

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 4 March 1993

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

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN BILL

The **Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Public Infrastructure)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to approve and provide for carrying out an agreement entered into between the Commonwealth, New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia with regard to the water, land and other environmental resources of the Murray-Darling Basin; to repeal the Murray-Darling Basin Act; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

On 24 June 1992 the Prime Minister and Premiers of South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales signed a new agreement as the basis for cooperative and coordinated planning and management of the water, land and other environmental resources of the Murray-Darling Basin. This agreement consolidates and replaces the River Murray Waters Agreement of 1982 and its subsequent amendments as well as adding some further provisions.

This new agreement, the Murray-Darling Basin Agreement 1992, is still to be ratified by the Federal Parliament, the Parliament of Victoria and this Parliament. A Bill ratifying the agreement has been passed by the New South Wales Parliament. The Bill now before the House approves and provides for the carrying out of the new agreement, and repeals the Murray-Darling Basin Act 1983.

The new agreement is an extension of the current agreement. Although it retains most of the existing provisions as they are, it modifies the current agreement in six important areas:

- it broadens the role of the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council and Commission in the measurement, monitoring and investigation of water, land and environment resources
- it provides for other States, such as Queensland, to become parties to the agreement
- it provides for the implementation of specific strategies such as the Natural Resources Management Strategy and the Salinity and Drainage Strategy to become schedules to the new agreement
- it provides for a more business like approach to the management of the financial resources of the Murray-Darling Basin Commission, including flexibility for the Ministerial Council to determine alternative cost sharing formulae if that is thought to be appropriate in any particular instance
- it overhauls the water distribution clauses so that water used by NSW and Victoria is accounted for on a continuous basis

- it provides for the appointment of an independent President of the Murray-Darling Basin Commission, in lieu of the current arrangement whereby a Commonwealth Commissioner automatically becomes President.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal.

Clause 3 sets out the purpose of the Bill.

Clause 4 defines terms used in the Bill. Words used in the Bill have the same meaning as in the new agreement (see subclause (2)).

Clause 5 provides for Parliament's approval of the agreement.

Clause 6 sets out the basis on which Commissioners and Deputy Commissioners are appointed by South Australia.

Clause 7 provides that a State member holds office on the terms and conditions determined by the Governor.

Clause 8 ensures that the appointment of a State member is not invalidated by a defect or irregularity in the member's appointment.

Clause 9 provides for remuneration and allowances for State members.

Clause 10 enables a State member to resign in accordance with clause 29 of the Agreement.

Clause 11 provides for removal of a State Member by the Governor.

Clause 12 provides the Commission with its powers, functions and duties.

Clause 13 enables the Commission to authorise a person to enter and occupy land for the purposes of the Act and the agreement. The Commission must provide the authorised person with a certificate that complies with subclause (3).

Clause 14 provides for notice before entry onto land. Subclause (4) places restrictions on the exercise of this power.

Clause 15 makes it an offence to obstruct or hinder an authorised person or Commissioner.

Clause 16 authorises the construction, maintenance, operation and control of works and the other acts and activities set out in paragraphs (b) and (c).

Clause 17 gives the Minister power to acquire land.

Clause 18 gives the Minister power to construct works and undertake other acts and activities set out in the clause on behalf of the Commission.

Clause 19 authorises the Minister to pay compensation.

Clause 20 gives the Minister power to sell or lease land acquired under clause 17.

Clause 21 provides that land dedicated under the Crown Lands Act 1929 for the purposes of the agreement may be used and occupied by a contracting Government.

Clause 22 provides for the resumption of land that is subject to a Crown lease for the purposes of the agreement.

Clause 23 provides for the imposition of tolls at locks.

Clause 24 gives the Supreme Court jurisdiction in relation to the Commission and the Commissioners.

Clause 25 provides that money to be contributed by the State under the agreement must be paid out of money appropriated by Parliament for that purpose.

Clause 26 exempts the Commission and its operations from State taxes.

Clause 27 is an evidentiary provision.

Clause 28 requires the Minister to lay the documents referred to in this clause before Parliament.

Clause 29 provides for other States to become parties to the agreement.

Clause 30 provides an offence in relation to the destruction of, or damage to, any works.

Clause 31 provides for the making of regulations.

Clause 32 repeals the Murray-Darling Basin Act 1983 and enacts transitional provisions.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1) (1993)

Adjourned debate on the question:

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

(Continued from 3 March. Page 2268.)

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): In speaking in this grievance debate I wish to raise a number of issues, a couple of which are of a local nature and relate to my electorate. Yesterday I came across a quotation that made some reference to the democracies of the various countries of the world and I want to use this in the House at this time, particularly as we are on the eve of a Federal election, and it maybe that it is time for people to reflect on where we are at. I refer to a book written some 200 years ago by Alexander Fraser Tytler, who lived at the end of the eighteenth century and the early part of the nineteenth century, called *The Decline and Fall of the Athenian Republic*. It is amazing, is it not, how timely is the following quotation from that book, written about ancient democracy long before American democracy had really been tested. He wrote:

A democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of government. It can only exist until the voters discover that they can vote themselves money from the public treasury. From that moment on the majority always votes for the candidates promising the most benefits from the public treasury with a result that a democracy always collapses over loose fiscal policy, always followed by dictatorship. The average age of the world's greatest civilisations has been 200 years. These nations have progressed through the following sequences: from bondage to spiritual faith; from spiritual faith to great courage; from courage to liberty; from liberty to abundance; from abundance to selfishness; from selfishness to complacency; from complacency to apathy; from apathy to dependency; and from dependency back into bondage.

I wonder at what stage we are at this moment, and I would suggest to the House, and many people would probably make this assumption themselves, that we have gone through the stage of abundance to selfishness and from that stage through to complacency. We are now in the era of complacency to apathy, leading into the apathy to dependency category and virtually at the end of that cycle from dependency back into bondage. It is a sorry thing to say, but I believe that is where we are at this moment. If one listens to some of the propaganda that has been circulated in the current Federal election campaign, we must understand that ethics and truthfulness have gone out the window with much of the publicity surrounding this election.

One of the issues that I wish to raise before the House today relates to an announcement two days ago by the Highways Department that there is to be an axing of jobs

from the Port Lincoln Highways Department. I am expressing concern at that, because the proposal is to administer the whole of Eyre Peninsula from Port Augusta. One needs only to travel on Eyre Peninsula to realise the vastness of distances and the impracticalities of doing just that. For a regional director based at Port Augusta to be able to oversee the whole of Eyre Peninsula is just ridiculous, therefore it is something that should be rejected out of hand.

I am surprised that this has come up at such short notice. Needless to say, the number of workers who almost certainly will face the sack are also quite shocked by this. We need a moratorium on any Government closures of that kind until a full assessment has been made. Although there has been some criticism of the ODR report in the Department of Agriculture, at least there has been some public consultation about it. In this case it is a *fait accompli* that has been forced through, and some of the employees within the regional office, and the associated 32 staff members, really do not know where they are at this stage.

The regional office at Port Lincoln has developed on a needs basis over a long period of time to service and maintain the highway structure on Eyre Peninsula. It has grown because of need and it has been established in those areas because of need. For some reason or other, that need seems to have disappeared. I am somewhat cynical, and I do not mean to be but, quite clearly, the Government department intends to run down our infrastructure in those areas, because it is quite impractical to expect that the Highways Department can be run from Port Augusta in a meaningful and efficient way. I would hope that a moratorium could be placed on the closure of any Government department until full and proper consultation had taken place and the full ramifications of those efforts or actions are known.

On a slightly different tack, yesterday I waited on the Minister of Public Infrastructure, together with a deputation from the Streaky Bay District Council and a water committee from Streaky Bay, to explore the possibility of a desalination plant at Streaky Bay. The water supply for Streaky Bay comes from an independent lens known as the Robinson Basin, and that lens has now been proved to be fully taxed in its throughput. It has a recoverable amount believed to be in the vicinity of 210 megalitres, and about eight to 10 years ago the local consumption or drawdown from that lens was far in excess of 210 kilolitres. In fact, it was well over 300 kilolitres.

The panic bells struck when it became clear to the community and to the E&WS that, with such a high draw down, there would be an increase in salinity, which proved to be the case. That lens did not have the ability to recover and provide a permanent water supply to the township of Streaky Bay. The department, through the Government, put certain proposals to the community. The community responded to that and cut down its consumption of water to 160 megalitres. That is a phenomenal cut down, and it was a tremendous response by a community faced with that crisis. The community, through the district council, is now trying to find a means of supplementing that income, and it is looking at the possibility of a desalination plant so that it can

supplement the existing 210 megalitres of water that is believed to be available from that lens.

In the deputation with the Minister last night it became fairly clear that the Government is not able to help subsidise that sort of water infrastructure. It worries me because it means that no further water reticulation schemes will be introduced unless they are cost neutral to the Government, meaning that those people living in communities that are somewhat distant from the metropolitan area will be disadvantaged and considered as second class citizens. If an average person living in a local government built up area cannot have access to a water supply or the basic services at the same price as everyone else, we will get a differential of people within those communities. We will have the haves and the have-nots, and that should be opposed.

It is for that reason that I voice these concerns at this time, because the old user pays principle does not work for country people. It means that country people will pay more for their commodities, because they live farther out and, therefore, they have to pay more freight costs. It also means that the basic services such as water, power and gas (wherever that is available) are not available to the public on an equitable basis, and it means that those people will have to pay yet higher costs for living in those communities. I should point out that those communities in the far-flung areas are invariably there as service communities to a productive sector of the State, and that is more than can be said for many of the residential areas of the metropolitan region. In some cases, the metropolitan area has manufacturing services, and so on, but in the main it is a residential area for retirement.

This State should be looking, at supporting the productive areas. On the one hand the Government says that it wants to support any industry that has the ability to bring income or jobs to South Australia but, on the other hand, and in this instance, the Government is working in reverse. We need some form of encouragement so that in this case the desalination plant, first, can be built, and, secondly, if the community contributes to the construction of that work, it should not be penalised with a 50c a kilolitre add-on cost for every drop of water that is used; and the other alternative is a double rating over the set limit.

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

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): There are three matters to which I wish to draw the House's attention during the course of these remarks. First, I refer to the way in which this Government has failed to deliver on its responsibilities to the people who were so adversely affected by the unseasonal weather conditions and the resulting flooding just a few months ago. Not only did we suffer such heavy downpours as to cause considerable damage in some places in consequence of the flooding but right across the State great damage was done to the cereal crop harvest. Whilst I acknowledge the loss which has occurred in that regard, the Government could have ameliorated the problem by simply declaring a state of natural disaster. It chose not to do so, because it is so strapped for cash that it could not find the money it would have to use to make the arrangements for the

provision of finance to the people in those rural communities and towns right across the State that were so adversely affected.

It was simply not true, as the Minister of Agriculture otherwise tried to represent, that, had the Government chosen to do that, we would not have been able to help the farmers on Eyre Peninsula who suffered harvest losses in consequence of persistent wet weather with very little storm damage and very little flooding in many instances. That is simply not true. The Government could have provided, as it is now providing under the Rural Assistance Scheme, funds for those people who unexpectedly lost their crops, their harvest, or the best part of it.

My particular concern is not only for those small towns such as Callington that were flooded out and severely damaged but also, and more especially at a parochial level, those dairy farmers on the Mobilong Swamp who were totally devastated. Their entire property went under water through no fault of their own. The Government has sat on its hands and done nothing. If that disaster had been repeated in a number of other places, for instance, and all the dairy farmers had been flooded out, the Government would have done something. It would have been a political imperative, but because only just over a handful of people lost their entire property to flooding for several days, which ran on and on into weeks and has been devastating for them, the Government knew that it could get away with it, has got away with it so far, and thinks it can continue to get away with it. Well, it cannot.

To my mind it is despicable that the Government chooses to ignore the plight of those people where it could otherwise have provided some assistance. I do not suggest grant funds, but it could have provided loan-funds. It most certainly should have done more than it has, and I am not talking about public servants, particularly those who have regional responsibility for the action that had to be taken to get the water off the swamp. I am talking about the Minister and the rest of Cabinet who sat on their hands and did nothing other than address the sorts of problems that might arise in the public health domain with respect to avoiding epidemics and so on. I applaud officers from the E&WS Department and the Department of Agriculture who stood shoulder to shoulder with the dairy farmers who were flooded out and assisted them to get the water off their land and make interim arrangements for the relocation of stock and so on. Neighbours have been particularly helpful also.

I want it to be a matter of record that, to the extent of its assistance, the Government deserves praise. In every other respect, it deserves condemnation. It was slow to provide an assistance package to local government to fix the damage to public infrastructure such as roads and so on, and it has done nothing for the people who were wiped out. I intend to pursue the Minister on that. He spoke as if he would do a lot but ended up doing nothing.

The second matter that I draw to the attention of the general public and the House in particular is the necessity for us as a nation to address the problems that we face. My grievance is that the Labor Party has been simply indulging in calumny. I cannot call it lies—this

House's procedures prevent us from using the term 'lies' to describe that practice, even though that is what it is. The Labor Party continues to misrepresent the Fightback package and the way in which the goods and services tax will be to the greater benefit of the vast majority of Australians. With your leave and that of the House, Mr Speaker, I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* a table which I assure you is entirely statistical. It sets out

the effect which the Fightback Ready Reckoner would have on families on a variety of income levels and with a differing number of dependants.

The SPEAKER: Can the honourable member give an assurance that it is purely statistical?

Mr LEWIS: Yes, it is purely statistical, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Leave granted.

Weekly Income \$	Gains under Fightback \$ per week	Weekly Income \$	Gains under Fightback \$ per week	Weekly Income \$	Gains under Fightback \$ per week
Families		Sole Parent/Widow		Unemployed/Sickness	
One Income No Children					
380	17	140	13	130	7
440	23	160	12	180	25
490	21	190	18	230	23
560	23	200	26	270	24
630	35	220	22	300	31
770	37	240	31	330	34
860	49	260	31	380	38
1010	36	280	40	490	44
1270	60	320	44	630	43
One Income/Children		Single People		Pensioners Married	
430	40	340	13	220	23
500	49	450	20	250	25
560	56	510	23	260	26
620	60	570	22	270	26
690	53	630	31	280	28
770	59	710	34	300	26
860	56	820	40	320	29
970	57	1000	43	340	30
1150	54	1120	53	390	36
Two Income/No Children		Part-Time Workers		Pensioners Single	
520	19	220	19	130	15
760	32	300	24	150	14
880	38	390	29	150	15
970	42	450	32	150	15
1060	41	540	32	160	16
1150	46	640	33	170	16
1240	48	760	39	180	14
1340	66	900	46	210	16
1500	65	1160	50	260	19
Two Income/Children		Small Business		Retirees Single	
		Self-Employed/Farmer			
580	41	140	24	130	22
750	41	230	30	200	15
840	39	320	32	240	14
930	43	410	30	270	43
1020	41	520	48	300	29
1110	52	630	34	340	27
1220	46	750	40	380	38
1360	50	890	37	450	38
1570	56	1130	52	590	62
		Retirees Married			
240	31	410	38	640	67
330	37	470	35	820	91
370	38	540	37	1120	123

Mr LEWIS: It will be noted, for instance, that it is possible to see how a family's status, given the estimated weekly income, will benefit from the package. It also points out in another purely statistical table how the

family allowance will be increased and paid to the principal carer in that family, usually the woman. It is doubled for families on incomes of up to \$30 000. It will be increased by 50 per cent on family incomes between

\$30 000 and \$40 000 and by 6 per cent on incomes from \$40 000 to \$55 000, being phased out after that. It is for the needy, not the greedy. This table is purely statistical. It sets out the number of children, the old rate of the allowance per fortnight and the new rate per fortnight under Fightback.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member seek leave to have that table inserted in *Hansard*?

Mr LEWIS: Yes, Mr Speaker.
Leave granted.

Up to \$30 000			\$30 000 to \$40 000		
Number of Children	Old Rate per fortnight	New Rate per fortnight	Number of Children	Old Rate per fortnight	New Rate per fortnight
1	\$20.00	\$40.00	1	\$20.00	\$30.00
2	\$40.00	\$80.00	2	\$40.00	\$60.00
3	\$60.00	\$120.00	3	\$60.00	\$90.00
4	\$86.70	\$173.40	4	\$86.70	\$130.15
5	\$113.40	\$226.80	5	\$113.40	\$170.10

For the sixth and every additional child the Family Allowance will increase from \$26.70 to \$53.40 for incomes up to \$30 000, and from \$26.70 to \$40.05 for incomes from \$30 000-\$40 000.

Mr LEWIS: It is a pity that the Labor Party cannot be honest about this because, had it been so, there would have been bipartisan support for these reforms and Australia would be a better place in consequence of their adoption. After the 13 March election, the Labor Party will be embarrassed, because the whole package will provide not only relief for those lower and middle income families in a number of ways but also incentive for people to employ. By providing jobs through that mechanism, it will reduce the number of people who are presently paid unemployment benefits.

Accordingly, Australians will be more prosperous. They will not have to pay so much in taxes to support those on welfare benefits, who would otherwise continue to need them as unemployed. Not only will they be getting their income from their employment, and thus not be dependent upon the State, notionally—that is, the Government, the other taxpayers—but they in turn will be paying taxes themselves, and there will be an incentive for them and also for those people who have new jobs, as well as those who currently have jobs, to work to the best of their ability, because there will be a reduction in income tax. Those people obtaining funds from their incomes will have an incentive to save.

That will mean that we will be addressing the problem we have at present, where there is a deficit of savings. We have to borrow overseas. We are unable to support and provide capital from within our own savings here in Australia for the essential expansion of equipment and capital works in which to house the facilities and provide the machinery for the people who want the jobs to get those jobs. That is another inequity and economic inaccuracy of the present Government's policy, which is causing problems. Altogether we will be much better off after 13 March following the adoption of Fightback. There will be no Australian worse off under the new package, those who are better off will be the unemployed. It is clearly not true to claim that Fightback will destroy conditions of work and so on.

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

Mr VENNING (Custance): Before I begin my speech, I want to pay tribute to one of my colleagues. I

understand that, as of this week, one Stanley George Evans has been 25 years in this place, and I think that is a tremendous record. It would be remiss if that record was not brought up and if this House did not note such a splendid record of one of our colleagues. He has had unbroken service since coming into the House in 1968. He served with my father on these benches. He has been very helpful to me as a younger member. Mr Evans is a very professional man and he has done his job as Whip, both in Government and in Opposition, with great finesse. Any younger politician would not find a better role model than Stan Evans, the member for Davenport.

I am very grateful that he was here at the beginning of my political career; he has been able to help and guide me. He has been a tremendous representative for his electorate, having given excellent representation to all constituents, irrespective of their politics. That has been the secret of his longevity. It would appear that the member for Davenport is not standing again after the next election, and I am sure that this House will be much the poorer without him. I would like to put on record my thanks, and I am sure that of many others opposite, to Stan; I hope he has a long retirement.

I want to talk now about a problem that grieves me greatly. There is an old saying or joke, 'Will the last person to leave the country please turn out the light?' These days, when the country involved is the rural community of South Australia, it has long stopped being a joke. Under the combined yoke of Federal and State Labor Administrations, the economy and with it the lifestyle of country South Australia is being gutted. There is an accelerating drift of people to the dubious benefits of metropolitan Adelaide and one or two major regional centres. One of the worst affected areas in the State and in this country is northern South Australia. I have alluded in this House previously to this dreadful problem, and I make no apologies for elaborating on it now.

The depopulation of country South Australia is a matter of such importance that I cannot stand silent about it. It is a matter that strikes at the very heart of the economic well-being of this State. I cannot stand silent, because I know full well what is happening—because the attitude of this Government to the needs of the South Australian rural community ranges from apathy to

downright hostility. Let us look first at the nature and extent of the problem. A report by management consultants Coopers and Lybrand for the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industries and Energy shows that more people have moved out of northern South Australia since 1976 than from any other region of Australia. It is a big loss to northern South Australia.

According to census figures collected between 1976 and 1989, northern South Australia lost 17 844 people through migration to other regions. At the same time, the population of Adelaide and outer Adelaide grew by more than 62 000. The great tragedy is that young people, and especially young women, are leading this exodus from the country. We do not need to be Einstein or to be very observant to see that there are no young women in country towns. The jobs are not there and, if young women are educated in the country, they soon come down to finish their secondary education in Adelaide, and they never return. It is an absolute tragedy. It is above politics: it is an absolute tragedy.

What makes this problem of vital importance now is that people in the country are faced with a Government of bean counters who regard the country electorates as having no political value and so as easy targets. When the services available to country people in these communities are reduced, there is even more pressure, on young people especially, to join the drift to the city. It is a very vicious cycle. What we are seeing is a vicious cycle: the Government is unsympathetic to the needs of country people and insensitive to the need for South Australia to have a vital rural sector. It is little short of genocide by stealth.

This is a very serious matter, and obviously the Government has not taken much notice of the issue, but all of a sudden people are realising that we have a problem. Labor Governments in Adelaide and Canberra have made policy aimed at urban Australia and left the country to battle on under inappropriate policy measures. Cost structures, development funding, transport policies, the use of interest rates for economic control and even taxation policies all become barriers to expanding the rural economy. We know full well of the problems in education for country students and country people. The Government has had a policy of fair go—'social justice' is the term it uses. There is no social justice in country education—none at all. What sort of opportunities does the working class person who lives in the country have for his children to be educated to a reasonable standard?

It is a very sad day. Likewise with our health facilities. We have exactly the same with the closing of the Blyth Hospital the scaling down of all others and with many others under threat. It is extremely serious. I do not know why the Government cannot see that and take strong measures to reverse the trend. The tragedy is that this need not be. It is cheaper to house people in country areas than in Adelaide. We will not be overlaying the structure, because often the structure is there and is not fully utilised.

