to other fisheries throughout the State.

Mr MEIER: I still have concerns about the whole issue, but I do not have the time to take it up this evening that will have to be done in the other place. When the Minister said that management plans for fish farming would be introduced, my mind went back to the management plans for pastoral areas, and we spent hours debating that issue. There are areas, including the prescribing of the terms of fish farming licences and the renewal of those licences and other matters, that will need further examination. I hope that by the time this legislation is considered in another place more details will be known about the licence fee.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In that process we will detail how we set fee mechanisms. I do not think that management plans should be of major concern to anyone who wants to see the fisheries preserved and the general environment not damaged.

Clause passed.
Remaining clauses (21 to 26), schedule and title passed.
Bill read a third time and passed.

**ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST (PARLIAMENTARY
COMMITTEE AND BUSINESS ADVISORY PANEL)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amend-
ment.

**STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE (IMMUNITY FOR
MEMBERS) AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amend-
ment.

**THE FLINDERS UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH
AUSTRALIA (JOINT AWARDS) AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amend-
ment.

**SUPERANNUATION (MISCELLANEOUS)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council with an amend-
ment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.59 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 26
November at 2 p.m.