Even within the ranks of the Labor Party there are those who recognise what should be done. I should like to quote a news article from the Hon. Lloyd O'Neil, the retiring Federal member for Grey.

The Hon. H. Allison: Is he honourable?

Mr VENNING: He is 'the honourable'. I have a lot of time for Lloyd O'Neil. He has given his people very good representation. I do not mind what politics one has, as long as one plays the game straight and speaks the truth. I will always give such people full score and I give Lloyd O'Neil full score. In last week's *Recorder* he called this population loss tragic and he also called for a Premiers' Conference on the issue. He said that it was the Government's responsibility 'to create the environment where people can work'. That is a Federal Labor politician. He said that we have to create the environment where people can work.

After the State Bank and other financial disasters, this has to be our next most serious problem. The depopulation of our regions is a critical problem. The Government can do more than just talk about it. I know that the Government has a decentralisation policy but all we do is hear about it; we see nothing concrete. I challenge the Government to do something physical, even though it be a small move, to demonstrate that it will do something about acting on its own decentralisation policy.

I conclude by asking: is it too much for this Labor Government to recognise the importance to this State of a vibrant, expanding rural sector and to do whatever is necessary to ensure that our rural industries are able to make their full contribution to the economy of South Australia?

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): The subject of my 10-minute grievance today continues to be two issues which I raised during the earlier Supply Bill debate: the South-East dairy industry and the South-East fishing industry. I will reverse the order of preference today and put the dairy industry first.

I find it disturbing that, after I had spoken on Wednesday evening about the problems of the allocation of the Metropolitan Milk Board laboratory equipment and the strong pressure which I thought was being applied by the Herd Improvement Services of South Australia Cooperative Ltd (HISCOL) to obtain that equipment, a letter of denial should have been circulated among dairymen in the South-East. The letter from HISCOL, in response to a brief letter circulated by the South-East Herd Improvement Association, says that the SEHIA is quite wrong in what it has been telling South-East farmers. HISCOL in its letter, dated 26 February 1993, says that it has never requested that the Metropolitan Milk Board laboratory equipment should be given to it. What it did was seek support from sections of the industry to implement the recommendations made in both Government reports on deregulation that 'herd testing equipment used by the MMB be transferred to HISCOL'. What HISCOL does not say is that it was quoting directly from a green paper and a white paper.

It referred to the green paper at section 6.3.1 at page 41, which refers to administration, and to the white paper at sections 7.1.5 and 7.2.1. What HISCOL does not say is that the authors of those two papers, the green paper, P. Day and T. Newbery, and the white paper, I believe, T. Newbery, are in fact officers of the Department of Primary Industry, and one of those authors of the two papers is in fact a senior adviser to the Minister. He was

a sitting member of the HISCOL board. He is the person whom I named in my last speech as being a contact person for HISCOL, listed in a South Australian stock publication in February 1993 and, therefore, still representing HISCOL.

Once again there is a deviousness about the manner in which HISCOL is going about advising dairy farmers. They are not telling the full truth. They are not telling lies, but they are not telling the full truth. The simple fact is that someone directly connected with the board of HISCOL has been recommending preference for HISCOL in the allocation of Metropolitan Milk Board laboratory equipment, and I find that most disturbing in view of the fact that there are other herd testing organisations in South Australia which have been charged what I believe to be excessively for HISCOL's services when HISCOL has received the Metropolitan Milk Board laboratory computer services free of charge.

Not only that but the white paper also recommended that the costs of HISCOL's herd testing fees should be recovered from farmers and allocated to HISCOL specifically. In other words, once again there is an element of preference in the recommendations from the white paper which HISCOL is quoting.

Another point in HISCOL's letter is that it is claiming that the levy on market milk sales is covered by the price of milk. It is saying that the farmer does not have to pay that cost of testing, which is carried out by the Metropolitan Milk Board. I believe that that claim, too, is wrong. It is a claim made in the letter, and I believe that the cost is in fact paid by the farmer who is a client of HISCOL, because the farmer receives less as a result of having the tests carried out. In any case, HISCOL is making a false assumption that that levy can be continued because, under the new South Australian Dairy Act, there is no provision for the Metropolitan Milk Board to continue in existence and there is therefore no provision for that levy to continue in the form in which it has previously been charged.

Whether the consumer or the farmer paid it is completely irrelevant because the South Australian Dairy Board will determine how fees are collected and paid for the various aspects of the dairy industry, including herd testing.

There is also another claim. HISCOL says that the levy should continue because consumers receive the benefits of the efficiencies brought about by herd testing. Indirectly, that may be true, but directly the claim is false. The people who benefit from herd testing are the farmers, who are about herd improvement. They want to improve their herds. Herd testing detects and therefore obviates mastitis but other diseases that may be present in milk are not cleared up by herd testing. Herd testing tests only for mastitis. The other diseases are cleared up by pasteurisation of milk, and therefore to suggest that the consumer is the chief beneficiary is quite erroneous. It is the farmer who engages in herd testing, who benefits directly in the long term by herd improvement. He benefits by having a better herd, by better and increased productivity, and by increased protein and/or butter fat content of the milk. Ultimately, of course, the consumer has a very good supply of milk but it is the farmer who is the chief beneficiary. HISCOL's arguments once again I find to be specious and should be revealed as such.

Other claims made by HISCOL are that there has never been any question that the costs of all herd testing in South Australia would be covered by the levy. They say, 'It would appear from the letter that you received from the IHTA (the Independent Herd Testing Authority) that the South-East Herd Improvement Authority have decided not to accept the benefit of any levy.' This is quite wrong. In fact, the SEHIA sought a levy to partly fund the Metropolitan Milk Board Laboratory.

So once again a false claim was made by HISCOL in a letter circulated to farmers. They deserve to be exposed. They also say that the continuation of levy would not make HISCOL one iota more competitive today as the benefit has always been to the HISCOL dairy farmer members and not to HISCOL. That, Mr Speaker, makes me wonder why the HISCOL charge was always \$5 dearer to the South Australian dairy farmers who were members of HISCOL than was the South-East Herd Improvement Association fee—\$5 dearer. And they claim by implication that the members of HISCOL have been better off as a result of their membership/ The SEHIA members are in fact better off by \$5 per test. Of course HISCOL is still seeking to have access to the Metropolitan Milk Board Laboratory free of charge.

I also have to admit that I made a minor error in my previous address to the House and that was that the fee was for test; it was in fact for computer access.

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

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): I want to echo the thoughts of the member for Custance in acknowledging 25 years in this Parliament by Stanley George Evans, not only as Government Whip but as Opposition Whip and I know Stan has got the—

Mr Ferguson: A quarter of a century.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Yes. I think I have about 15 years to go before I get to that.

Mr Ferguson: Will you make it?

Mr D.S. BAKER: Healthwise, yes. Stan Evans is someone who is respected on both sides of the House as a Whip because he can hold the confidence of people and help manage this House and it is that confidence that is needed from your Opposition that makes this place work. I think we should all pay tribute to Stan Evans for 25 years well done.

The other matter I want to talk about really goes on from a conversation I had with my friend, the former member for Grey, Lloyd O'Neil, who was very well respected in that area and had a tremendous personal following over the many years that he represented Grey. Lloyd's views were that Grey could not be held with the calibre of candidate that was selected and I will go through a letter that has come into my possession from the Labor Party candidate for Grey, Barry Piltz.

Lloyd O'Neil at least attempted to represent all the people in Grey and of course the calibre of that man is completely different from the new Labor candidate up there. He has put out a letter under the name of 'Barry Piltz—A Local Who Listens'. Well, he might listen but what he puts down on paper obviously does not reflect the truth. The letter is written to a member of this House, to the Venning family, and it is a very

personalised letter, of course. I guess they are all very happy with that. It says:

Dear Venning Family

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: Didn't it say, 'Dear Ivan'?

Mr D.S. BAKER: It was not personalised in the way that we write to our constituents. It is just this blanket thing. That is what Lloyd O'Neil mentioned.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to address his remarks through the Chair.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I accept that. The letter starts off by saying:

The March 13 election is crucial to your future. People living in the country are the backbone of Australia. They need and deserve special treatment.

What has the Labor Party done for country people in South Australia in Grey or in Australia over the last 10 years? If ever there has been a disadvantaged group it has been at the hands of this State Government and the Federal Government. I will go through a few of the problems that country people have had and how they have had those services taken away from them. The letter then goes on:

Yet independent studies show that people in the country would be hard hit by Dr Hewson's plans...

I would like to see those independent studies. At the meetings I have been at lately, involving the transport industry and the National Farmers Federation, all of those people who represent country transport and rural interests are lauding the Fightback package for what it will save country people. Transport alone is going to save costs for all people living in the country, not only farmers. The members on the Government side do not understand that there are school teachers living out there, there are blue collar workers living out in country areas, and they are people who have to be looked after—not like the Minister of Public Infrastructure, who refuses them a 6 per cent productivity increase; not like the Minister of Marine, who slashes the blue collar workers on the wharves while keeping the white collar workers at the same level.

We care about blue collar workers and we are there to look after those people. Dr Hewson will be reducing their costs quite dramatically—there will be a 25 per cent decrease in taxation and tax credits to help them with private health. What fairer system can we get than for people on under \$12 000 to get a \$400 tax credit?

If we give a tax deduction all we do is help those people on higher incomes. If we give a tax credit we help people on lower incomes. The tax credit for people in private health funds earning under \$12 000 is some \$400 a person, or \$800 a family. Then the tax credits that the Coalition is going to give scale down. When we get to \$30 000 they only get \$100 tax credit and \$200 for a family, and then it is neutral between \$30 000 and \$40 000. What could be a fairer system than that? Then over \$50 000—and this is a very important point—there is a penalty for those rich people who should be able to afford private health insurance. That is the system that looks after the needy and the disadvantaged and penalises those with money.

All of the people who sit on the other side of the House—and I know that the majority of them are in the private health system—and who have been bludging and

who have been members of Medibank will suffer a little penalty to try to encourage them to get involved and pay their fair share. This will also relieve those hospital waiting lists, which is a scandal in this State and it is a scandal all around Australia.

So what Mr Barry Piltz, the Labor candidate for Grey, is really saying is that he wants to penalise all those blue collar workers who live in the country and all those people who are needy and disadvantaged by putting out this untruthful letter.

An honourable member: He doesn't understand it.

Mr D.S. BAKER: He does not understand it. He goes on to say:

...which include:

making you pay a 15% GST on just about everything you do and buy.

We know that is not correct. We have been told many times that there are seven taxes coming off. The wholesale sales tax will come off and that is going to help. Payroll tax on the bigger industries in the country will come off, so those people can employ more. All of this Jobsback policy is to help employ people. Fuel excise is the biggest single cost in country areas. Perhaps Mr Piltz does not quite understand that a lot of his election expenses would be fuel. It will be 19c cheaper when he is the candidate next time, if he is game to put his head up, because he will not be paying the fuel tax.

The letter states further that Dr Hewson plans to slash services, including the ABC's rural network. Funding for the ABC will be \$500 million, and the Coalition guarantees to maintain regional services. What is this Barry Piltz doing by putting these lies in this letter to the constituents of Grey? It is scandalous that he can get away with this sort of nonsense. I hope that a constituent from the electorate of Grey receives a copy of *Hansard* in the next 24 hours and puts some of this information around in the area, because this person must be brought to heel. Telling lies in letters to the electorate of Grey is not the right and proper thing to do.

Mr Piltz goes on to talk about Dr Hewson's industrial and zero tariff policies. The Liberals' industrial 'jobs back' policy is very specific. It asks the question: 'Do you have to negotiate a new workplace agreement?' Of course, you do not have to. If you want to stay with the old award system and its benefits, you can do that—that is at the behest of the employee. It then asks: 'Do you have to look at your holiday loadings and those sorts of over-award payments?' The answer is 'No'. If you want to retain those, you can do so, but industrial relations in the 1990s will be completely different from the 1960s. It will not be them and us. The Liberals' policy will encourage employers and employees to get together and come to an agreement about what is best for the business in which they are working. Then, if they agree, they sign an agreement.

People try to tell me that this is something new. I have been doing this in all the businesses that I run for the past 10 years. All my employees are getting well above award rates; they are all happy, they compliment the boss and they work in very good conditions. They do not know why they did not leave the centralised wage fixing system years ago, because it penalises. A number of people in small businesses around Australia already have a sensible arrangement with their employer who pays

them above the minimum wage rate, but all that does is drag people down to one common level. We do not want a common denominator. I want to pay people according to their ability and for what they can do for themselves, their family and the businesses I run. That system has worked very successfully for those of my employees who are on those sorts of contract, and they are totally happy with it.

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

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): In speaking in this Supply debate, I want to pick up an issue to which I referred earlier in the week—that is, the wholesale sales tax system, the Keating Government's hidden tax that is in force at the moment—and draw to the attention of the House and the public the difficulties being experienced as a result of the widening of the wholesale sales tax system under the Keating Labor Government, its impact on small business operators throughout Australia and South Australia and the very negative impact it is having on the economy. We hear much from the Labor Party about the goods and services tax.

Mr McKee: And you'll hear a lot more, too.

Mr OLSEN: And might well we hear a lot more, because the goods and services tax is shifting the taxation collection in this country away to ensure that we put incentive back into the business community for the creation of jobs. At least the Liberal Party has a plan for the creation of jobs in this community; the Labor Party has no plan for the creation of jobs in the Australian community.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: That is right, and it washes its hands, walks away and has no plan or vision to correct one of the most insidious legacies of 10 years of Labor Government—that is, one million unemployed.

When he was rolled at the tax summit for introducing a goods and services tax, Treasurer Keating, the then world's greatest Treasurer—although that was fairly shortlived, given his track record—wanted to put in place a broad based consumption tax but, in spite of option C that he put forward to the tax summit, the union movement and Bob Hawke would not let him do it. So, what did he do? He then started to expand the wholesale sales tax system, and he took tax collections from \$3 billion a year in about 1983-84 to about \$11 billion a year. This is the Keating Labor Government's hidden broad based sales tax. It is in place, it is growing and expanding and, as at 1 January this year, there is a further expansion of the wholesale sales tax system.

What has happened as a result of this expansion is that it is impacting negatively on the small business community. There are 300 000 small business operators in Australia who will now have to register to pay the tax or claim exemption from paying it—300 000 additional small business operators. Of course, that will expand again the wholesale sales tax system—the Keating Labor Government hidden sales tax. The net is going wider, going further, income revenue from that area expanding. But do we hear much about that? No we do not, because it is a hidden tax and they want to keep it hidden. They do not want the public to understand fully that when people go to the supermarket there is already Mr

Keating's hand in their purse and pocket. Mr Keating's hand is already in the purse and the pocket of small business operators in this country to the tune of \$11 billion—and growing.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: They've emptied them out.

Mr OLSEN: Well, most small business operators would clearly tell you that there is not much left in the purse because of five years of high interest rates eroding working capital. Funds in those small businesses is but one thing: expanding the wholesale sales tax system is yet another grab for money out of the small business community and the private sector from where the jobs will come. In future the jobs in this country will not come from the public sector: they will come from the private sector, and until and unless we in this country understand and accept that and put in place policies that relieve the burden on small business operators we will not in any meaningful way give them the capacity to expand and employ. Australia's beleaguered small business—

Mr Ferguson: Small business—

Mr OLSEN: I will come to that in a moment. I will canvass a few points for the honourable member in a moment. Australia's beleaguered small business community will be further changed by the Keating Labor Government. The Government is holding on to sales tax refunds—and this is the most iniquitous component of these 1 January amendments to the wholesale sales tax system—until they reach a total of more than \$200 per company; any less and it will not pay. Even if it takes a year, the Government will not refund it. Given that small business is one of the worst affected by the recession, that money (rightfully theirs, but locked up with the Government's nightmarish taxation system), can be the difference between paying the rent, power or telephone bills and getting further into debt.

The mess has been created by the new sales tax legislation, which came into effect on 1 January this year. During lengthy debate in the Senate the Government was warned numerous times of the various difficulties in the legislation both for the tax office and for the business community. It ignored the warnings, as it has ignored many warnings over the course of the past decade and the confusion has been far worse than could ever have been envisaged.

Already transitional arrangements have had to be put in place until 31 March to allow many hundreds of business taxpayers in South Australia in the mining, agricultural, fishing and manufacturing areas to register for the exemptions made available in the Bill. The ongoing confusion and lack of publicity about the Bill has meant that the Government has erroneously collected sales tax in the meantime from many businesses which are exempt but which have not registered. They then find out they cannot claim their money back unless and until they are owed more than \$200 by the tax office. Yet the money is rightfully, legally theirs.

How would the Keating Labor Government feel if we refused to pay its numerous taxes until we owed more than \$200? What would be the reaction—or for that matter the State Labor Government—if there was a licence fee for \$150 and we said, 'No, we won't pay that until it gets over \$200'? I am quite sure action would be taken by the Government. It would be a vastly different

story, with the boot clearly on the other foot. There is one set of rules for the public and one set of rules for Labor Governments, which clearly are setting in place imposts on small business. I think it is 'about time that the Keating Labor Government's hidden sales tax had the veil of secrecy taken off it and we see it for what it is: the biggest tax hike in this country's history, from \$3 billion to \$11 billion and growing, which would make other tax amendments and changes pale into insignificance. The fact is that the Labor Government has been raiding the bickie tin of the small business community solidly over the past 10 years and the figures and statistics prove it.

Mrs Hutchison interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: However, let us see what the alternative is under Fightback. There would be \$10.8 billion in personal tax cuts and the tax-free zone would be increased to \$7 000. So, low income earners are protected; their tax-free component goes up to \$7 000 before they start paying tax. There would be a \$10.8 billion return in personal tax cuts—more money in the pocket, more money in the purse and the wallet—to spend as one sees fit. If people spend, they know they are spending and they pay the tax: if they do not spend then they do not pay the tax.

It comes back to providing people with some choice rather than the tax man in Canberra or the tax man in South Australia saying, 'We will have that much, thank you very much.' There is no choice left to individuals. It takes away the freedom of choice of people, making them dependent upon the State. That is clearly the direction we have been following over the past ten years.

The family allowance has been doubled. There is an extra \$120 a fortnight for a three-child family. The dependent spouse rebate will be up \$300 a year for families with children. The member who interjected just a moment ago could well take that into account. The price of petrol is cut by around 19c per litre. She ought to take that into account because country people, who have to rely on the purchase of petrol to get to and from places and who rely on the cost of freight and transport to buy their goods locally, will of course benefit by not only the 19c a litre reduction in the cost of fuel under the Fightback package but also a 26c a litre reduction for fuel, and diesel for business enterprises. So, for those businesses operating in Port Augusta and Port Pirie, to get the goods up on the shelves, there will be a substantial reduction in the freight rate because the fuel will cost less and we are going to abolish the wholesale sales tax system. That is the tax applied to all parts going into trucks operating on those lines.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: The only hand in their pocket is their own.

Mr OLSEN: Yes, the only hand in their pocket is their own, unlike the Keating Labor Government and this Administration, Mr Speaker, which have made taxation and Robin Hood look—

Mrs Hutchison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: The list of Fightback changes goes on. Payroll tax would be abolished, and that was canvassed yesterday. All pensions will be increased by an additional 8 per cent prior to the introduction of the GST and Fightback proposals on 1 October 1994. So, they will be

fully compensated, according to the Federal Treasury, by several per cent—over compensated.

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

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I cannot let this debate go by without using it as an opportunity to refer to a media release that was put out in the public arena on Friday 26 February by the South Australian Housing Minister, Greg Crafter. It was a press release along the lines of pamphlets which are now circulating through the Federal electorates. It was designed to put out misinformation and to be a scare tactic, and I think it puts the Minister of Housing in the same category as those whom we have seen at the candidate level in the Federal campaign. They were scurrilous and totally inaccurate statements, drawing on assumptions which they expect the public to swallow, in an attempt to create a perception in the media that the Opposition in Canberra—the Coalition Parties—is going to do something which in fact it will not do. It is a style of campaigning which we have now become used to with the Labor Party and the union movement. They do put out misinformation. It is a style which is regrettable in Australian politics.

However, I guess that as long as we are dealing with people who play this game then we have no option but to attempt to counter it. The press release that went out under the name of the State Minister of Housing predicted the closure of the South Australian Housing Trust under a Federal Coalition Government. That statement by the Minister is totally wrong, it is without foundation, it is taking selective quotations out of the Fightback package and twisting and turning them to try to achieve a political objective. The Minister says in the media release:

Mr Crafter says that one can only assume that the Federal Coalition is proposing to abolish the concept of public housing altogether.

That is a totally inaccurate statement, a total misrepresentation of the Fightback package, and demonstrates a total lack of understanding of what is in the Fightback package and, indeed, demonstrates that the Minister has not even read the Fightback package. If he had, being what I think is an intelligent man, he would not have come out and made that statement. I can only assume that his minders somewhere back in the department or in the Housing Trust, who are of a political persuasion similar to his, have drafted this press release and he has been foolish enough to sign his name to the bottom of it. The whole press release, I believe, is an embarrassment to him.

The Labor Party should be very careful in its criticism on this question of public housing. There is no question that here in South Australia public housing is in a position of crisis. In 10 years we have seen the waiting lists for public housing rise from 24 000 to 42 000 because of the recession and unemployment, and cautious people just cannot afford the rentals in the private market at the moment. It is also because of the whole of the Government's public housing policy and its obsession even to want to try to use the private sector to try to help it get out of trouble.

It is dabbling with the private sector; it dabbles to some degree with joint ventures, but it is only a very

recent addition to its public housing policy. In the past it has tried to do it alone. The private sector has enormous resources both in capital and in ability to help the Government get out of trouble and start building public housing at a price which the needy in this community can afford to pay. The Fightback package, when analysed, gives access to housing to people in need, by using the private sector and the massive resources of some of the major lending institutions. It changes the whole manner in which financial assistance is received.

It does that by providing money in direct subsidies to people who need it, and also makes available to the disadvantaged people far more than they will ever receive through the present Government's socialist based public housing policy, which relies on the public sector going out, building the property, owning the property then renting it back to the customer. So, the savings to be made by the Coalition—and I would refer members to section 16.18 of Fightback—will not result in any reduction in the supply of public housing. I hope the Government members can read my lips on that: it will not result in the reduction of the supply of public housing.

I hope that, in years to come when members opposite are sitting on this side of the House and we are sitting on the Government side, we can look at that statement and reflect on it to see whether in fact Fightback did result in a reduction in the supply of public housing. To the contrary: our proposals should actually increase public housing stocks. That may come as a bit of a shock to Government members, but our proposals will in fact increase public housing stocks by releasing financial resources in the right direction. The Coalition intends to retain the current network of public housing but will shift the responsibility of ownership of new additional stocks from the public to the private sector. That is not going to be deleterious to the public housing policy; it will aid and abet it, and there is no question about that. As such, public sector investment institutions or, indeed, any other business—and I emphasise that—housing cooperative or corporation that wants to come forward and get involved will construct or purchase housing and then lease it on a long-term basis to each State Government for the accommodation of low income tenants.

If I could underline my speech in *Hansard*, I would underline those last few words: for the accommodation of low income tenants. The investor or other institution will retain ownership of the properties. So, an investor, such as the AMP, would retain ownership of the property, which means that the State would not have billions of dollars tied up, and it would own the property. Each State Government (and members opposite should listen to this, even though it might be against their philosophy) will continue to manage, repair and maintain the properties. They will also continue to be responsible for the placement of tenants on the waiting lists into the properties. Does that sound as though we are about to put the Housing Trust out of existence?

There is a very real role for the Housing Trust in this whole area of public sector housing. A Liberal Government in South Australia would be committed to public housing to ensure that people are housed, and it would get rid of this waiting list of 42 000 created by the Labor Government in this State. We are committed to the

reduction of that, but we will use the enormous resources that are available to us in the private sector to achieve that objective.

State Governments will provide private sector property owners with a return equal to market rent and guarantee a long-term capital gain to entice them in. Tenants of the properties will continue to pay a less than market rent—members opposite should note that—calculated according to the existing formula based on percentage of income. The Commonwealth-State housing agreement funds will be used, in part, to subsidise the difference between rent paid by tenants and market rent payable to the owner. Members may be interested to know that the program has already been successfully tried in New South Wales, and I referred earlier to the involvement of AMP. The New South Wales Government entered into an agreement with the AMP society, whereby that society purchased and then leased 1 000 properties to the Government on a long-term 20-year basis. In return, the AMP received a rental yield on the property as well as a guaranteed long-term capital gain equivalent to the CPI.

In conclusion, public housing in this State is in crisis. It is a matter of concern to the public that this Government has allowed the waiting list to get up to 42 000. It is a concern that the Government now does not know where it is going. It knows its current public housing policies are not working, and it is up to us to fix them.

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

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I was not going to be drawn into this debate, but unfortunately some of the carping criticism I have heard from members opposite has drawn me to my feet, because I feel that I must answer some of the untruths that have been said in this House. I am particularly drawn into the debate by the member for Kavel and his unfortunate dissertation on small business and how it will be assisted by the introduction of Dr Hewson's goods and services tax.

It is well known that this side of politics has been the only side of politics in this place that has been prepared to assist small business. What we have seen from members of the Opposition is that they really support large business and they really want large business to exploit small business. The introduction of the GST is really an example of this. The introduction of the GST will mean more not less tax for small business. No member on the other side has drawn attention to the compliance costs that will be imposed on small business as a result of the introduction of this tax. In the United Kingdom, when the value added tax was introduced, about 80 per cent of small businesses either sold up or moved out of business in the following year because they found it impossible to act as tax collectors for the then Government.

At least one day each week was taken up by these small businesses actually doing the paper work, etc. that was required of them as tax collectors for that Government. This will be the case following the introduction of a goods and services tax into this country. Unfortunately, in spite of all those wise words of the member for Kavel about small businesses in Port Augusta, Port Pine and other country towns, those

people will have to spend a lot of time at their desk working, for no reward, as Government tax collectors. The competitive advantage that small business has over large business right now will disappear. With respect to the wholesale tax that is currently in vogue, that is worked out and complied with by the wholesalers, not the people who actually sell the goods to the public.

Mr Matthew interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bright is out of order and out of his seat.

Mr FERGUSON: What has been forgotten by members of the Opposition is that a wholesale tax is a tax on goods only, but the goods and services tax is a tax on goods and services. So, if we start taxing services, we will find that those people in a service area and not paying tax at all—and I refer to people such as hairdressers who actually sell a service—will have to pay an additional 15 per cent on every haircut. What will hairdressers in the northern areas of Port Augusta and Port Pirie think about that? Also, those who own a fast food service store will have to increase their prices by 15 per cent. It will not be any less than 15 per cent, because they will have to charge the full 15 per cent in order to cover the services they will have to provide to the Australian Taxation Office for doing the work and employing the staff, such as accountants, to work out this tax.

Members of the Opposition say that this can be easily overcome by a computer, so they can do it at the flick of a button. But how many small businesses can afford to spend an additional \$15 000 to \$20 000 on the installation of such equipment? It is not only the installation of the equipment but all the training and software that goes with it. The people who are heavily involved in small business would not have the time. They are trying to survive as best they can, but members of the Opposition support the Hewson package, which will impose additional costs on these people by forcing them to introduce the computer hardware and software that would be necessary for the calculation of these taxes.

Further, there would be a reduced cash flow for the business operating on credit, as well as increased running costs. There have to be increased running costs. There is no way that a small business could get away from the increased running costs if this goods and services tax is applied by a Hewson Government. There is a myth that the GST is a simple tax. It is not a simple tax. Small business would need to keep a record of every item or service bought or sold for accounting purposes with respect to the GST. For every packet of razor blades, every packet of chewing gum and every milkshake that is sold, the business will have to keep a record in order to charge the public the extra 15 per cent that will have to be paid back to the Taxation Office. If no records were kept, I would not know how a small business could impose a GST. So, it is nonsense to say that there will be no cost to small business with the introduction of this tax.

What about a country general store? I understand it is not beyond the powers of imagination for a general or hardware country store to stock about 15 000 separate items. At present there is no wholesale sales tax on hardware. Every person who buys from that store would have to pay that 15 per cent. Not only that but, if the

small business man sells one screw—and in some hardware stores it is possible to sell one or two screws—he has to keep a record of the number of screws sold and provide to the Taxation Office every month or quarter, as the case may be, an account of what he has sold plus 15 per cent. Can you imagine the hours of work that this will involve for storekeepers? I am referring to storekeepers not only in the country but in local delicatessens. People in local delis do not make a lot of money; they are in there surviving, and I say good luck to them because, while they are working in these local shops, they are not on the dole queue.

This is one of the reasons why we on this side of the House have tried to encourage small business. Most of these people are working flat out; they work long hours with members of their family, starting at 8 o'clock in the morning and finishing at 11 o'clock at night. Because of the Hewson GST, they would have to employ additional staff, some being members of their family, or, when they are feeling tired and weary after working those long hours, they would have to do extra work to gather a tax for the Federal Government. If I were in small business in a country area—in Port Augusta or anywhere else—I would be running away from this GST as fast as I could run. There are no advantages for small business under this GST. The only thing they will get under this tax is an imposition and more work. What is more, it will reduce the competitive advantage that they once had over the big supermarkets.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): In view of the importance of the Murray River to the viability of South Australia, this Government must take a leading role in the rehabilitation of the Murray-Darling Basin. I recognise that the Government today has introduced a Bill for the ratification of a new Murray-Darling Basin agreement. While that covers many aspects of this issue, I wish to refer to some of the problems not covered by that legislation.

The Murray-Darling Basin covers about one-seventh of Australia's land mass. It is one of the nation's most productive areas, contributing about \$10 billion annually to the wealth of the country. The resource has deteriorated, and continues to do so. This should be recognised as one of the major environmental problems to be tackled now. Land salinisation in the Murray and the Murrumbidgee Valleys poses a major threat to the natural resources of the Murray-Darling Basin, as does river salinisation. Current production losses are estimated to be about \$65 million per annum, with additional losses in the Mallee and up-land zones. The cost of current river salinity levels on urban, industrial and agricultural water users is about \$40 million per year. Without remedy, these losses will increase.

So, what are the causes of river salinity, land salinisation and water logging? Salt enters the river from a number of sources: natural discharges from tributaries and groundwater; 'induced' groundwater discharges from irrigated and dryland areas; and saline drainage from irrigation. Salinity problems are driven by changes in the balance between groundwater and surface water systems. This balance is finely tuned. A small increase in the infiltration of water from the surface (due to rainfall or irrigation) to the groundwater can cause a significant rise

in groundwater pressures and in the level of the groundwater table. As they rise, groundwaters dissolve naturally occurring salts in the soils and bring them to the surface, where the salt becomes concentrated through evaporation. This increase in salt level near the surface can damage vegetation and soils. This in turn leads to soil erosion, decreased agricultural productivity and increased concentrations of salt in the rivers and streams.

The behaviour of groundwater is influenced by the underlying geology. The Murray groundwater basin is a closed system, with the only outlets for groundwater being to drainage lines that lead directly or indirectly to the Murray River, or to the atmosphere by evapotranspiration. Thus, while water can enter the groundwater system rapidly and cause rapid increases in groundwater levels, it takes a long time for the water to drain from the system and for groundwater levels to fall. In geological time, the Murray-Darling Basin has had high salt levels in land and water systems. These events occurred during wetter eras when accession to groundwaters was high. The last significant period of widespread salinity problems occurred 15 000 to 20 000 years ago.

Since European settlement, the clearing of natural vegetation for agriculture in the Murray-Darling basin, together with irrigation development, has had an effect similar to past periods of high rainfall. Clearing has caused widespread increases in infiltration of rainfall to the groundwater, resulting in increased groundwater levels. This has led to increased areas of waterlogging and land salinisation. Waterlogging can also occur because of poorly drained soils, irrespective of groundwater levels. Monitoring studies have shown that groundwater levels have risen and are continuing to rise in the major irrigation areas. Significant rises occurred during prolonged wet periods in 1956, 1963 and 1973-75. Without intervention, groundwater levels will continue to rise, increasing the extent and severity of river salinity and land salinisation.

Then we come to the problem of turbidity. In most discussions on basin salinity, there is usually no mention of the related problem of turbidity. The tonnage of suspended matter carried by the river is about double that of dissolved solids. Turbidity is the result of upstream erosion and land degradation, and is a problem comparable with or even larger than that of salinity. So, what do we have to do to come to grips with the problems to which I have referred? They can and must be rectified in broad terms by the following means:

1. On-farm improved irrigation practices—
 - (a) overhead sprinklers
 - (b) low throw sprinklers
 - (c) micro jet sprinklers
 - (d) drip irrigation
 - (e) dead level irrigation (where soil types permit)
2. Engineering works—rehabilitation of irrigation distribution systems and groundwater interception schemes—
 - (a) pipelines in place of channels, where appropriate
 - (b) water on demand to enable efficient on-farm improved irrigation practices to be implemented
 - (c) natural and irrigation induced saline groundwater interception schemes.

3. Reafforestation of the Murray-Darling Basin (a) on-farm (b) off-farm to combat high water table salinity and dry land salination.

4. Removal of town and city sewage effluent from the river system.

I believe that when the foregoing has been effected the residual effluent should ultimately be piped to the sea.

What I have been saying is not new. The problems of the Colorado River in the United States of America are very similar to those of the Murray-Darling Basin. The salinity problems of the Colorado River were regarded as almost insurmountable. That river system had deteriorated far beyond the point that we have reached in relation to the Murray-Darling system. However, it is fair to say that the States in the United States through which the tributaries and the main stream of the Colorado River flow neither had the financial capacity nor the will in many instances to resolve the problems of that large river system.

On that basis I have on many occasions proposed that the Federal Government has to take a significant role in the rehabilitation of the Murray-Darling Basin. Based on what I believe is needed to cover the works to which I have referred of about \$100 million annually for the next 10 years, I suggest that the funding, based on the Colorado experience, should be \$70 million annually from the Commonwealth, with the States of New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia each contributing \$10 million annually, making a total of \$100 million each year available for the type of rehabilitation work to which I have referred. This represents only 1 per cent of the estimated contribution that the Basin makes to the economy of this nation each year. Therefore, in real terms it would be a genuine benefit to the whole nation.

The proposed program and funding will not only rehabilitate most of the degradation which has occurred in the past 150 years but will also solve the problems of annual saline ground water inflows which have been occurring throughout the history of the Murray-Darling Basin. On-farm productivity will substantially increase—

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

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): I take this opportunity of joining the member for Chaffey in commending to members the various programs which have already been set in train to rectify the problems of the Murray-Darling Basin and to urge that they should remain very high on the political agenda. It is all very well to have a Murray-Darling Basin Commission set up, which was one of the real achievements of the 1980s, but it works only as a result of the political will which is invested in it by the Governments which are the signatories to the agreement. I notice that the legislation which we shall be debating in this place in a week or so now envisages that Queensland will be recognised as one of the States which has a stake in the Murray-Darling Basin.

While commending to the House all the engineering solutions to which the member for Chaffey referred, I must say that I had to listen for a long time before he finally got around to making a reference to what I see as the major long-term program that has to be introduced. It is long-term in the sense that the results will be slow in

coming, but they will be very significant as they come. It is also difficult because it involves negotiations with hundreds, if not thousands, of landowners. I refer, of course, to reforestation.

After all, although the Murray-Darling Basin is clearly a saline environment by many standards, there is little doubt that the mass clearance of vegetation from the lands adjacent to the Murray and its various tributaries has considerably exacerbated not only turbidity, to which the honourable member referred, but also salinity.

That results from the rising of the water tables in the areas close to the tributaries and the main river itself, and the consequential saline inflow to those rivers from that rising of the water table and its attendant salinity. I also remind members that despite a good deal of controversy another one of the real achievements of the 1980s which had and which continues to have consequences and implications far beyond the Murray-Darling Basin is the Labor Government's decision to make land clearance subject to some form of decision making process beyond that which would involve the landowner.

I refer to the decision to define land clearance as 'development' under the Planning Act and make it subject to decision by the South Australian Planning Commission in the first instance and then, following the passage of an amending Bill through this Parliament, subject to decision by the Native Vegetation Authority. In a fairly short space of time that considerably halted what had been the wholesale stripping of the Murray Lands, often in marginal areas where it was not clear that there would be any productive gain from this clearance.

The problem was that although it could and has largely stopped clearance of native vegetation nonetheless what do we do about rehabilitating the land from which much of that vegetation was cleared, not necessarily by the present generation of landowners but by their parents or grandparents or people from those generations? The only answer is wholesale and mass reforestation. I would much prefer that it be native vegetation rather than, say, pine plantations, but in an answer I got back to a Question on Notice that I asked some weeks ago the point is made that in terms of evapotranspiration effect, to which the member for Chaffey referred, pines and native vegetation are pretty well on an even par. Pine plantations can have the effect of having a commercial return as well.

True, there are some commercially viable native timbers, and we have to look closely at that as well because there is a sense in which we can have our cake and eat it, too. There can be a commercial spin-off but, at the same time, we are re-establishing something close to the original native vegetation which cannot be said of a pine forest which, of course, grows pines and virtually nothing else, because of the suffocating effect of the pine needles on the forest floor.

Much work has been done on reforestation. I seem to recall that when I was Minister of Environment and Planning Dr Jacqui Gillen in the department did much work on experimental plots up in the Mallee and that eventually led to the production of a handbook that landowners could use for guidance in broad acre reforestation. If one can do it that way from seed, just as one plants wheat or another crop, it will obviously

have a much greater effect than planting out seedlings, which is a far more cumbersome way of going about it.

One has to fence and someone has to pay for the fencing. One has to be able to fence off the sheep; otherwise they will make short work of the seedlings as they come through. It has always been of some regret to me that, of the funds made available for compensating people who could not clear native vegetation, little funding has been available for the further step of reforestation.

As we have now largely worked our way through the clearance applications, it seems that any funds in the future that might have had to go to that purpose could well go to some sort of incentive scheme that would enable primary producers to put more resources into reforestation. I would also support any call on the Commonwealth Government to assist in this respect. It is only a decade ago that the Commonwealth Government was still offering taxation incentives for people to actually clear native vegetation; fortunately that is now long gone. But taxation incentives to allow reforestation and revegetation would seem to me to be important indeed.

I close on one other point and that is that the honourable member did refer to the relative problems which are caused by turbidity, salinity and nutrification. The only point I would make about turbidity is that although it costs us something there is a reasonably low technology way in which turbidity can be removed from the water for domestic, industrial or any other purposes. In fact there is no way that you can dissolve material from water except by distillation and, of course, nobody in their right mind would ever contemplate that as any sort of proposition because of the enormous costs that are involved.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): Mr Deputy Speaker, this is an opportunity for members in this debate to raise issues of concern and I suppose it is only natural at a time when there is a Federal election campaign that some people will take the opportunity to talk about or compare policies of either side of politics.

Sir, I found it amazing that the member for Henley Beach, who normally claims to be reasonably intelligent, astute and takes some interest in the money markets of the world would suggest that a country store, which might be a hardware store, would have to keep a record of each item sold as a separate item for the sake of the goods and services tax. What a lot of hogwash. I believe the honourable member may know better but decided to use one of the typical half truths or blatant untruths that his Party has been using in all sorts of correspondence throughout this country.

The truth is that if a business, small or large, does not know at the end of the month what its income is and what its expenditure is it does not deserve to be in business and you know that, Sir, as Deputy Speaker and as member for Henley Beach. Anybody that uses the other argument is either a fool or is deliberately trying to falsify the situation. All that business has to do is send in a return showing what its expenditure has been and the amount of tax paid, take that amount off the amount of tax collected with a cheque for the difference. Or if there is a credit, as there can be in some cases, claim the

credit because it depends on your purchases for the month, or the three month period, whatever it may be, as against your sales. There is a guarantee in it that the refund will be within six weeks. Not like the so-called great gladiator that you may promote as does the member for Henley Beach, Sir—Mr Paul Keating—who will take \$200 from individuals and not return it.

The Hon. M.J. Evans: The great gladiator?

Mr S.G. EVANS: That is the opinion of the member for Henley Beach. Let us pick on our honourable Prime Minister—the title I have to give him. Sir, that man passionately believes in the GST. He showed it in the mid-1980's. He wanted it. Enough of his Party convinced him not to have it. But passionately he knows that that is part of the solution to Australia's problem. He knows it but he puts the position of sitting in the Lodge above the future of Australia or those who are unemployed.

That is the truth of it and all of his Party have to blindly follow him because to do otherwise they realise would be an absolute disaster for them at the forthcoming election. So they set out on a scare tactic, as you did, Sir, to try to frighten people, instead of saying as a Party at the time it was announced by Dr Hewson, 'Yes, we believe in that aspect and we will fight you on the other issues; we believe in it as a Party; the Prime Minister believes in it.' Instead of saying honestly and sincerely, 'We believe in it but we will fight you on all the other policies you have', your Party would not do that, Sir.

The other man, Dr Hewson, knew that it would be hard to sell such a tax. He knew that it would be hard to sell some of the policies that needed to be implemented to get Australia out of the hole it is in and help the many unemployed and the businesses that are going broke. He knew that he was putting his political future and his Party on the line in doing that. But he had the courage, the honesty and the integrity to do it. I hope enough Australians understand that.

More particularly, the Prime Minister knows, and we all know, that in the main Australians have lost the pioneering spirit—not altogether, but in the main we have lost it, because when there is talk of change, to change our way of life, we run away from it to a great degree. There is clear evidence of that within our society. When there are jobs on the River Murray to pick fruit, or other jobs in the outback, many people will not even make that move to go and take up that employment. Their forefathers who came to this land in sailing vessels took up the challenge with the pioneering spirit; or, more particularly, in recent years, they left lands where there were wars or attacks upon their families to come here because they had that fighting spirit. The easy life that we implemented through the 1970s and particularly in the 1980s has, to a great degree, eroded that ability to stand up and say, 'We have to accept change; we in the country have to have that pioneering spirit, or more of us will go down the gurgler.'

The ABC is no better. The ABC is frightened of receiving some cut in order to become more productive, if one likes, and it has carried out a most scandalous, continuous and deliberate campaign to denigrate Dr Hewson and his policies. Any organisation that does that, which has public funding and does it deliberately in a planned way on every occasion it can, does not deserve to get the credibility one would expect it should get. I

believe that in the past the ABC has played an important part in this country in the fields within which it operates. I admire the ABC for a lot of its work, but I have no admiration, none whatsoever, for its blatantly using its public funding to denigrate any political Party's program, even if it does mean it might have to alter its budget a bit if that particular Party wins. We all know that these changes have to occur right throughout the community if we are going to provide jobs for those who do not have jobs. If those in the ABC deny that, either they are fools or they are deliberately telling an untruth.

I now refer to exports. If anybody believes that this country can go on bringing in money from outside to pay the interest on our debt, building up a bigger debt overseas and just borrowing enough to pay the interest on our debt, and that we do not have to start looking at exports, they are also fools. I appreciate your comment, Sir, that we have only 10 minutes; I could use half an hour and go through everything, but I will confine my comments, and you will appreciate that from the position you sit in as a member of the Australian Labor Party. If we do not build up our overseas reserves with exports we will be an even worse banana republic than we are at the moment.

The Hon. H. Allison: The figures were worse a few minutes ago than they were last month.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I have not seen those figures. My colleague tells me that this month's figures are even worse. Why does not the Prime Minister stand up and fight to create jobs for this country and, in particular, say that he is interested in working towards getting exports, because the only way we can do that is by decreasing our cost structure. There is no other way. I do not care whether it is the ABC or Mr Keating's desire to get back into the Lodge but, if they are prepared to sacrifice this opportunity to help get Australia back onto an economic footing where our children will have a future, I am disappointed in them. However, I am more disappointed in a man who passionately believes in the GST but who now is fighting to scare people by saying that it will adversely affect them when it will not. As to your comments, Sir, as the member for Henley Beach about country stores, I will finish by saying that I hope you realise that many hardware stores never pay sales tax.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable Leader of the Opposition

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): I take this opportunity with the Federal election campaign only one week away to touch on what I think are the most important issues of the campaign. In particular, I want to put a case later in this speech for why the election of a Federal Coalition Government will be of enormous benefit to South Australia. Before I do so, I want to deal with a matter that disturbs me greatly as a person who has always supported democracy and its principles. Democracy requires an element of truth from those who wish to participate in the whole program. There is no doubt that truth has been the major casualty of the Labor Party's Federal election campaign. I would like to highlight the extent to which—

Mr Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am amused that the honourable member opposite laughs, because I realise this matter is somewhat embarrassing. Members opposite at this stage could not even tell the difference between the truth and the lies that they have been peddling.

I want to highlight the extent to which they have been trying to create within the electorate, by playing on the financial security of people, a fear that is totally unsubstantiated. I will start by quickly running through a number of the pamphlets and other material put out by the Labor Party.

Rod Sawford, the ALP candidate for Port Adelaide, claimed a couple of days ago in one of his pamphlets that households in the Port Adelaide electorate would be worse off under a Coalition Government because the cost of registering a Ford Laser would increase from \$61 to \$158. That is a blatant lie—there is no truth in that claim whatsoever. He went on to claim that car registration fees would increase by up to 160 per cent. For a sitting Federal member of Parliament to put out trash like that is a sad reflection on the credibility of some of the candidates that the Labor Party is running.

I touch on the pamphlet put out by Bob Catley, the LP member for Adelaide. Bob Catley is an educated person who understands or should understand under most circumstances the difference between the truth and a lie, yet in his pamphlet he highlights five results that he will provide when re-elected. Fortunately, Bob Catley will not be re-elected; Trish Worth will be elected for Adelaide together with a Federal Coalition Government. So, we will not have to put up with this sort of trash from Bob Catley any more.

The first of Bob Catley's five points is: 'No GST: no consumption tax on nearly everything and service'. The facts are that there is a sales tax of between 20 and 30 per cent on most items that people buy from supermarkets; in fact, it is on most items paid for by anyone, whether it is a business or a private individual. I have been in business, and I know the extent to which wholesale sales tax is a huge impost on companies, and the time and difficulty involved in filling out sales tax returns every month, which businesses are required to do under the Labor Government.

An example of this is the recent changes to the sales tax imposed on rural industries, for instance, that involving irrigation suppliers where, under the new Labor Government provisions brought in as from the beginning of this year, not only is there a 20 per cent sales tax but that needs to be paid up front when the goods go into the store. Furthermore, they have to get the public officer of the company actually to place the order for the goods if there is an exemption to be applied for rural industries. You might have to go and find your accountant and get him actually to sign and personally deliver the order form for the goods if you still wish to obtain the exemption from sales tax for primary production.

Sales tax involves one of the most costly and most difficult administrative systems for tax collection. I say that as a former principal in a company that sold goods throughout supermarkets in Australia, experiencing enormous difficulty in filling out the returns, especially where there are returned goods and various promotion programs that apply, and where the sales tax needs to be

adjusted week by week, depending on the type of promotion. The public just does not understand how inefficient and time-consuming that system is.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am sure that the Leader does not need any assistance.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The second point that Mr Catley has outlined refers to award wages and conditions being maintained and improved, implying that under a Federal Coalition Government award wages will be abolished. Nothing could be further from the truth, and I will come to further material put out, I think, by the Nurses' Federation (not by the nurses but by the Nurses' Federation) and by the South Australian Institute of Teachers, trying to claim just the opposite when, in fact, there is not one skerrick of truth in those claims.

The third thing that Mr Catley claims is 'tariffs to protect Adelaide's manufacturing industry'. I point out to the constituents of Adelaide that it has been Labor Party reductions in tariffs that have cost South Australia the loss of 21 400 manufacturing jobs in the past two years alone—the equivalent of five Mitsubishi plants. Who is Keating to go down to Mitsubishi and make any claim about the future of Mitsubishi when his own policy on tariffs has cost this State 21 400 manufacturing jobs?

I come to another piece of material handed out by Barry Piltz, the ALP candidate for the Federal seat of Grey. He will not get past 13 March. He is going to run into a concrete wall and be well and truly buried. He wrote a personalised letter to individuals on 22 February 1993 (he probably had to put this in a private letter because he knew that to peddle such lies publicly would get him into trouble; he has put it in a private letter hoping it is not revealed) and, referring to Dr Hewson's plans, he says they include:

...making you pay a 15 per cent *GST* on just about everything you do and buy—
which is plainly false; secondly:

timing your telephone calls and charging you by the second—
and that lie was put to bed in his own electorate when Dr Hewson was there; thirdly he says Dr Hewson will:

slash all services—

and fourthly he says Dr Hewson will be:

making you pay his new road user's tax which would double or even treble the registration fees on your vehicles—

and that is plainly wrong. Does he not even realise as a Federal Labor candidate that registration fees are set by State Governments, not by the Federal Government? He does not even understand the demarcation of responsibilities and taxing powers between the Federal and State Governments. There has then been the \$500 000 campaign run by the United Trades and Labor Council here in South Australia. I highlight to the House the fact that just before Christmas I met two of the very senior officials of the UTLC—Mr White and Mr Lesses—and pointed out the inaccuracy of a lot of the campaign that they were running and I gave them certain assurances, which they have had in writing as well. It disturbs me that within a week of giving those assurances Mr White was on the radio waves again repeating the lies that he had been telling previously, with absolutely no regard for the truth.

Mr Hamilton: They don't trust you.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It is not a matter of trust. If the honourable member only realised, it is a fact that the Labor Party—

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Albert Park to order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Labor Party realises that its only chance of getting even close to the mark on 13 March is to peddle lie after lie after lie.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Leader to resume his seat. I ask the House to come to order. The member for Albert Park has in fact spoken in this debate. I believe he received courtesy while he spoke and I ask him to extend the same courtesy to the Leader.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker; I appreciate your protection. I was pointing out to the House that it is time that the public understood the extent to which these untruths and lies have been told by Labor Party candidates and their cohorts such as the United Trades and Labor Council, the South Australian Institute of Teachers and the Australian Nursing Federation, in peddling their material, trying to scare people into voting for the Labor Party when, Mr Deputy Speaker, you would realise that people clearly understand the issues, even though there is some confusion. They will not be scared by the Labor Party into returning to office State and Federal Labor Governments which have given them no leadership and no direction for the past ten years and which have doubled the level of unemployment and reduced living standards throughout Australia.

I have other examples of material that has been put out. I refer now to the *SAIT Journal* of 24 February, where it is claimed that there will be huge State Government cutbacks in education spending, a potential loss of hundreds of teachers leading to larger classes, onerous workloads, and no capacity to achieve gains from the State Government because of cutbacks in funding by a Federal Coalition Government. I point out that what they have failed to recognise is that a Federal Coalition Government will return approximately an additional \$500 million as compensation for the abolition of payroll tax by State Government. Here is a Federal Coalition Government willing to take over the entire responsibility for a tax previously covered by the State Government and to pay that on a dollar for dollar basis—approximately \$500 million benefit for South Australia. This article on Liberal Party policy goes on to state:

The GST to apply to education except for primary school fees.

That is just a straight lie. Then, under the industrial relations policy, it states that a Liberal Government would:

Deregulate the labour market by abolishing centralised wage fixing, compulsory arbitration and most minimum conditions.

Again, that is a plain lie. The Federal Liberal Party has put down a policy that industrial awards will be maintained and that there will be a clear choice by individuals whether they stay with their industrial award or go across to an enterprise agreement. It is up to the individual involved. There will be no abolition

whatsoever of the industrial award. I cannot imagine that by choice people would go across to an enterprise agreement unless the collective benefits were better but, if they do, they are still protected with minimum standards laid down within that enterprise agreement. They then went on and claimed in this article that the results of this industrial relations policy would be lower wages and conditions, with women and workers, casual and part-time workers particularly being disadvantaged. Again, it is plainly false. I would hope that you, Mr Speaker, would join with me in coming out over the next week and criticising the lies that have been perpetrated by the local party. You are a man of honour and I would hope that you would join with me.

A pamphlet on education has been put out by John McCombe, 163A Greenhill Road, Parkside, South Australia. The interesting thing is that, if you go to that address, you will find that it happens to be the address of SAIT. In other words, the South Australian Institute of Teachers has produced this full colour glossy pamphlet, full of fabricated material and certainly full of lies, because it claims in the very first item that there will be larger class sizes, and it does not even have the gumption or the honesty to put it out under its own name.

It peddles that sort of material throughout the Federal seat of Adelaide without even taking recognition for the fact that it is the one who paid for it. SAIT has put approximately a quarter of a million dollars into its very highly political campaign for the Labor Party, and I highlight the point that it is turning the teachers away from SAIT in droves. Teachers have come to me and expressed their absolute disgust at the way in which SAIT has campaigned in this Federal election campaign, using the funds of its members. I come to another piece of material that was put out.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Surely, the Leader does not need all that background support.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Here is another glossy brochure, this one put out by the United Trades and Labor Council. Let us look at one point made in this glossy brochure as part of the half million dollar campaign it has gone out to run, this fabricated campaign against the Federal Coalition. It is entitled 'Kids in education', and states:

Not only would State funds be cut so much that State schools would have to charge fees to make ends meet...

Now, here is the United Trades and Labor Council claiming that State schools will have to charge fees under Federal Coalition policies. Again, that is plainly false and everyone understands it, yet we have the United Trades and Labor Council perpetrating this campaign of false claims. It later states:

Meanwhile, Labor's training and work experience programs would be cut, throwing more low skilled people onto the unemployment scrap heap.

The truth is that a Federal Coalition Government has promised from now to the year 2 000 to dedicate a further \$3 000 million for these training programs. That is over and above what the Labor Government has so far committed from now until the year 2 000. So, in fact, quite contrary to the claim of its being a cut, the Federal Coalition will actually increase money for training and pump in an additional \$3 000 million over the next eight

years. I could go on at great length. There is the material from the Australian Nursing Federation and some of its false claims, such as the following:

No matter whether you want the award to continue, if your employer does not, it will no longer apply.

That is plainly false. It is up to the individual employee as to whether or not the industrial award continues. It goes on to state:

There is no limit to the ordinary hours of work.

An honourable member: Your hearing's wrong.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hayward and the Minister are out of order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The document continues:

Overtime payments are, therefore, able to be abolished, weekend penalty payments abolished, along with annual leave loadings.

The Federal Coalition, quite counter to that claim, has given an assurance that there will be no legislation to remove any existing industrial awards. In other words, penalty, annual leave and overtime payments will not be abolished: they will remain within industrial awards, and people have the choice to stay under those awards. The assurances have been given.

I would like to stand up the points as to why it is to the benefit of South Australians that they vote for a Federal Coalition on 13 March. The first and most fundamental thing is that the vast majority of families in South Australia will be better off under Fightback. Just to highlight that, the *Advertiser* last Saturday ran the story of a family—picked by the Labor Party in this State; it was not a Liberal Party choice—whose situation under Fightback was assessed by an independent consultant. It turns out that, based on the assessment of that independent consultant, this family, which was apparently doing badly and which was picked by the Labor Party, would be \$28 a week better off under the Liberal Party—\$28 a week better off under the Fightback package. That is the minimum. If the Liberal Party's calculations had been applied, they would have been about \$40 a week better off, but let us stick with the independent calculations. Under the policies of a Federal Coalition Government, this family, which was picked by the Labor Party, would have been \$28 a week better off.

There is the message to all South Australians. Fightback is not what has been painted by the Labor Party: Fightback is there for the benefit of South Australian families. Why? Because there are considerable increases in allowances and very significant reductions in taxation levels. In all the Labor Party publications, no-where do you see the other side of the equation; it completely ignores the tax reductions that apply under Coalition policy.

The second important reason why South Australians would be better off under Fightback is that Fightback will start to lift the productivity of the industry of this State, and unless we get a lift in productivity our standard of living will slip as it has been for the past four or five years under the Labor Party. For example, for a ship to unload at the port of Auckland the charge is \$3 500, but at the port of Melbourne the charge is \$27 500. That is how inefficient our ports are with the excessive costs of operating our ports, despite all the

so-called micro-economic reform of this Labor Party which is just fictitious. It is no wonder that we are not competitive.

I will provide an even better example of where we stand in international competition in terms of productivity. First, as you would realise, Mr Speaker, on the latest figures—and they are more than 12 months old—we rank something like 16 out of 22 in terms of world productivity. I have talked to a very large manufacturer in this State which runs manufacturing plants throughout most developed countries in the world. That produced a table of its productivity and costs of company production for the factory in South Australia compared with those of other countries in the world. The important thing to realise is that this manufacturer produces the identical product in each factory, so a fair comparison can be made. The factory in South Australia ranked second to bottom in terms of productivity per employee because of the centralised rigid wage fixing system that we have had for so long.

Secondly, in terms of their international comparisons, our costs of production per unit in Australia are the second highest in the world. The only plant where there is a higher cost per unit is a very brand new plant in the United States of America with very highly automated equipment and which has accelerated depreciation write-off and therefore has very high amortised costs per unit. In other words, we rank second bottom in the world in terms of productivity for this product, and under normal circumstances on a fair comparison would have the highest cost of production for any country in the world. No wonder we are not internationally competitive; no wonder that we have 90 000 or more unemployed people here in South Australia, and 1 million people unemployed throughout the rest of Australia. There is no doubt that at long last Fightback will give some chance for Australian industry, particularly South Australian industry, to become internationally competitive again.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It will give exporters, for instance, the chance to reduce their costs by 11 to 15 per cent, because no GST will apply whatsoever to exported goods. At long last there is some hope for our manufacturing and primary industries to get out in the world markets and compete on a price basis. Under Fightback, there is a major readjustment of our tax structure, the sort of reform of taxation that we should have had years ago. If we had had it years ago, we would not have had the decline in our standard of living and the levels of unemployment that we have.

What other developed countries in the world have such an archaic system of taxation as Australia? What other countries in the world impose a 6.25 per cent levy or loading on all employee wages as we do under payroll tax in this State? However, we have a Government in South Australia that says it will not abolish payroll tax under a Federal Liberal Coalition—words that it will have to eat. If the Government had any regard for the unemployed of South Australia, it would be out there now advocating the abolition of payroll tax and the introduction of the tax reforms of the Federal Coalition.

I point out another very important policy and benefit for South Australians in electing a Coalition Government,

and that is the Alice Springs to Darwin rail link. I was disappointed that the Premier of South Australia was not prepared to come out and support the campaign being run by the Northern Territory Government, a bipartisan campaign, to have that rail link built. The Chief Minister expressed his disgust to me that Premier Arnold was not prepared to come out and back that non-political bipartisan campaign.

Mr Brindal: He puts Party politics before the State.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Exactly, and he has done that consistently ever since he has been Premier of South Australia. That rail link is one of the most important links in helping our industry to expand into South-East Asia. Do members realise that the number of people in South-East Asia within 750 kms of Darwin, with a *per capita* income which would allow them to go out and buy consumer goods, food and fresh products that we could supply from South Australia, will increase from 9 million on present day figures to 45 million by the year 2000? It is the fastest growing market in the world because of the huge size of the market and the rapid increase in its consumption spending, yet this Premier and this Government are not prepared to come out and publicly back a campaign to have that rail link built.

South Australia has the potential to become the basket for fresh food, vegetables, fruit, milk, meat and fish for that vast market of South-East Asia, and the Liberal Party in South Australia is out there supporting the Federal Coalition and the Northern Territory Administration to make sure that we get it, despite the negative stance taken by the Labor Government in South Australia and the Federal Labor Party.

The final point I would make, and the final reason why South Australians should vote for the Federal Coalition, is none other than jobs, because their only hope of overcoming the 90 000 unemployed in South Australia, and starting to increase the number of jobs, is by the election of a Liberal Government at both Federal and State levels.

Fightback, by the abolition of payroll tax, by the reform of our tax system, by the abolition of GST on exports and by the introduction of major industrial reforms to increase productivity, will once again give some hope and optimism to industry in this State that it is worth going out and creating jobs. Under this Labor Government, we have lost 32 000 full-time jobs in the last two years alone. When it comes to 13 March, there is no doubt that the people of South Australia will make the ultimate choice. They want some hope for the future; they want the chance of a job in the future; they want a better standard of living in the future; and they will vote for a Federal Coalition Government.

Motion carried.

Bill taken through its remaining stages.

POLICE SUPERANNUATION (SUPERANNUATION GUARANTEE) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 February. Page 2097.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the Bill. The Police Superannuation Act has been subject to a number of changes in recent times to reflect the change from pensions to lump sums as well as the changes that have been necessary due to the ever changing circumstance in relation to superannuation provisions. What we see in this Bill is three propositions that enjoy the support of the Opposition.

The first proposition is that the Government has to meet the superannuation guarantee, as is required, as at 1 July 1992, and that means the minimum benefit has to be provided. The second proposition relates to the estates of those contributors who have not enjoyed the full benefits that would normally accrue on their death. The Bill amends the Act to reflect the requirement that people who die during their service with the public sector, and now with the police, should have the right to have their asset preserved, that asset being superannuation and the Government contribution thereto. The third proposition is for reasons of clarification, and it relates to amendments to the principal Act because of some concern that there may be double dipping in terms of a person's capacity to claim not only the pension but also a lump sum benefit. The Opposition supports those three propositions.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Treasurer): I thank the Deputy Leader for his support for this Bill on behalf of the Opposition. As the Deputy Leader said, it is a small Bill but a not unimportant one, and it is pleasing to have the cooperation of the Opposition to have the Bill passed as swiftly as has occurred.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Death of Contributor.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: My first question relates to new subsection (6)(c) regarding a contributor who dies in the course of duty; the lump sum is the greater of two sums, and two formulae are provided. In the existing Act, we find that the provision is for the lesser of the two amounts. Can the Minister please explain why we now change to the greater amount?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: If it were not the greater of the two formulae, it would not satisfy the superannuation guarantee levy provisions.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The second question is one that may have to be taken on notice. At what level will an average person in his or her own right have provided sufficient contributions, equivalent to the salary of that person? In other words, does it take 15 years or 20 years with the accumulated benefits plus the interest against the person's contribution before that person has contributed the equivalent of the salary that the person has at the time?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (6 to 9) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

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

QUESTION

PRISONER, DRUGS

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

In reply to **Mrs Kotz** (18 February).

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I have had the discovery of a syringe in prison food at Yatala Labour Prison investigated and can now inform this House of the findings.

At approximately 4.15pm on Thursday 28 January 1993, prisoners in F Division at Yatala were receiving their evening meal when a prisoner found a cut-down hypodermic syringe on a plate containing coleslaw.

Prison officers were notified and immediately stopped meals from being served from the hot boxes. The plate was removed and prisoners were given alternative meals from the kitchen.

The syringe was similar to those used in the prison infirmary and liquid inside the syringe was tested and found to be an illegal substance.

The coleslaw where the syringe was found was prepared by prisoners in the kitchen and then placed in individual unit containers by custodial specialists. The method of allocating hot boxes to units and distributing meal serves to prisoners makes it very difficult to determine how the syringe got into the coleslaw.

Many theories on the reason why the syringe was placed in the food have been put forward.

These range from wanting to cause a needle stick injury to prisoners trying to avoid being detected by prison officers.

Alternatively a prisoner may have wanted to pass the syringe to another prisoner for personal use. This is unlikely as the syringe was put in a large serving bowl for further distribution by meal servers within the unit.

Another theory is that it may have been deliberately planted to stir up ongoing prison issues;

However, in view of the lack of evidence during the investigation and that there was no deliberate targeting of the syringe to a particular prisoner or officer, there will not be any further investigations.

MID-NORTH DEPARTMENTAL HEADQUARTERS

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Public Infrastructure): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: During Question Time on 18 February the member for Custance asked me if a review had been conducted into whether the Mid-North headquarters of the E&WS Department at Crystal Brook should be rationalised or closed. He said that he had been told that such a review had just been completed, but suggested that the results would be withheld until after the Federal election on 13 March. I have been advised by the E&WS Department that it has not conducted a review into the rationalisation or closure of its Crystal Brook office. It follows that there is no information to withhold, as implied by the member for Custance. The question also contained a reference to the Department of Road Transport. As I advised the honourable member at the time, I cannot answer for the Minister of Transport Development.

QUESTION TIME

GENTING GROUP

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Deputy Premier refer to the Casino Supervisory Authority a report by an Assistant Police Commissioner in Western Australia so that the authority can further consider whether the Genting company should remain associated with Adelaide Casino and whether any changes to the Casino Act are necessary? I have obtained a copy of this report which, I am advised, has not been made public. It has been submitted to the Federal Parliamentary Committee on the NCA to assist its inquiry into the operation of legal casinos in Australia. It is signed by L.D. Ayton, now an Assistant Police Commissioner in Western Australia, who is described in the report of the WA Inc. Royal Commission as an upright, conscientious investigator'. His report is based on the Burswood Casino in Perth during the period it was half owned and operated by the Genting Group.

This report makes a series of very strong criticisms of procedures to regulate the ownership and regulation of casinos in Australia, and points to infiltration of criminal figures and a reluctance by casino management to assist police investigations. Referring to the appointment of the Dempster-Genting consortium to own and operate the Perth casino, the report states that the Western Australian Government 'chose persons to build, manage and part own the casino who they knew possessed a suspicious background. When later faced with damning evidence of illegality by those same persons, the Government and their committee simply ignored the information'. In a report tabled in October last year, our own Casino Supervisory Authority advised that the same Genting Group has too much influence in the running of the Adelaide Casino.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Leader must be desperate for a question. This was going around the traps about six months ago, and I can only give the same answer as I gave then, that Genting, to the best of my knowledge and to the best knowledge of the police and the Casino Supervisory Authority, and of the full public inquiry that was held into the establishment of the Casino and who should operate it, is a clean company.

That is the information we have. If the Leader has any accusations to make against this company, I suggest he go outside, call a press conference and make those allegations on the front steps of Parliament House. I am quite sure that those allegations can be tested in the appropriate place. But what we get is the Leader coming in here—to coward's castle—rubbishing this company—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: —which to the best of everybody's knowledge in this State has gone through a public inquiry. I do not know what that company has done to deserve this kind of treatment from the Leader. The Casino Supervisory Authority has already had a look at this company and, to the best of its knowledge and its

ability to inquire, the company has done absolutely nothing wrong.

I think that the issue really ought to be put to rest once and for all in the interests of this company and in the public interest. The way to do that is not to come in here making remarks about these people but for the Leader to show some courage, to have the courage of his convictions, to put his money literally where his mouth is and to go outside and cast the same aspersions on this company as he does here. But the Leader is not game to do so; he only enjoys slagging off against people from the protection of parliamentary privilege. The Leader has absolutely no courage and no guts; if he had he would demonstrate it.

I have previously taken up questions relating to Genting and, as far as I know, there is absolutely no new information. On the previous occasions that I have taken up these questions, the police, the Casino Supervisory Authority and the public inquiry into the establishment of the Casino and the operators have all given this company a clean bill of health.

STATE BANK

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I direct my question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Question Time each day this week has been a long drawn out affair, albeit with an hour allocated but with very few questions asked. Many delays have been caused by interjections, with the Chair having to bring the House to order. That will not happen today. The honourable member for Stuart.

Mrs HUTCHISON: Can the Treasurer provide the House with the exact components of the Prime Minister's tax compensation package for the sale of the State Bank?

The Hon FRANK BLEVINS: This is an important question, and I want to put on the record precisely what the Federal Government, when it wins the Federal election on 13 March, has offered to this State if the State Bank is to be sold at a fair price. The package consists of a grant, interest payments to be forgone by the Commonwealth and debt forgiveness over the remainder of this in the next two financial years. Within the four months after the election, the Prime Minister has agreed to provide South Australia with a grant of \$134 million, forgo interest payments of \$22 million and provide debt forgiveness of \$107 million, making a total of \$263 million.

In 1993-94 the Commonwealth would forgo interest of \$36 million and provide debt forgiveness of \$114 million, a total of \$150 million. In 1994-95 the Commonwealth will forgo interest of \$22 million and provide debt forgiveness of \$212 million, a total of \$234 million. That is a nominal total of \$647 million, with a net present value of \$600 million, using an appropriate public sector discount rate of 8.5 per cent. That is a remarkably good deal for South Australia. It is certainly a lot better than the \$400 million in present net value.

Mr MEIER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Treasurer was asked what the Prime Minister's package was. We have heard the answer; the Treasurer is now starting to debate the question, which is against Standing Order 98.

The SPEAKER: The Chair has no knowledge of the extent of the response by the Treasurer. It may be that that was his closing remark. The comment about commencing to debate is valid, but I have no idea where the Treasurer is in his response. I would ask the Minister not to debate the question and bring his answer to a close as soon as possible.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Thank you, Mr Speaker, but I do think it is extremely relevant, given the visit of Dr Hewson to South Australia on Friday, that the Leader of the Opposition informs Dr Hewson that he has made some comments about a bank package. Dr Hewson apparently knows nothing about it. At least the Leader should inform Dr Hewson that he has made some comments—there is no need to look embarrassed—and ask Dr Hewson whether he will at least match the Federal Government's offer. In fact, why not increase it? However, he should at least match what the South Australian Government has been offered by the—

Mr MEIER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the Treasurer has continued to debate the question after being asked not to.

The SPEAKER: I think the Treasurer may have finished. The honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

GENTING GROUP

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Deputy Premier. In view of confidential police and Corporate Affairs reports relating to the Genting Group obtained from New South Wales and Western Australia, will he immediately order a review of previous investigations by South Australian authorities into the affairs of Genting? In a ministerial statement of 27 October last year the Deputy Premier said that South Australian authorities had pursued access to these reports but 'no evidence came to light which was thought to justify action being taken against Genting or any of its officers'.

I have copies of four reports which contain material in direct conflict with the Deputy Premier's ministerial statement. Two of these are New South Wales police reports and, based on them, the New South Wales Government rejected a tender from Genting to operate a casino at Darling Harbour. These reports conclude that available information 'raises considerable concern as to the probity and integrity of Genting.' That information included an analysis of Genting's proposed involvement in a Gold Coast casino in 1990 associated with the notorious Eddie Kornhauser who, according to the Fitzgerald inquiry, made a payment of \$200 000 to Russ Hinze while this project was being negotiated.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Western Australian reports cover the activities of two directors of Genting who have been directly involved with the Adelaide Casino operations and recommended that they be prosecuted on fraud charges.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I assume that the Deputy Leader, like the Leader, is casting aspersions on

this company. If that is the case, the proper place to do that is not hiding behind parliamentary—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition had a very long time to put his question and explain it. Interjections after the question has been asked are out of order. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Thank you, Sir. I assume that the Deputy Leader, like the Leader, is casting aspersions on this company from the safety of cowards' castle. If the Deputy Leader has any guts—and I expect that he has a little bit more than his Leader—he will make these allegations against the company outside this place where it can defend itself. That is the honourable thing to do. I would not expect it of the Leader, but I would expect it of the Deputy Leader.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will tell you what I am responsible for. I am responsible for the Casino Supervisory Authority, which is headed by a very eminent Adelaide QC. If the Deputy Leader is casting aspersions on that individual and saying that she is not capable of seeing that the Casino is run, in a proper manner, I suggest that the Deputy Leader go outside and make that accusation.

The Police Commissioner in this State has said very clearly on the record that the Casino in South Australia is run in a totally clean and pristine way, and the Police Commissioner ought to know. The Casino Supervisory Authority has chased these furrphies brought up by the Opposition on previous occasions and has reported back to me; and I have reported back to the Parliament that, as far as the Casino Supervisory Authority is concerned, there is no evidence to suggest that this company in South Australia has acted in any way other than the way it ought to do.

As far as I am concerned, if the Police Commissioner is happy, and if the Casino Supervisory Authority is happy, and I know nothing whatsoever against this company, that is the end of it. Incidentally, I do not know this company at all, and I know of nothing whatsoever against it. To the best of my knowledge the company has never contacted me or had anything to do with me. Occasionally I met Bob Bakewell, who was associated with it at one time, at the airport, but he is no longer involved with the Casino as I understand it. He may not be too happy about it. I think he has probably mentioned it to members opposite, but that is the closest I have ever been associated with Genting to the best of my memory or knowledge.

I repeat: it is quite wrong to come into this place and make accusations against a company that, to the best of the knowledge of the Police Commissioner, whose responsibility it is to investigate these things, and to the best of the knowledge of the Casino Supervisory Authority, which also has some responsibility in this area, has done absolutely nothing wrong in South Australia. It is a disgrace that people such as the Leader and the Deputy Leader come in here and make accusations against it. Let them go outside and make their accusations.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE ACT

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister of Environment and Land Management explain to the House the procedure involved in the administration of the wildlife protection provisions of the National Parks and Wildlife Act? There seems to be some uncertainty within the community about how the Department of Environment and Land Management operates within the Act to prosecute those who commit offences against protected wildlife species. Specifically, what is the role of the department, what is the role of the courts and what is the role of the Minister?

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Playford for his question and agree with his point. The honourable member has made a very good point in raising this matter because quite clearly there is some misunderstanding in the community about the Act, particularly with respect to the seriousness or otherwise of offences committed under the Act and the propriety of the Minister in intervening in these matters. I take the opportunity to remind members and the public that offences under the National Parks and Wildlife Act are breaches of the law and are dealt with by prosecution officers of the department.

Briefly, the department's procedures in such matters are as follows: if an incident occurs, it is investigated and, if evidence is available of an offence, and it is revealed through the investigation, the offender or offenders are reported and the necessary evidence confiscated. A breach report covering all the circumstances of the alleged offence is then prepared and sent to the prosecution officer. The Resource and Protection Division then go through the report. This adjudication takes place with the reporting officer and possibly the Director of the division, depending on the circumstances, investigating the evidence before them.

Depending on the adjudication, the prosecution officer will then either warn the offender and return the confiscated evidence, such as firearms, or he may lay charges for breaches of the National Parks and Wildlife Act. Clearly, unless a warning is given, it is necessary for the department to confiscate firearms, for example. A recent instance was a case before a magistrate in Peterborough where the magistrate recommended that the firearm be confiscated until the matter was finalised before the magistrate.

The role of the Minister in this procedure has been, very properly, not to be involved in any way in directing the department or the prosecution officers, and that practice has been established over the past 21 years. Clearly, there is a very good reason for this, and it should remain so. As in the case with police prosecutions, it is totally inappropriate for the Minister in any way to become involved in directing the course of justice or the investigations that are being conducted. I am not sure that members appreciate the necessity for such a policy, because I have had correspondence in recent times from a prominent member of the Opposition, using—indeed abusing, in my opinion—the status of his office within the Opposition and requesting me to intervene in the case of a constituent, and to have

charges dropped against that person and the firearm involved returned.

I trust that members appreciate that a request that I intervene in this matter on behalf of an individual is essentially a request for me to pervert the course of justice, and I cannot accept that practice. Offences under the National Parks and Wildlife Act are offences against the law of this State. Members appreciate that due process must be followed and, indeed, the administration of the law must be followed. It would be totally inappropriate for me as Minister to intervene in this matter, and I believe it is totally inappropriate for a member, particularly a prominent member of the Opposition, to approach me to do so.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

CASINO

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): My question is directed to the Deputy Premier. If he has any guts, why has there been a five year delay in a review of the Casino Act? As the Adelaide and Perth casinos have some common management arrangements, will the Government take into account the report of an Assistant Police Commissioner in Western Australia in considering amendments to the Act, particularly to prevent the infiltration of organised crime and other forms of serious crime through the Casino?

The SPEAKER: I would ask the honourable member not to bring comment into the explanation, as he did into the question.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Most decidedly, Mr Speaker. In December 1987, the South Australian Government appointed a working party to review the Casino Act. In its 1990-91 annual report, the Casino Supervisory Authority stated that 'some quite significant changes to the Casino Act' were expected to follow this review. So far, the Government has not moved to amend the Act. However, the West Australian report addresses the issues of infiltration by crime, money laundering and junkets involving groups of overseas gamblers which have become a lucrative form of gambling in the Adelaide Casino. The report states that the huge volumes of cash turned over by junket gamblers causes casino regulators and management to be less than resolute in regulating, monitoring and controlling these activities.

Bearing in mind that the Genting Group has had an involvement in both the Adelaide and Perth casinos, other relevant extracts from these reports include:

The experience in this State has been that criminals have been involved in conducting junket tours to the casino. In at least one incident, a group from Thailand which included international heroin smugglers and racketeers sought approval to conduct junket tours.

The report further states:

Junket proprietors from Thailand and Indonesia constructively breach and assist their clients to breach the laws of their own country each time they bring a party to an Australian casino.

The last quote reads:

The probability that junket gamblers may be criminals is very high as is the probability that some of their funds will be the proceeds of crime. Of much greater concern is the sheer number

of gamblers brought to Australia and the possibility that some may use the trip for criminal conduct.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: There are two issues involved, the first being the question of changes to the Act. By sheer coincidence I was advised this morning by one of my staff that the changes to the Act that were to be introduced in this session are not ready. I will tell the House why—and it involves nothing quite so dramatic and entertaining as criminals from Thailand or whatever. It is merely because of a debate in the bureaucracy about the level of deregulation and the involvement of the Lotteries Commission—its necessity or otherwise. So, we will find that it is all terribly mundane. I do intend to change the Casino Act, but I can assure members that it will be in a very mundane and boring way. So, unfortunately, the member for Victoria will get no excitement out of that.

As regards the comments that were made apparently about the operators of the Burswood Casino, as best as I could understand the member for Victoria, that is something that the Western Australian royal commission can take up, debate, discuss and comment on as it wishes. But, if the member for Victoria is suggesting that Genting in this State is involved in any way in criminal activity that the authorities here will not investigate, he ought to just moderate what he is saying or, again, say it outside the Parliament. The clear implication of what the member for Victoria is saying is that the Police Commissioner in this State is either a fool or he does not want to investigate instances of criminal behaviour, that the Casino Supervisory Authority consists of fools or people who do not want to investigate criminal behaviour, and I can assure the member for Victoria that neither is the case.

Mr D.S. Baker: What about the Minister?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: 'What about the Minister?' is the interjection. Even more so, if the member for Victoria is suggesting that the Minister is a fool and does not recognise criminal behaviour or if he does, even worse, that the Minister does not want to investigate criminal behaviour that he knows about, I say to the member of Victoria, with some pleasure, we would be happy to have that debate on television; the member for Victoria can make those allegations outside the Chamber. Merely to state the proposition is to dismiss it as absurd—absolutely absurd—because the Police Commissioner, the Casino Supervisory Authority and the Minister would be down like a ton of bricks on any criminal activity in this State emanating from anywhere, whether from the Casino or anywhere else. So, if the member for Victoria or the other two members here today have any evidence at all of criminal behaviour attached to the Casino, they ought to take it to the Police Commissioner or to the Casino Supervisory Authority, or bring it to me, and I will see that the Police Commissioner and the Casino Supervisory Authority—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is not evidence.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I would have thought that the Leader would have the decency just to sit quietly today, after listening to the answer to the last question. If we are talking about intervention in criminal activity, if

we are talking about people trying to pervert the law and justice, I would have thought the Leader of the Opposition today at least would have the decency to sit back and be quiet. I have no hesitation whatsoever in referring any evidence of any nature to the Casino Supervisory Authority or the Commissioner of Police. Neither of those bodies, nor the individuals concerned needs me to do so. They can of their own volition investigate anything they like at all connected with the Adelaide Casino. Nevertheless, any evidence of any substance—not just wild assertions—will certainly be taken to the police and any other proper authority.

WOMEN, EMPLOYMENT

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): I direct my question to the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety. Can the Minister advise the House what are some of the difficulties experienced by women who work outside the award system? I refer to the article on page 15 of today's *Advertiser* which suggests that women outside the award system are being exploited by employers, that their wages are as little as \$4 an hour and that they lack employment benefits.

The SPEAKER: I ask Ministers to keep their answers as short as possible.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Yes, Mr Speaker. Yesterday I launched 'Lifting the lid on the too hard basket', and that inquiry demonstrated that people who are working outside the award provisions (about 19 per cent of people in this State) are under considerable disadvantage with 76 per cent of those people having no say in their terms and conditions of employment. They were told, 'This is what you are getting; this is what you are going to do.' There was no discussion and no negotiation but just straight bald statements.

They found that in many instances there was no clear description of what their duties were supposed to be. They found that their hours of work were constantly varied at the whim of their employer. They found that there were constant variations in their rates of pay. Unlike other workers in this State who work under award conditions, they are unable to go off to the Industrial Commission and have that rectified. They are at the mercy of their employers, who could change conditions hour by hour if they wanted to. Indeed, reading some of the statements made and listening to some of the stories told by those women, I can understand that happening.

We have the Liberal Party in this State saying they do not mean to do that. They have a national policy which says that their State counterparts will implement that policy, and that is precisely what these agreements will mean. They will be non-enforceable because this area is in the non-award area. We will find that people are required to keep their own tax returns and look after their own insurance. They get no sick leave or annual leave and receive no additional moneys for overtime. This is a group of people in our community who are exploited; they are vulnerable and they are principally females. If the Opposition is ever elected in this State

and carries out the industrial relations policy enunciated by its Federal counterparts it will make 132 000 more female workers as vulnerable as this group.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Goyder says it is lies but he knows it is true. He tries to hide behind that interjection. He knows it is true. In Victoria I know of a nurse who had a contract negotiated at \$8 000 less a year. What did that do to the family income? Two children went out of private school back into the State school. They had to sell the second family car so that they could keep their commitments. That is the policy of members opposite. That family lost \$8 000 a year. What about the other worker who, when he was interviewed by the employer and told what his contract was—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.G. EVANS: On a point of order, I believe that the Minister is debating the question. If he wishes to do that, under Orders of the Day: Other Business No. 20—

The SPEAKER: Order! I uphold the point of order. I point out once again that fewer and fewer questions and answers are being permitted and that, unless we all take some action in this matter we will lose Question Time altogether. I think the Minister has answered the question. The honourable member for Bragg.

GENTING GROUP

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): My question is directed to the Minister of Emergency Services. What reports, if any, has the South Australian Police Department prepared into the background of the Genting Group?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The Deputy Premier is obviously the Minister who has been handling this matter. I will take the question on notice and refer it to the Commissioner for an appropriate and full report from him, and I will be happy to provide a reply, through my colleague, to the honourable member's question.

TELEPHONES

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Public Infrastructure consider lifting the ban that has been applied to members of Parliament on 0055 telephone numbers? On page 2 of the Festival of Light publication *Focus*, the following article appears:

Victory for families.

Senator Margaret Reynolds announced in Canberra this month that Telecom has now removed all sexual fantasy messages or material reasonable parents would not want their child to hear from the 0055 phone message service. Dr David Phillips of Festival of Light has also written to thank Telecom for its action. 'I also want to thank the many people who spoke out' he said. 'This 0055 cleanup is a small victory for families.'

It now appears that the retain reason for restriction on the use of 0055 numbers because of excessive dialling of certain numbers has now passed.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: From what little I know of this kind of number, it appears that that material—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Heysen is out of order. The Chair cannot hear the response. The Minister.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: It appears to me as though the material referred to, at the very least, is highly unnecessary. Therefore, I think that members will unanimously support the withdrawal of this particular—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Have you finished?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I think that members—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Heysen.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: —will unanimously support the withdrawal of this part of the 0055 service by Telecom. If I have misrepresented any particular member in assuming anonymity, I am sure that member will make the appropriate statement at the appropriate time.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Because you were the last person to interject.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will direct his remarks through the Chair. Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Indeed, Mr Speaker, and I apologise for allowing my attention to be distracted by the member for Victoria. I am not sure whether or not there is actually a ban by Telecom on this, but I would be surprised if there was. It is my view that the common sense normally displayed by most members most of the time in this House would have been sufficient. However, I shall be happy to look at whether that is the situation. From memory, I think that we have a situation where members who wish to could alter their telephone accounts in such a way that 0055 numbers do not appear on that account. I have not checked whether any members have availed themselves of that service and, to be quite frank, I do not particularly want to know.

PENSIONER IDENTIFICATION

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Will the Minister for the Aged take immediate steps to prevent confidential information concerning age pensions being divulged to people actively campaigning in the Federal election, and will he ask his Federal colleagues how such confidentiality has been breached? I have received complaints from angry pensioners at Surrey Downs, Tea Tree Gully, Modbury and St Agnes, 11 in all, whose pension details have been disclosed to a campaigner acting on behalf of Mr Peter Duncan.

Each of these pensioners, living in the Federal electorate of Makin, has received a letter from a Mr Harry Hirst accurately identifying his or her pension and asking for their support for Mr Duncan. These pensioners, who are extremely sensitive about their financial affairs, feel vulnerable and outraged at this invasion of their privacy.

The Hon. M .J. EVANS: What the honourable member is alleging is clearly a breach of the Federal Social Security Act and I would assume that, if she has any information that leads her to suspect that a breach of

a Federal law has occurred, she should refer that to the appropriate Federal authorities, the Federal Police or the Federal department, who I am sure will pursue the matter with all due diligence, and I would ask that she do that. If the honourable member wants any assistance to do that, my office would be delighted to provide it.

SUBMARINE CORPORATION

Mr De LAINE (Price): Will the Minister of Business and Regional Development invite the Commonwealth Auditor-General to visit the Australian Submarine Corporation's Osborne site to meet with management and workers following his recent inaccurate criticisms of the submarine project?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Members will be aware that this morning at the Osborne site there was the keel laying ceremony for submarine No. 4, HMAS *Dechaineaux*, named after a distinguished captain in the Second World War who lost his life. It is interesting to note that back in December there was an *Advertiser* report headed 'Contract for subs bungled', which states:

Taxpayers may have to pay hundreds of millions of dollars because of Defence Department bungling of Adelaide's \$5 million contract, an inquiry has found.

It goes on to state:

The Auditor-General's Report tabled in Parliament says the Osborne project is unlikely to be completed on time and the contractor has used the Federal Government's poor contractual position to win excessive price increases.

I understand from information given to me that this is incorrect; indeed, the Federal Minister and the head of ASC, Don Williams, this morning strongly criticised the Federal Auditor-General. I have to say that in my seven-plus years in Parliament I have not criticised an Auditor-General, but it appears from the information given to me that his report is sloppy, inaccurate and just plain wrong. Certainly, I invite him to visit the site to be briefed by management, staff and workers about progress on the project, which I understand is on time and within budget.

Of course, it is a fixed cost contract. It appears that there has been inadequate consultation and that perhaps the Commonwealth Auditor-General has been poorly briefed. The fact remains that that report is extremely damaging, as inaccurate as it is, to the ASC and South Australian industry, because already that report, and reports of it, are being used overseas by competitors of the ASC in terms of bidding for contracts.

We are all aware that the ASC is currently involved in bidding for patrol boat contracts overseas and it is a shame that an inaccurate report is being used to discredit Australian industry unfairly. So, I hope that there will be a chance to torpedo that report by local industry and a chance for a supplementary report to highlight its inaccuracies. Let us remember that the submarine project is responsible for 1 000 jobs in this State and many thousands more in indirect jobs. It is responsible already for a \$1.3 billion boost for South Australian industry and a range of companies is currently involved.

Of course, we are aware of the Australian Submarine Corporation, but several South Australian firms, including British Aerospace Australia, AWA Defence Industries, Perry Engineering, CBI Constructors

(Adelaide) and APV Baker Refrigeration have won subcontracts. Major subcontractors Strachan & Henshaw (Weapons Discharge Systems), SAAB (Integrated Ships Control) and Pacific Marine Batteries have established either facilities or project offices in Adelaide.

Let us make sure that we get behind this project. We remember the comments of a former Leader of the Opposition who was disappointed that we did not win a bigger share of the project. I can remember that headline in the papers. Let us see the Liberal Opposition come in behind this important contract for this State.

GOODWOOD TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): My question is directed to the Minister of Environment and Land Management. In view of the Minister's statement to this House today that offences against an Act are offences against the law of this State, why has he as Minister of Environment and Land Management failed to ensure that the Government meets its statutory obligations to provide open space in a major Government development at Goodwood? For some weeks prior to Tuesday the Minister has had a display of plans for the redevelopment of Goodwood High School in the window of his electorate office. The display showed that 30 building allotments are planned to be created on the site. However, this has been misleading to the public because the Government has revised the plans to reduce the number of allotments to 19.

The number of allotments has been reduced by the simple process of doubling the size of 11 of them. This means that purchasers may divide their property into two, thus re-creating the original 30 dwelling sites. However, the reduction in the number of allotments means that the development will not have to comply with requirements under the Real Property Act because developments with less than 20 allotments do not have to include open space for the public. There is widespread concern in the Unley and Goodwood communities that the Government is attempting to avoid its obligation to provide open space in this development through artificially reducing the number of allotments.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Murray-Mallee is out of order.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The honourable member is referring to a site which is in the ownership of the Education Department and in which the Housing Trust and the South Australian Urban Lands Trust have indicated some interest with respect to development. No final decisions have been taken with respect to the composition of the development on that site. However, I understand that considerable misinformation has been spread around the community and that opposition to the development has been whipped up by the honourable member who asks this question. The reality is that a number of proposals have been advanced for the development of this site. Indeed, over many years the local community has made representations to respective Ministers of Education about the unsuitability of the provision of education in that locality and has sought a change of use for that property.

It is certainly in the interests of the Unley council and our community at large that these areas are used for residential purposes. That is certainly the desire of the Unley council. I met with the council yesterday and there is already a substantial parcel of open space land adjacent to that site which is owned by the local community through the council. The local community has made representations to increase the size of that open space parcel of land, so the negotiations are continuing with respect to that matter. In relation to the allegations that the honourable member has made, I understand that the initial proposals or discussions that occurred with the council with respect to development on that site were entirely legal and were practices that have been followed by Government and by developers in this State for a very long time and are certainly not outside the law in this State.

COAST PROTECTION

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): What commitment will the Minister of Environment and Land Management give to my constituents in relation to future funding for the protection of general areas in the coastal regions of Semaphore Park and Tennyson? For many years general erosion has been of concern to a large number of my constituents whose properties abut the Coast Protection Board land and local beaches in the aforementioned areas. In recent times the Messenger Press and the *Advertiser* have run a series of articles in relation to the protection of our coastal regions. For example, the *Portside Messenger* of Wednesday 3 February states, in part:

Mr Dyer said councils were in danger of being sued should any developments they approved be affected by sand erosion or coastal damage. The coast was given a severe pounding between August and December last year causing sand-dunes to erode. The mayor said the problem was further increased by lack of State Government funding for sand replenishment along the beaches.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Albert Park for his ongoing interest in this matter. His commitment to representing his constituents is well known. This is an issue which is of vital importance to those people not only in the honourable member's district but all members who have coastal exposure in their particular constituency, including you, Sir. The current situation, as I am sure most members know, is that there are ongoing discussions between local government and the department—and I say that in terms of agencies collectively—regarding funding responsibilities for coast protection. A review of the Coast Protection Act is being considered in order to accommodate these discussions. Taking into account the member's concerns and, of course, the concerns of his constituents in the Semaphore-Tennyson area, there is an obvious need for us as a community to address this problem.

The department has made preparations for a Treasury submission to the Government for funds to be provided next year for dredging and sand replenishment, particularly, given the honourable member's question, for Tennyson and Semaphore. In addition, specific plans are proposed next financial year for replenishment of sand at

Semaphore Park and in the Tennyson area at a cost of about \$50 000. We are looking at this from a biennial point of view, hoping that we can have a long-term arrangement with local government which will settle the arrangements for the continued protection of our coast. I am sure that all members in this place are unanimous in their support of that action.

GAYLER, MS D.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Recognising the need to promote economic development in this State, and recognising the sensitivity of the position of Manager of Planning and Policy in the proposed Environment Protection Authority, and the need to ensure no political bias in this important area, does the Minister of Environment and Land Management believe it appropriate that Ms Di Gayler, a previous State Labor MP, should be selected for this position, particularly since the legislation to set up the EPA has not even been introduced into this Parliament?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am disappointed that the member is taking this approach. I expected better from the member for Heysen, and I am disappointed in his response. The member refers to Ms Di Gayler who, before she had the opportunity to enter this place, had outstanding credentials in the environment and planning areas.

The Hon. J. C. Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Indeed. The honourable member knows that Ms Di Gayler prepared many reports which were actually sent to him when he was Minister in the Tonkin Government. I cannot understand why suddenly, because Ms Gayler had the good fortune and the sense to stand for election to this place, which is part of our democratic process, and was successful, she is suddenly persecuted by the former Minister for taking up that position. Ms Gayler has academic qualifications which adequately allow her to perform those tasks. She has the skills, the capacity and the ability; she is qualified to do that job. She was selected through the normal processes, which were appropriately followed, and I am sure she will continue to be a very dedicated public servant, committed to seeing that those values which the member has enunciated in this place are preserved and protected by this Parliament and by this Government. I am disappointed that there has been this attack on this particular individual. I am sorry it has occurred, because I have full confidence in her, as does industry and the community. I hope that she continues her work and ignores this little blip that has been raised today by the member for Heysen.

SOCCER CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport tell the House what help the State Government has given the 7th World Youth Soccer Championship scheduled to start in Adelaide this weekend?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: This is a very exciting time for all sports fans in this country, particularly

followers of soccer. Australia was chosen by the International Federation of Football Associations (FIFA) to host the 7th World Youth Championship for the FIFA-Coca-Cola Cup. Some 140 countries have played in qualifying tournaments throughout the world to be among the 15 countries to join Australia, which has already qualified, as host country. Adelaide is indeed fortunate to have such exciting teams as Brazil, Norway, Mexico and Saudi Arabia competing in the rounds here in Adelaide. The first matches are scheduled for this coming Sunday and continue for the week after that. Most of the games will be televised to some 70 countries, and I am told there is a viewing audience of some two billion viewers of this contest throughout the world.

The State Government, through the Department of Recreation and Sport, has already completed substantial upgrading works at the Hindmarsh Stadium, which I understand is the best stadium of its type in this country, to ensure that the venue is suitable to host the 7th World Youth Championship. Those improvements include \$900 000 spent on floodlighting; \$430 000 on the upgrading of player and referee facilities; \$305 000 on the installation of some 3 000 additional seats; and \$90 000 on improvements to catering facilities. I can assure you, Sir, that this will be a very important event for South Australia and for soccer. The State Government is extremely pleased and proud to be involved in its promotion.

PRISONER, RELEASE

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): What action is the Minister of Correctional Services taking to correct erroneous projected release dates for prisoners, and how many prisoners have already been released early as a result of errors in calculating prisoner release dates for the past 10 years? I have in my possession a departmental memo from Correctional Services Executive Director Mr John Dawes to all prison General Managers. The memo instructs that, following the recent industrial dispute, prisoners at Yatala, Northfield and Cadell are to have their sentences reduced by 58 days and, in addition, 'administrative staff are required to add a remission event of nine days'. The sentence reduction, therefore, totals 67 days in all.

Further investigation has revealed that this nine day additional early release bonus will continue a calculation error made for 10 years using a manual method to calculate prison sentences. During the design of the recently implemented computer system that is now used to calculate prisoner release dates it was discovered that for 10 years the department has not been calculating prisoner release dates in accordance with the Correctional Services Act. This means that many prisoners have enjoyed early release from prison. The departmental memo continues that practice.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the honourable member for his question. I am not familiar with the matter that has been raised with respect to the nine days. I will seek a report from the department, just like the member for Kavel would have done when he was the Minister for a very short time.

UNIVERSITY FEES

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Ross Smith): My question is addressed to the Minister of Education, Employment and Training. Further to the question asked by my colleague the member for Baudin yesterday concerning the Liberal Coalition's deregulatory plans for South Australian universities, is the Minister aware that the Coalition yesterday unveiled major changes to its scheme and announced that the value of vouchers would vary according to the cost of the course, and that Australia's older and more prestigious universities would be able to charge students substantially higher fees than more recently established universities?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. Indeed, as one of my colleagues has said, it is right back to the 1950s. I do not believe that anyone would see, in terms of university education, the 1950s as in any way the good old days. In fact, they were most discriminatory days in terms of access for all members of the Australian community to higher education through universities. If there were any doubts about the inequities of the Liberal policies for higher education, they were removed by Dr Kemp yesterday. In Today's *Australian* an article by Michael Dwyer under the heading 'Kemp unveils funding change' states:

Speaking at a forum at the University of Western Sydney, the Opposition spokesman on education, Dr Kemp, said a Coalition Government would ensure that a proportion of its student vouchers would be allocated directly to universities. This is in direct contrast to Dr Kemp's statement that the full amount of \$550 000 worth of vouchers would be paid directly to students. So we have now seen a slight change. One can well understand why we have seen the changing of feet in this whole discussion. The article goes on to say:

The average value of the voucher would be between \$9 000 and \$10 000, although he said the value would vary according to the cost of the course. It is interesting that Dr Kemp also conceded that Australia's older and more prestigious universities would be able to charge students substantially higher fees than their more recently established counterparts under a Coalition Government.

These policies destroy the equity of opportunity for all students in South Australia. They will disadvantage everyone but, most particularly, they will disadvantage those who are less able to pay. This, I believe, is a disgrace.

The Federal Liberal Party's policies, supported—because we have heard nothing from the State Liberals—by the State Liberal Opposition, threaten to disadvantage our three great universities just when they are poised to take advantage of both national and international opportunities for the delivery and export of higher education services. I believe there is a very high risk that the Liberal policies would emasculate our universities at a time when they are so important to the future of South Australia.

AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): What steps is the Minister of Labor Relations and Occupational Health and Safety taking to ensure the speedy and efficient transfer of assets and documents from Australian National to the National Rail Corporation, which at present is being held up in South Australia by the actions of the Australian Services Union and the Australian Federated Union of Locomotive Enginemen? It has been reported that the essential microeconomic reform of our national transport network is being crucially delayed by these two unions, which are refusing to hand over vital information about rolling stock, such as locomotives, and which is in the possession of AN. Bans have been put in place and the dispute has now been described as reaching a crisis point—in fact, it is a major embarrassment for the Federal Labor Government.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Kavel for his question. I am very pleased that he thinks I can interfere in Federal matters. What the member for Kavel ought to remember—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I can assure the member for Kavel that, whilst I do have a slight hearing loss, I did hear him. There is no need for the honourable member to repeat his question by interjection, thus possibly earning your displeasure, Sir. It is a Federal matter that is best dealt with by the Federal Industrial Relations Commission. That is a commission which the Federal Liberals have pledged to abolish—a commission which has allowed very smooth industrial relations to operate in Australia to date and which has allowed disputes to be settled in a proper manner.

WALSH, MEMBER FOR

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I noted in *Hansard* yesterday in the Supply Bill grievance that the member for Murray-Mallee referred to some occasions when I rapidly quoted material, such as a media statement, in order to have it incorporated in *Hansard* despite the restrictions of a five minute limit. He referred to my reading material into the record at more than 140 words per minute. However, 140 words per minute is only very slightly in excess of standard stenographic speed, and the long-suffering *Hansard* staff, who have frequently asked me to slow down a little, have indicated to me that the member for Murray-Mallee has misrepresented my sins. They have suggested that a rate at least double that cited by the member for Murray-Mallee would be more appropriate, and they indicated that they felt professionally slighted at any implication that a rate of 140 words per minute represented anything out of the ordinary.

**ENVIRONMENT AND LAND MANAGEMENT
MINISTER**

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am not embarrassed in the slightest.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Wait for the facts to come out.

The SPEAKER: I ask the Leader to make a personal explanation.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: During Question Time today, the Minister of Environment and Land Management made certain accusations concerning a letter he had received from a member. I am quite willing to admit to the House that I happen to be that member, and furthermore—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: In fact, the Minister had arranged for his own staff to run the letter around to the press outside this House at any rate, which shows the level of principle—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —if any, that the Minister happens to have.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Minister has no principle whatsoever.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader will resume his seat. The Minister will cease interjecting. The Leader has sought leave to make a personal explanation. The rules covering personal explanations are very clear.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! They do not include debate; and they certainly do not include responses to interjections, which are out of order. I ask the Leader to make his personal explanation direct to the Chair, and I will not interject. The honourable Leader.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: As I was pointing out, the Minister's staff have circulated outside this Chamber this afternoon the letter that I sent to the Minister. It is only fair and reasonable that I put in full context the letter and the circumstances that led to that letter's being written. On 10 February Mr R.M. Oates of Kangaroo Island wrote to me concerning his 18 year old son who was wanting to carry out some active and worthwhile employment. He sought permission through the legal system to be able to shoot kangaroos and wallabies on a farmer's property where there were excess kangaroos. In fact, he approached the farmer as was appropriate, and I point out that I am quite willing to make available the letter that I received from Mr Oates, because it is appropriate that people look at the circumstances that faced this 18 year old.

First, he approached the farmer and was told by the farmer that he had a permit to shoot kangaroos on his land and that he could go ahead and do so. He approached the police; he bought a rifle, he registered that rifle with the police and he sought the advice of the police. It appears that the advice given to him by the police was inadequate and that the advice given to him by the farmer was also inadequate. One could accept the fact that perhaps the farmer might not have known the circumstances, although one would have thought that the police would fully know the circumstances.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I stress that the 18 year old lad in fact did register his rifle with the police. He then started shooting kangaroos, and finally officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service confiscated his rifle for so-called illegally shooting kangaroos. As I said, the father of the 18 year old lad wrote to me and asked me to take up this matter with the Minister on behalf of his son, and specifically asked that, as his son had been very unfairly treated, all charges be dropped and the gun returned.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I then wrote to the Minister as Minister of Environment and Land Management, not as Minister of Emergency Services, specifically pointing out the bureaucratic nature of the regulations and the fact that he apparently had not been properly informed by the police in the operation of those regulations. It now turns out that not only did the lad formally have to register the rifle but he had to have written permission from the farmer and not verbal permission. Secondly, his name had to be included on the permit that the farmer had obtained; and, thirdly, he himself had to have a hunting permit. I further wrote back to Mr Oates—so that we put all this in context—

Mr Ferguson: Read it out.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Well, I will read it out if the honourable member would like. This is what I said, in part, to Mr Oates:

It appears that Mark is a victim of narrow bureaucratic attitude and his own trusting nature.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I point out that apparently the farmer's application to shoot kangaroos had been lodged with the department, but the department lost the application—on its own admission.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The department had lost the application—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader is now debating the issue. Although the Leader feels that he has been misrepresented, the reasons for that are not part of a personal explanation.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I am pointing out the facts, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I understand what the Leader is doing. A personal explanation is specific. The honourable member has access to a grievance debate to fully explain the issue if he wishes.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I stress the point that the landowner had lodged an application and that that application had been lost by the department, on its own admission. I wrote to the Minister, as Minister of Environment and Land Management, and asked the Minister to look at the matter, and I will use the exact words—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out also to the Leader that there is a five minute time limit on personal explanations. If he wishes to extend, he will need to seek leave.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: My letter states:

Unfortunately, Mark was not made aware that he needed a hunting permit, written permission from the landowner and that his name had to be added to the permit. In view of the boy's youth and his attempt to fulfil all the obligations he was aware of, I ask you to intervene—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —to have Mark's rifle returned and charges dropped.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: There is nothing wrong with that whatsoever.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The letter continues:

Justice and farmers would appear to be properly served by this course of action. Yours sincerely.
That clarifies the situation fully.

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: If the House will come to order, we will proceed with business.

RESTRAINT ORDERS

Mr SUCH (Fisher): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr SUCH: On Tuesday of this week during Question Time—

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

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

Mr SUCH: On Tuesday of this week I asked a question of the Minister of Education, Employment and Training about restraining orders. I stated:

A southern suburbs high school has sought restraining orders from the Juvenile Court on four separate occasions to prevent known undesirables entering the school grounds. The magistrate rejected the applications because the incidents, often on a weekly basis and involving threats of violence to staff and students, were not considered frequent enough to warrant a restraining order.

I wish to correct that. I have been informed today that the decision not to proceed with those restraining orders was made by the Juvenile Prosecutions Branch of the Police Department, which apparently felt that the applications would not succeed before the Children's Court. I put that on the record so there is no unfair or

inaccurate reflection on the Children's Court or any of the magistrates therein.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: Order! The proposal before the Chair is that the House note grievances.

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Today I want to refer to the GST. Much has been said about the GST, but I wish to refer to one aspect that I do not think has been canvassed widely enough, and that is the effect that the GST will have on local government, local councils and, thereby, the ratepayers of this State. In the form of selling the GST, the Liberals have made much of their proposal to get rid of the wholesale sales tax and replace it with a 15 per cent GST. I have to point out to members opposite that local government does not pay wholesale sales tax.

Members opposite have also made much of the fact that they will reduce payroll tax. I have to point out to them that local government and local councils do not pay payroll tax. So, local councils will suffer a direct impact of the 15 per cent GST. They will have no alternative but to hand that on to every ratepayer in this State, every home buyer, every mortgagee, and in fact it will—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr McKEE: Those extra charges will be handed onto people in private rental, because the owners will not absorb that increase, and the rents will be increased in private rental as well. The nub of the matter affects the commercial services supplied by a local council, and the Conservatives have not yet delineated what they will apply the GST to and what they will not apply it to, in relation to—

Mr Matthew interjecting:

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

Mr McKEE: —the commercial aspect of local councils. Let me give another example. Garbage collection and disposal is a commercial service put forward by local councils. That will directly attract the GST and will be passed on to ratepayers. In fact, the Local Government Association has said it will be listing on rate bills all the items that will attract a direct GST, so people will be forced to pay extra rates to the council.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: can you please explain the disorderly behaviour of the member for Playford as he enters and leaves the Chamber and his unwillingness to observe the—

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order. Many members are lax in their approach to the Chair in this Chamber. I thank the honourable member for reminding me of that: I will remind members.

Mr McKEE: Another aspect that will result in a cost increase for ordinary ratepayers, in terms of the commercial elements of councils, is sporting parks, for example, golf courses. Let me point out that there is a golf course not very far from here in North Adelaide; in fact, there are two, the north and south courses. They are

controlled and run by the Adelaide City Council. As a commercial service they will directly attract a 15 per cent GST, which will be paid by all the ordinary people in the city of Adelaide who use the North Adelaide golf course. I am one of them, because I cannot afford membership in the Royal Adelaide Golf Club or any other private course, and even if I could afford it I would be in an A frame before I had time to use it. Both the golf courses in North Adelaide are public courses and are controlled by the Adelaide City Council. They will cop a full 15 per cent GST.

So, there are a number of expenses throughout the community; people will be out of pocket simply because of the GST. People who use swimming pools and tennis courts that are controlled by councils and community groups that hire halls owned by councils will have to pay a 15 per cent GST. The poor old Secretary/Treasurer of the Senior Citizens Club will need an abacus to count up all the expenses he will have to pay to the local council because of GST. I point out that the GST will bury the Liberals in this campaign, but the *Advertiser* keeps digging them up.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! When the member for Murray-Mallee comes to order and observes decorum and proper conduct, the House will continue its business.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): This afternoon the Liberal Party has asked a number of questions about casino operations and the involvement of the Genting Group with the Adelaide Casino. We have also placed a number of questions on notice. We have been researching these issues since the tabling of a report by the Casino Supervisory Authority last October. Our research is continuing and we expect to ask more questions. However, at this stage, I indicate that the information we have obtained raises a series of questions about the circumstances in which the licence to operate the Casino was dealt with in 1984 and 1985, including the State Government's role. When I asked a question today, I referred to '1990', but it was in fact 1980 when Eddie Kornhauser was involved, so there was fair warning at that time. The second issue was whether the South Australian Government has adequately pursued legitimate questions about the background of the Genting Group. Thirdly, there is the question whether the Genting Group has been involved in making political donations to secure its position in casino operations in Australia.

We have a series of reports from authorities in Western Australia and New South Wales which question the *bona fides* of the Genting Group. In October 1987, the Liberal Party asked questions in this Parliament about investigations of Genting in Western Australia and New South Wales. On 14 October 1987, the former Premier told this House:

The Casino Supervisory Authority has let the licence to the Lotteries Commission. At all stages of that process rigorous checks were made, including police checks.

On the same day, the Attorney-General told the Legislative Council that the South Australian police had reported on the character, background and suitability of individuals involved with the Genting Group. The Deputy Premier told this House on October 27 last year that the reports we have released today were 'pursued by the

former Premier and by the relevant authorities in this State, but no evidence came to light which was thought to justify action being taken against Genting or any of its officers.'

It is impossible, after reading these reports, to accept the assurances from the Government. At the very least, this Parliament is entitled to have serious doubts that the Genting Group has been checked to the extent suggested by the Government or, more importantly, required under the terms of the Casino licensing arrangements. However, even before the Adelaide Casino opened in December 1985, Genting received a rails run into this State. The Casino Supervisory Authority had very serious concerns about Genting's involvement in the Adelaide Casino as it was originally proposed. Despite these concerns, the Government backed Genting's proposal. Genting obtained a 20-year agreement, now described by the Casino Supervisory Authority as an 'unusually long time' for such an agreement—most of them are for only five or 10 years.

Genting will earn well over \$50 million from this, yet its involvement in the Casino is now confined to one employee. There is a view that some people in authority have made it very easy for Genting to secure a favourable position and to evade any scrutiny about the company's background. There is continuing concern that this may be linked to political donations. The WA Inc Royal Commission identified that in 1985 Genting paid \$300 000 to former Premier Burke just before the opening of the Perth Casino. At the same time, Burke transferred, from the same account into which this money was paid, \$95 000 to the ALP in South Australia, just a week before the opening of the Adelaide Casino. We are asked to accept this as mere coincidence. Many more questions need to be asked before we can be satisfied.

The New South Wales police would not lightly report that Genting did not have the probity and integrity to be involved in casino operations in that State. An Assistant Commissioner of the Western Australia Police Force would not lightly report that those chosen to build, manage and part-own the Perth Casino had a 'suspicious background' and had made 'huge payments' into secret bank accounts controlled by Brian Burke. The South Australian Government has shown no willingness to follow up this information. It has shown no willingness to review the Casino Act.

A working party was appointed more than five years ago. Two years ago the Casino Supervisory Authority promised significant changes to the Act; they have not materialised. Is this because the Government, yet again, is unwilling to upset the *status quo* within the Adelaide Casino? The report to the NCA parliamentary committee by an Assistant Police Commissioner was based on his experience of casino operations in Perth. The same people responsible for those operations have been directly involved with running the Adelaide Casino. Two Genting directors referred to in the material we have produced today, Mr Colin Au and Mr K.T. Lim, who were recommended for prosecution on fraud charges in Western Australia, are Directors of Genting South Australia Pty Ltd, which has been intimately involved in the running of the Adelaide Casino.

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I would like to speak today about a very important issue for me, that is, health, especially as it affects people who live in country areas. I would like to make some comparisons, as reported in an article that appeared in the *Bulletin* of 29 December 1992-5 January 1993. It is written by David O'Reilly with the heading 'Fightback health scheme slammed'. The article states:

As the Americans look at copying Medicare, the Coalition proposes to mimic the free market health insurance system that the US wants to dump.

In other words, what the Federal Coalition wants to pick up is a scheme that has proved to be unsuccessful in the United States. The article further states:

Advisers to US President elect Bill Clinton are studying Australia's Medicare as a model for reforming the American health system just as Australian voters are to be given the chance to dismantle the scheme at the 1993 Federal election.

Joseph White, a policy analyst at an influential liberal think-tank, the Brookings Institution in Washington DC, visited Canberra last week for talks with Federal Health Minister Brian Howe. White followed another contingent of policy advisers to the incoming Democratic administration who had earlier slipped quietly into Canberra for talks with senior bureaucrats at the Health Insurance Commission. Clinton's main health adviser, Stuart Altman, has also been to Australia and has written extensively on Medicare for the Democrats.

Under the heading 'Promise' this article states:

A key promise in Clinton's election campaign was to shift from the current essentially private employer financed US health insurance system (which up to 40 million Americans cannot afford)—

and I would stress that 40 million Americans cannot afford health cover—

towards a fairer national system.

Further, the article states:

Surveys show that about 70 per cent of Australians are happy with Medicare, funded by a 1.25 per cent tax levy which Government proposes to raise to 1.4 per cent on 1 July next year. Fightback proposes a series of tax credits, subsidies and penalties to force people into private health insurance. Bulk billing would be abolished for all but pensioners and the poor, and doctors would be free to determine their own fees. In essence, Fightback would produce a health system as close as any in the developed world to the existing US free market system—

which the United States wants to get rid of; it does not want it any more.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs HUTCHISON: But the Liberal Coalition wants to pick up something that does not work. The article continues:

A respected Canberra health bureaucrat, John Deeble, claims 'a quagmire of potentially destructive difficulties lies behind the simple statements of Fightback'.

He goes on to say:

...on a conservative estimate, the Fightback system would cost an extra \$1.4 billion a year, with more than \$1 billion going directly to doctors as their net private incomes climbed by an estimated 60 per cent. Deeble says some specialists' incomes could double. 'It is hard to see this as other than a blatant rewarding of political support, which sits very ill within a policy

portrayed as based on rationality, efficiency and the elimination of restrictive practices gains.'

The article continues:

'The package does not make sense where it should,' White said—

this is the adviser from America—

'And it is also based on a theory that really isn't credible.' White said it would be a mistake for Australia to abandon Medicare for a US-style system.

Dr Armitage interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs HUTCHISON: Well, it should not abandon Medicare for the US-style system, which is what you are doing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs HUTCHISON: Further, the article states:

'It certainly looks like the supposed benefits of the Opposition system do not make any sense. And the dangers in going down the American road to higher expense and less security in health care are obvious.'

I could not agree more. The voters of Australia and South Australia should reject that Fightback policy in health because all it will do for Australians is disfranchise a whole section of the Australian community from having any health care; it will make the doctors' income double, which has been proven; and it will make the system more expensive.

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

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): It could not be more appropriate that I speak now to correct a few misapprehensions of the member for Stuart. First, let me say that both the Federal shadow Minister of Health, all the members of the Opposition and I have no intention of getting rid of Medicare, as has been said a million times.

An honourable member interjecting:

Dr ARMITAGE: Mr Speaker, I ask that the same protection be afforded to me. The member for Stuart is continually telling me that we will get rid of it: we will not. The simple fact of the matter is that in the American system 25 per cent of people have no health insurance, whereas under the Coalition 100 per cent of people will have health insurance. The only real difference between the Medicare system which is failing at the moment and the Medicare system which will operate under the Coalition is that under the Labor Party you would pay 1.4 per cent and under the Liberal Party you would pay 1.25 per cent.

However, let us look at what actually happens under Medicare—and that is the point I wanted to address. Yesterday, in Question Time I spoke of a person with a throat tumour who was told, 'The next appointment is six months away; take it or leave it.' That is the coal-face of the Medicare system of the Labor Party. I would like to point out that the Minister said in answer to that question, once again shooting the messenger and blaming the doctors:

If those specialists would cooperate more with the public sector in providing their time and their sessional services, more procedures could be done.

I remind the House that only towards the end of last year I quoted the example of the ear, nose and throat clinic,

which is where this man with the throat cancer would have gone, and the Director of the ear, nose and throat department informed the Minister that he is now able to perform only emergency theatres because the waiting list is so long that, by the time you get on to it, there is almost no point in putting people on to the emergency waiting list. So, what then happened? The doctors in the ear, nose and throat clinic, these specialists who the Minister, the lackey of the bureaucrats, says should be more cooperative, went to the Royal Adelaide Hospital and said, 'We will operate on Saturday mornings for no fee. We will operate for no fee on Saturday mornings, in our own time, to get rid of the waiting list.' What did the hospitals say? 'We don't have the money; we can't afford it.' Yet the Minister has the gall to say:

If those specialists would cooperate more with the public sector in providing their time and their sessional services, more procedures could be done.

What a joke! How much more cooperation does the Minister want than saying, 'We will come in our own time and do the operations for nothing'? In September last year, the Professor of Surgery at the Flinders Medical Centre wrote to all heads of departments at Flinders Medical Centre as follows:

I am writing to you in your capacity as acting head of unit. The Department of Surgery funding is such that we can no longer maintain our services. The waiting list funding of \$530 000 has been diverted to the general hospital expenses, and thus high cost elective surgery will have to be curtailed.

The reason for the curtailment of services is not that the doctors are not cooperating but that this lousy Government is not getting any money to them. As the head of the department goes on to say:

If we are to meet our budget requirements, I will have to limit the Orthopaedic Department to one joint replacement per week.

Whose fault is it? Is it the doctors who are not cooperating, or is it the lousy Government that is not providing the money? Late last year, just before the closure of the outpatients department, someone saw on the last day an old woman who was not privately insured and who had a malignant parotid tumour. Knowing that this system would not provide any outpatient services for six weeks, he took her into his private clinic, arranged everything and did the operation in his own private time for no money. Yet this Minister has the gall to say that people are not getting their operations because of doctor cooperation. What a joke!

The only thing I would say to the Minister is that he is known in the system already, despite having had the portfolio for only six months, as a lackey of the bureaucrats and as a person who would judge his independence as a valuable thing for him. It is a great shame that he has been curtailed in making sensible changes and has to come in and spout this rubbish.

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): During this Federal election campaign, we have heard a lot about the truth—or the lack of it. The greatest example of the lack of truth is the proposition put by the Federal Coalition that the Government is somehow to blame for the world recession and for just about every problem faced in this country. Earlier this week we had Dr Hewson's policy launch, and he had a number of people talking about their problems. One of them was Beverly; she was one

who had all the tears during that launch. She told everybody that she and her husband had invested in a hairdressing salon four years ago but had to sell it because of the recession. Apparently, because of the pressure of all the extra work, her marriage had ended and, with the help of her family, she was starting again. I happened to read in the *Australian* earlier this week that a friend of Beverly and her husband, a Mr George Pearce, telephoned the *Australian* to say that he was outraged by Beverly's implication that her problems had somehow been caused by the Government. So, just who has been a little careless with the truth? Dr Hewson does not appear to have had too many problems during the course of the Keating Government. He seems to have done pretty well: \$600 000 in consulting fees during the policies of the Keating Government.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HOLLOWAY: Nothing at all. But here is the same person saying that Mr Keating's policies are responsible for all the evils of the world. Further, Dr Hewson did not seem to have too much trouble with this tax system that is so bad, because he apparently managed to pay only 15 per cent tax on that \$600 000 he earned in consulting fees. There was a time when members opposite used to advocate self-reliance, stating that people should become responsible for themselves and not be dependent on the Government, and yet here we have, during this campaign, the Liberal Opposition trying to blame every single problem of any individual on the Government. Everyone is a victim, apparently, according to the Liberal Party—we are all victims. All we have to do is depend on the Government and it will all be right; we will have jobs from day one! We will have all the answers to the problems! If you believe that then you believe in fairies.

One of the policies that the Federal Opposition is putting is, of course, the GST, which is going to raise something like \$24 billion in tax less about \$2.5 billion in compensation. The only problem with that is that the taxes they are going to remove raise considerably more than the GST would raise. I think one of the things that has been most overlooked in this Federal campaign is this gaping hole in finances—this \$10 billion hole that will be made up of a combination of privatisation and cuts to Government expenditure.

I think it is about time the public of South Australia were aware of some of these cuts in Government expenditure proposed by the Federal Coalition, because it is absolute nonsense to pretend that you can cut \$10 billion out of Government expenditure without any effect on either the economy or the quality of life or living standards of ordinary Australians. Yet, that appears to be the assumption. Obviously the Coalition has gone to every single Government department and prepared a list of all the money that is supposed to come out of each of those departments, without any effect.

For example, arts, heritage and sport—that is one of the smaller ones—only \$60 million: apparently that will not affect anybody's quality of life; \$440 million from energy and resources; \$300 million from employment and training; \$500 million from defence; \$76 million from communications; \$52 million from Attorney-General and Justice—presumably that is to allow all these corporate crooks to get away with a bit more; housing,

\$400 million, so presumably that will not affect anybody's quality of life; \$1509 million out of health—presumably that can happen without anybody suffering; \$497 million from primary industry—presumably farmers will not suffer any problems as a result of that; \$70 million from trade; \$87 million from land transport; \$53 million from industry and commerce, and so it goes on. Yet members opposite are trying to tell us that ordinary Australians, low income earners and pensioners, will all be better off. Presumably that means all those people who rolled up at Dr Hewson's launch in their Mercedes-Benz and their furs and pearls were cheering so loudly because they were all looking forward to paying to make the ordinary people better off. If you believe that you believe anything, and that is what the Federal Coalition is hoping people will do: they hope people will believe anything, because you would have to fall for their line of garbage.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I appreciate the opportunity to try to correct the record in respect of some of the misinformation and fabrication made up at any cost—scare tactics or whatever—that have been peddled by the Labor Party and their union mates, and of course some of their faithful. We have had, not only in the media but through the letterboxes, a tremendous amount of literature, particularly in the electorates of Adelaide and Hindmarsh. In the electorate of Hindmarsh my family received a letter from Senator Crowley waffling on and enclosing a pamphlet from the ALP candidate. If ever there was abuse of my taxes by a senator in politically campaigning for a candidate, that was it. Senator Rosemary Crowley is the one who advised the Speaker in the Federal Parliament what to do when he fell off his pushbike. What credibility does Senator Crowley have?

Let us set the record straight, because we have continual allegations from the Labor Party and their union cohorts—the thugs of the industrial relations scene—claiming that everything will go up 15 per cent. That is simply not true, because everybody knows that seven taxes will be removed; there will be the wholesale sales tax and the petrol tax. Further, in South Australia most of our groceries—indeed, everything we depend upon—is carted by motor transport or rail into the State. Anything that is carted into South Australia by a vehicle using fuel must be cheaper in the future. It has to be cheaper, and at one stage I put a comparison of household goods between Sydney and Adelaide and found that most tinned and jar foods are at least 5c dearer in Adelaide, because it all has to be carted into South Australia.

Chris Gallus, who has done a tremendous amount of research into this, is our candidate in Hindmarsh and doing an extremely good job, and she will be successful. The nephew of Clyde Cameron has no hope whatsoever. The present price of two litres of milk is \$2.05 and after GST it will be \$1.98; 500g of cheese is now \$4.40 and after GST, \$3.99; 500g of butter is now \$1.95 and after GST, \$1.88. This is giving examples of the impact of GST on food items, and it shows how beneficial it will be for the people of South Australia.

I give further examples: 500g of margarine at present costs \$1.89 and after GST, \$1.85; 2kg of self-raising

flour is now \$2.48 and after CAST it will be \$2.43; 550g of cornflakes is presently \$2.99 and after GST it will be \$2.93, and that will suit me because I like my Special K: it is very good for you and very beneficial; 1 kg of rice is currently \$1.09 and after GST it will be \$1.07; a 680g loaf of bread is now \$1.45 but after GST it will be \$1.42. If we compare our bread to Sydney bread, our slices are much smaller and the quality is not as good as New South Wales bread, so it speaks volumes of what the GST has the ability to do. Further examples are 235g of Vegemite which now costs \$2.42 and after GST will cost \$2.30 (I am not taking into consideration specials that are offered by various retailers); 250g of tea costs \$1.69 and after GST, \$1.64; 1kg of apples at the time of preparing this leaflet cost \$1.55 and after GST it will cost \$1.48; two litres of fruit juice (Australian made and not this junk that is imported from overseas to the detriment of our citrus industry) currently costs \$2.90 and after GST, \$2.53.

Anything we can do to support local industries and particularly the Riverland ought to be encouraged but, no, members of the Labor Party in this State and their union cohorts are belting the daylight out of anybody who is trying to support Australian-made goods and Australian-grown products. Washing powder is a further example: currently 1 kg costs \$4.25 and after GST, \$4.10. So, with GST there is a benefit to the people. Nobody in the Labor Party likes to see change. They cannot understand it and that is the big problem we have with this Government. The Labor Party fears change because they do not understand it. As a result, they are out there searing the daylight out of everybody else—the widows, housewives and the workers—implying that they will lose their jobs. That is a lot of garbage. For the first time in this country, someone is game enough to bring about change.

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

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

DAVENPORT, MEMBER FOR

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That this House recognises the 25 years of meritorious service to this Parliament of the member for Davenport.

And it took him by surprise, Mr Speaker. In moving this motion I want to draw to the attention of the House and the public the fact that the member for Davenport today is serving the completion of his 25th year of continuous service in this Parliament. He has served as the Liberal Whip from 1970 to 1985 continuously and then from 1990 until now, a total of about 19 years. That makes him the second longest serving Whip of any western Parliament, and that alone is a historic record and very meritorious.

His service to this House has continued a longstanding family tradition which dates back to about the 1840s when his own pioneering family took a significant role in local government and served the community. The member for Davenport has fought hard in Parliament for

a whole range of issues, as we all know, but there has probably been no issue more outstanding in terms of what he has fought for and achieved than the introduction of the Ombudsman here in South Australia.

Along with all other members of Parliament I have appreciated that move to introduce an Ombudsman into South Australia. I can recall the moves to do so by the honourable member at that time, even though at that stage I was not even a member of Parliament. Of course, the honourable member has had many other interests, and one worth noting at this stage is the fact that he has always stood up and defended the rights of small businesses. I know that many small businesses, particularly in his electorate but outside his electorate as well, have always appreciated the way that the member for Davenport has stood up and fought their case against Government bureaucracy and unfair trading practices and fought to make sure that they had a chance to prosper and survive as small businesses.

I know how highly regarded he is in his own electorate and in the Hills area, particularly in Blackwood, Belair and Coromandel Valley, as well as closer to his own home area towards Mount Lofty. I am sure that thousands of South Australians would want to join with us today in commending the fact that the member for Davenport has given 25 years of service to this Parliament and to the people of this State. Of course, that family tradition of service is going to carry on, because his own son has been endorsed as the Liberal Party candidate for Davenport, as Stan is retiring. The Evans family truly has worked hard to serve the people of this area and, more importantly, the broader community of South Australia. All of us on this side of the House join together in paying our tributes to Stan and thank him for his service to the Parliament and to the people.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): I have great pleasure in joining with the Leader of the Opposition in commending to all members, and the electorate of South Australia generally, the 25 years of political service rendered by the member for Davenport. Political longevity is not something that is given to all parliamentarians. If anything, the extraordinary periods of service which characterised some political careers in the 30s, 40s and 50s seem to have disappeared and almost certainly will never be repeated.

Sir Lancelot Stirling served 49 years in both Houses of Parliament. Sir Lyell McEwin served 42 years and Mr Len Riches from the Labor Party served, I think, 37 years. As I say, it is most unlikely that anyone in the future will obtain to that degree of political longevity. There are a number of reasons for that. One of them almost certainly is—and I think the honourable member who is the subject of this congratulatory motion and I, as seconder of the motion, have something in common in that we have both signalled our intention to leave this place—that, if one wants to discover that there is life beyond politics, one has to do so while there is life in the individual to enjoy whatever it is that one will discover.

So, 25 years is all the more meritorious because, as I say, it is the sort of term that will not often be repeated in the future. I particularly admire the honourable member because he has not always had it easy. He did not have an electorate handed to him on a platter. In fact,

he had to survive a preselection process. He had to survive a fairly intensive election with a rather interesting opponent on one occasion and we find that, in fact, he is still very much with us. I would also want to say that the honourable member is certainly not within the mould of the caricature that some people on this side of the House often visit upon Liberal politicians. In fact, I might say that, but for an accident of geography, the member for Davenport might well have been attracted to Labor politics in his earlier years. However, the point of view of battlers at Iron Bank tends to be rather different from the point of view of battlers at Port Adelaide.

As I say, I am very happy to place on record my appreciation of the service that the honourable member has shown to his electorate and beyond. He has been here for as long as I have been in this Chamber. I have seen him at work, I have seen him in his electorate and I think I can say without fear of contradiction that he is unbeatable in his own electorate. I wish to conclude with a little story that the honourable member once told me that may be entirely apocryphal—I do not know. It is worth placing on the record because it is one of the nice stories that ought to be true. In fact, it is a little typical of the knockabout humour of the honourable member and the way in which he has always approached his responsibilities.

He and I shared a common boundary in the early 1970s, except no-one seemed to know where it was. Although it was located easily enough on a map, when one tried to find out where it was in terms of streets, we could not find it. It had to be eucalyptus trees or the like. The honourable member told me he once went door knocking a little before an election and found a significant number of people who were not actually on the role. He suggested that they should enrol, except he was not sure, they were not sure and I certainly was not sure in which electorate they resided. I said, 'What did you do?' He said, 'I asked them who they voted for. If they were Liberal, I suggested they enrol in Fisher and if they were Labor they enrol in Mawson!'

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I have pleasure in supporting the motion before the Chair. Any brevity is not to be suggestive of any lack of sincerity in the few words that I want to say. For a person who has been a Leader of the Party and had the Whip assist in the way that a Whip must assist, one becomes very appreciative of the role that that person plays and one wants to believe on all occasions that the advice is going to be straight. It always has been straight from the shoulder and reflective of the situation.

The former Deputy Premier told one anecdotal story. I will tell another. There were many people on the parliamentary scene just before the member for Baudin and I entered Parliament who learnt that sometimes they have to look into a mirror to recognise the signature. So when Yelnats Snave wrote letters to the press, which had a fairly traumatic effect upon one's own Party, one needed a mirror to solve the problem. Congratulations, Stan Evans, the member for Fisher, now the member for Davenport and soon to be, like the former Deputy Premier and I, an ex-member of Parliament.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I would like to congratulate the member for Davenport on his 25 years of service to the House, but I make my comments in perhaps a different perspective, as the only National Party member in the House and, therefore, in many ways, an independent as such. I have had the opportunity during most of my time in the House to work with the member for Davenport as the Whip. I can only say that my association with him has been totally on the level, it has been honest, and I have been able to confide in him on many issues of a parliamentary nature that sometimes would have breached Party political factions, but that confidentiality has always been maintained. To you, Stan, congratulations on a job well done and thank you for your support.

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): I join the Leader, the former Deputy Premier and other speakers in acknowledging 25 years of outstanding parliamentary service by the member for Davenport, Stan Evans. I do so quite sincerely and would like to place on record my appreciation and thanks for the service that he provided when I was Leader of the Party. The Whip's position is a difficult job, and those who have experienced the position will know that on many occasions it is a thankless job in terms of looking after the competing interests of members of Parliament who all believe that their interests should be at the top of the agenda, or who think their issue is more important than others that might be there at a particular time. Stan has handled the task exceptionally well, in my view, and has done great service to the Liberal Party in the way in which he has performed the task of Whip. I sincerely thank him for his support, encouragement, guidance and advice in the position of Whip when I was previously in the position of Leader.

In acknowledging the work that he has done in Parliament, I would also like to acknowledge the work that he has done within the community over the past 25 years. I think it is fair to say that his commitment, dedication and hard work to the electorate is an example to many. He has been tireless in his work within the community and, as a constituent of his for some 10 years now, I have certainly observed the way in which community organisations have appreciated his tireless work within the community, his involvement and participation.

On this occasion, in acknowledging his work in this place and in the electorate, I would also like to pay tribute to his wife Barbara and members of his family for the way in which they have given him unstinting support throughout his parliamentary career and certainly within the electorate. Congratulations, Stan, on a job well done. I think the Leader referred to a history of the family in the parliamentary arena. I look forward, Stan, to history continuing in welcoming as you stand down the new member for Davenport, your son Ian Evans.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Today I would like to say a few words in praise of Stan Evans. Quite a few things could well be placed on the record so that people can later read in the *Hansard* some more details of the amazing political life that has extended over a quarter of a century. I refer to two things in particular: first, his durability; and, secondly, the integrity which I

have always found in Stan Evans in his role as Opposition Whip. I am sure that that could be reinforced by those who have dealt with him, such as the member for Baudin when he was Opposition Whip, regarding Stan's role between 1979 and 1982 as the Government Whip in the Tonkin Government.

Twenty five years is a long time to spend in this place—from 1968 to 1993, if my calculations are correct, and I am not 100 per cent certain. Stan Evans spent 19 of those years as either Government Whip or Opposition Whip. If I am not correct, I am sure that Stan, with his interest in precision, will correct me later. Three of those years, of course, were as Government Whip in the Tonkin Government (1979 to 1982). I am well aware of the arduous duties, having spent six years as Government Whip from 1982 to 1985 and over three years since 1989.

But I did say that I wanted to talk about Stan's durability as a member of Parliament. He has been a very powerful local member of Parliament (one of those from a particularly rare breed of which perhaps Kevin Hamilton, the member for Albert Park, is another example), whose grass roots connections are beyond comparison. Stan Evans has had a very strong grasp of his local sub-branch for most of that time too, except on those occasions when he had some difficulties with preselection, but he has bounced back from those and I think he has shown in recent preselections that have taken place in his immediate vicinity that he is still a force to be reckoned with.

Over that period of 25 years he has been the member for Onkaparinga, he has been the member for Fisher and he has been the member for Davenport. Every time there has been a setback, Stan Evans has bounced back from it. I believe he is a prime example of a story told to me once by the Clerk of the House of Commons who described a leading figure in the British Labour Party who, shortly after an election, was noticed by some of the new young Labour members who had recently come into the Parliament to be in the bar drinking with some of his Conservative opponents. They berated him afterwards and they said—I will not mention the particular member's name—'What on earth are you doing fraternising with your political enemies like that?'. He turned on the young Turks and said, 'Listen, you young fellows, those people I was drinking with were not political enemies, they are political adversaries; all my political enemies sit around and behind me.'

I think Stan Evans is a prime example of that, considering some of the vicissitudes of fortune inflicted by his colleagues from which he has continued to bounce back. For example, he was inexplicably dropped from the shadow Cabinet by David Tonkin in 1979. Other incidents followed later. We never did find out why Martin Cameron resented Stan's borrowing a bottle of wine from his office quite so much. A lot of resentment was shown by some members, such as Ted Chapman, about his rejoining the Liberal Party after a very successful stint as an independent Liberal member. I particularly remember the preselection squeeze of 1985: and was the pressure put on the durable Stan Evans at that time! He was pushed aside, temporarily only, by the current Leader of the Opposition, Dean Brown, in the electorate of Davenport. He was pushed aside by the

current member for Heysen, David Wotton, in the electorate of Heysen and then by an unknown Margaret Clinch—who can remember her name now?—who defeated him in the electorate of Fisher. But Stan Evans got the last laugh. He won in Davenport and he won well. The current Leader was forced into exile for quite some time as a result.

Of course, Stan Evans lost the position of Whip as a result of standing as an independent. As I recall, it was just a few weeks or a few months before the election in 1985 that Stan Evans was obliged to stand down as Opposition Whip, and I think the then member for Morphet took over in that position. But, after the 1989 election, Stan regained that post for a short while. There was a little bit of confusion when, three weeks later, in a vote that was split three times, 11 votes all, the Liberal Party encountered some difficulty in deciding who was to be the Opposition Whip, but that was then decided by a majority of 12 to 10 against Stan. About a year later Stan bounced back into the position which he has occupied with great integrity and great honour for such a long time.

We on this side have not always appreciated the positions that Stan has taken on issues. I am sure, for example, that the Women's Movement did not always appreciate some of the things he said, particularly the recent position he took over topless waitresses. However, he has done a great deal of good in here. His role in the creation of the position of Ombudsman, the stand that he has taken on the rights of the Parliament as an institution and, in particular, on the rights of backbenchers, are those of a very honourable member of this institution.

I mentioned that the position of Whip was the other aspect of Stan, other than his durability as a member, that I considered particularly outstanding. I will say this to you, Mr Speaker, and to all members of this Parliament: on every single minute of every day that I have occupied the position of Government Whip I have been able to put my complete trust in Stan Evans. Whatever our relationships were in connection with the work that was required of a Whip, I could put 100 per cent trust in his honour and his integrity.

Anything that related to the arrangement of pairs in particular fell into that category. If Stan Evans gave me his word that he would honour that pair, I knew that he would honour that pair even if it meant that at some stage he was to be put under quite intolerable pressure by the leadership of his Party. I knew that his integrity and honour, his pride in that position that he had fulfilled for so long, would mean that he would, if necessary, absent himself from the House in order to ensure that the pair arrangement was honoured.

All of us who have occupied the position of Government Whip or Opposition Whip opposite Stan Evans—the current member for Baudin (Don Hopgood), June Appleby, Glen Broomhill, Gil Langley, others and I; I am sure all of us, not just me—could put on the record our total respect for the integrity and honour of Stan Evans in his conduct as Whip. I congratulate him, Sir, on 25 years service to this Parliament.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): I support the remarks that have already been made. I knew Stan Evans in two roles. When I first came into this place in early 1986

Stan was then a Independent Liberal and I was the new Liberal member for Victoria, and I sat right down at the bottom end of the Liberal Party—there was no further to go—and next to me was Stan Evans. For the next two years I appreciated being taught exactly what Parliament was all about: when to put your head up and when not to; when to speak and when not to—and I got it wrong a lot of the time, and still do. Stan was tremendous in those times, because he really did take me under his wing and help me. That is most important for new members.

I think it is something that we have realised on this side of the House (I know I did when I was Leader) that, when new members come into this House, someone is assigned to them to teach them a little bit about what Parliament is all about and, as the member for Walsh said, how we treat each other not only in this House but also in the bar. That is pretty important. Many a good, sensible and convivial conversation is had in the bar with people whom, at an earlier moment, you might have been getting quite cross with.

The next involvement I, as Leader, had with Stan was when he was the Whip. Stan was one of those people who was totally loyal and said it as he saw it. Whatever he did was in the interests of the Party he served. It was a pleasure to have Stan running around the corridors getting things organised—and doing it very well. Most people have said something about Stan's electorate. I do not think I have ever known a person who could go to so many meetings in the one night and cover the electorate as he did. However, as the member for Kavel said, Barb was always there. In his electoral work, it was always the Barb and Stan show. Her work behind the scenes was absolutely magnificent. I know that we would all pay tribute to Barb, as we on this day pay tribute to Stan, who has been here for 25 years, and wish him well in the future.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I did speak on this matter this morning, but I want to place on the official record my support for this motion. In acknowledging and congratulating our colleague the member for Davenport, I do so particularly on behalf of my father and the generations of politicians who were here when Stan was first elected. Dad always said to me, 'Stan is the smartest and shrewdest politician you will ever meet.' That has been proven to me. As the member for Walsh said, the man is unbeatable. I have heard it said today that Stan is retiring. I am not aware that he is retiring. We never know where we might need Stan. We might need him in Port Adelaide. If we do, I am sure that he will win. So, look out members opposite. If anything goes wrong, I am sure that Stan will stand again if we need him. On behalf of all your colleagues on both sides, members here and past, I say to Stan, 'Congratulations.' I hope you and Barb have a long and happy time ahead of you.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I appreciate the action that has been taken. I must say that it was a surprise. It is my custom—some members know it, others do not—to have a sleep some time after 11 o'clock every day; once I get the place organised, I sleep for about 15 minutes. When the bells started ringing, that is where I was. So, it was a surprise by the time I got down here. For members' interest, that sleep was a custom from the time

when I worked in quarries and timber cutting; all the men slept at lunch time for 10 or 15 minutes after they had eaten—rain, hail or shine.

This motion was a surprise, and I am grateful that it has been moved. It is not my swan song regarding comments about people who have helped me on the staff and in other areas: I hope that happens in the budget session. But, if there is an early election, I will be just as pleased about that. I want to go back over one or two small things. The member for Baudin mentioned the boundary, and that is true. Who else would tell somebody who was Labor to sign up on your side if you are Liberal and *vice versa*? He had a big majority any way; he could have his. I was quite happy with that.

Originally I did not intend to be a politician, but a person came to my home and asked me to go to a Liberal Party branch meeting (I was a member) and, when I got there, they wanted me to be president. At the time I was 36 years old and I had never addressed a group, other than a football club, in my life. I said to that person that I could not become president of the branch because it was a blueblood area (as it was in those days). But I did, and subsequently I won endorsement against a sitting member. Unfortunately I have defeated two sitting members on my side of politics: to my knowledge that has never happened before in this country.

On the day I was endorsed I was at Liberal Party headquarters. I walked out the door after three-quarters of an hour and there was a big sign reading, 'Sitting member defeated.' It did not enter my head, until I went about 30 paces farther, that it referred to my challenge against H.H. Shannon. So I went straight back into headquarters, because I did not wish to face up to anybody at that stage; I was trying to sort out what this headline meant in the long term.

Subsequently, the Party was worried about my winning as a person coming from nowhere and not being active in the Party, although I had been a member since I was 18 years old. The member for Baudin is right: if I had been born at Port Adelaide, it is quite probable that I might have taken another course. So, they sent a man named Allan Rodda, the former member for Victoria—a man who helped me a lot in the early part of my parliamentary career—to meet me at the Great Eastern Hotel at Balhannah. I walked in and stood at the bar. I was not one who frequented bars then, and I do so very little now.

I did not know anybody there. There was a guy at the other end, fairly well dressed, talking to the barman. What happened was that the *Advertiser* put David Tonkin's photograph in the paper with my name under it as he had won preselection for Norwood at that time. Allan Rodda asked the barman whether he had met a guy named Evans, and he said, 'That's him up the other end of the bar.' So we did not even know one another at that time, and that was the beginning of it. I will not tell you what Allan did when he shook hands with me; some of you might belong to an organisation—a particular lodge—as he thought I did and I said, 'No, I am not a member.' Members know to which one he belonged. So I came into this place.

I want to recognise three people in particular from the early days—Allan Rodda, the Hon. Bert Teusner and the Hon. David Brookman. They were very important people

to me in my early days. I came from a rough area, a rough type of background, and I have practised some of that on my way through politics. Being Whip for 19 years is a long time. The member for Walsh commented about the last time I won—that three times there was a tied vote. That was not quite the case. That time it was reasonably easy: the time before that it might have been a little tougher. I think that that should be corrected.

Unless you know how much my wife Barb has put into the community, within and outside the political field, you would never understand. I appreciate that, as has the Stirling community by recognising her in recent times. I do not wish to put it all on the record. She has helped the disadvantaged and those who cannot look after their own money—she looks after it for them. It might be something that people would never dream of that she does. At the same time she has raised our five children, with me being away most of the time at various functions. Even now, with 14 grandchildren, she still does a lot of baby-sitting. To my wife and family, who have been and still are a great help, I say 'Thank you very much.' I will refer to staff and others later.

I do not think that any Whip has ever served six Leaders, as I have. My Leaders will tell you that I am not one to go to their door, sit down with them and talk very much. That is not my way. If I really think I have to, I do it, but if not I do my job and leave them to do theirs.

I want to refer to one incident concerning the member for Hanson. On one occasion he went with me as guest speaker to a function in Hahndorf. It was a winter's night, and it was reasonably foggy: we could see about 50 feet in front of us. He wanted to drive his car and I was driving mine; when we got to Eagle on the Hill I convinced him to leave his car there and to travel in my car. He did not speak once we had left Eagle on the Hill until we reached Hahndorf. When we arrived there, he was white. When I asked him whether he was all right, he replied, 'I'll never bloody well ride with you again.' I explained to him that it did not matter how foggy it was, you could always see the same distance in front, whether you were doing 100 mph or 60 mph. I do not think he has ever driven with me since.

I hope the Leader and the member for Heysen do not mind my saying this but, when I ran as an Independent, I was serving three electorates. On one occasion my Leader invited me to his office and said, 'You just need to watch what you are doing. We know you are running as an Independent, but don't be foolish. We know that you have spoken at three places last night, and they believe you are using your brother.' He looks very much like me, but I said, 'That is not true. He has a deeper voice.' I had to explain that I was covering the distance between Blackwood to Happy Valley and Stirling and I had spoken at three functions. My three opponents at the time could not work out how I could cover the distance, but I knew the roads and took some risks.

Finally, one thing that annoyed me on entering Parliament, following the life I used to lead, was having to wear a coat and tie. I am happy that this opportunity to speak has arisen on this occasion when I am wearing neither.

With respect to Government members over the years, at times I have had to go to them with matters of

confidence. Sometimes they were personal matters and, whether it be the Hon. Don Dunstan, the Hon. Len King, the Hon. John Bannon or others, those matters have always been kept confidential, and I appreciate that. I have served with many Labor Party Whips, and have had the same sort of respect and cooperation. I want to thank my colleagues, members on both sides, staff, you, Mr Speaker, and other Speakers who have had to put up with me as Whip over the years.

I just want to confirm one thing. It is not definite that I am retiring. I have something else in mind but it is just an option if I decide to do it. Today we are referring to 25 years of service in the House. During that time I have won many friends and I appreciate the cooperation that has been afforded me. As applies to all members, there are a few people in the electorate who annoy us, and we would always like to tell them what we really think of them. When I do leave, I will take that opportunity. I thank all members for this motion.

Motion carried.

IRRIGATION BILL

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Public Infrastructure) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the irrigation of land in Government and private irrigation districts; to repeal the Irrigation on Private Property Act 1939, the Lower River Broughton Irrigation Trust Act 1938, the Kingsland Irrigation Company Act 1922, the Pyap Irrigation Trust Act 1923, and the Ramco Heights Irrigation Act 1963; to amend the Crown Lands Act 1929, the Crown Rates and Taxes Recovery Act 1945, the Irrigation Act 1930, the Loans to Producers Act 1927 and the Local Government Act 1934; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill is the result of the ongoing review of water related legislation. It concerns the distribution of water for irrigation, and the drainage of irrigation water.

There has not been a comprehensive reform of irrigation legislation governing both Government and private irrigation areas for over 40 years. This legislation is the result of extensive public consultation particularly with the Riverland irrigation community.

Statutory powers for irrigation may be found in eight separate Acts of Parliament. There is no good reason for several Acts to address the same issue. Considering the similarity of purpose of the various irrigation Acts, it is logical and practical to have standard provisions which would enable all areas to be managed in similar ways. This encompasses both Government and private irrigation bodies.

The responses to the green paper on the proposals for legislation were generally supportive of consolidated and updated legislation.

The Renmark Irrigation Trust will continue to operate under its existing statute, the Renmark Irrigation Trust Act 1936. It can

however, elect at any time to have its Act repealed and operate under this legislation.

The need for land tenure and irrigation management to be dealt with in the Irrigation Act 1930 no longer exists. In fact this was recognised in 1978 when the administration of irrigation activities in Government irrigation areas was delegated by the Minister of Lands to the then Minister of Works. This Bill enshrines that arrangement in statute.

Much of the existing legislation is procedural and prescriptive and better suited to subordinate legislation. This Bill separates the procedural and the prescriptive from the substantive law.

The pertinent aspects of the Bill are:

- . The establishment and management of Government and private 'irrigation districts'.

- . It provides for a diversity of management structures with simplified rules to administer the irrigation and drainage function in an efficient, business like manner.

- . The separation of the land tenure provisions from water management.

- . The land tenure concept of 'irrigations areas; is not relevant to water management. The water management function will not revolve around 'irrigation districts' which are simply those properties to which the irrigation and drainage facilities are available.

- . It considerably simplifies the conversion from Government irrigation district to a private irrigation district, at the same time protecting the rights of individuals and taking into consideration Government's obligations.

- . In addition to the normal regulation making powers, there is also provision for private Trusts to make their own regulations to cover local requirements, subject to ministerial approval.

- . There is a right of appeal to the proposed Environment, Resources and Development Court.

- . There is a power to grant financial assistance under certain conditions to an owner or occupier in a Government irrigation district or a private irrigation Trust.

- . There is power for a Trust to borrow money from any institution it deems appropriate.

- . The current legislation provides a number of different procedures for the charging and recovery of rates for the services provided. This legislation provides for a simple but effective means of setting and recovering charges but more importantly provides the flexibility to suit the needs of individual districts.

I am confident that this legislation will go a long way in improving the way irrigation districts are managed in the future. It will enable the important primary industries which rely on irrigation waters to manage their affairs in a businesslike manner be they Government or private.

I commend this Bill to the House.

PART 1 PRELIMINARY

Clause 1: Short title, and Clause 2: Commencement: are formal.

Clause 3: Repeal: repeals the Acts listed in schedule 1. The Bill supersedes these Acts.

Clause 4: Interpretation: defines terms used in the Bill.

PART 2 GOVERNMENT IRRIGATION DISTRICTS

Clause 5: Existing government irrigation areas: provides for the continuation of irrigation areas established under the *Irrigation Act 1930*. They are called government irrigation

districts under the Bill and will be made up of the land connected to the irrigation systems in operation under the Act of 1930. See clause 4(2) for the concept of connection of land to an irrigation or drainage system.

Clause 6: Establishment or extension of irrigation districts: provides for the establishment of new government irrigation districts and the extension of existing districts by establishing or extending irrigation systems and connecting land to the new or extended systems.

Clause 7: Inclusion in or exclusion from a district: provides for individual properties to be included in or excluded from an irrigation district. The application must be made by the owner and any long term occupier of the property. A long term occupier is a registered lessee with at least five years of the term of the lease left to run. See the definition in clause 4(1).

Clause 8: Abolition of district: enables the Minister to abolish a government irrigation district by notice in the *Gazette*.

PART 3

PRIVATE IRRIGATION DISTRICTS AND IRRIGATION TRUSTS

DIVISION 1—PRIVATE IRRIGATION DISTRICTS

Clause 9: Establishment of private irrigation district: provides for the establishment of private irrigation districts. All land owners must apply and long term occupiers are given an opportunity to object. If a long term occupier does object the property that he or she occupies must be excluded from the district.

Clause 10: Existing private irrigation areas: provides for the continuation of existing private irrigation areas as private irrigation districts under the Bill.

Clause 11: Conversion from government to private irrigation district: refers to conversion from a government irrigation district to a private irrigation district.

Clause 12: Inclusion in or exclusion from a district: provides for inclusion of a property in or exclusion of a property from a private irrigation district.

DIVISION 2—IRRIGATION TRUSTS

Clause 13: Constitution of Trust: provides that the owners of land constituting a private irrigation district are the members of a trust which is a body corporate.

Clause 14: Presiding officers of trust: makes provision for the presiding officer and deputy presiding officer of a trust.

Clause 15: Calling of meeting: provides for the calling of meetings of a trust.

Clause 16: Procedure at meetings of trust: provides for procedures at meetings.

Clause 17: Voting: provides for voting at meetings. One vote may be cast in respect of each property comprising the district. The values of the votes are determined in accordance with subclauses (6), (7), (8) and (9).

DIVISION 3—ACCOUNTS AND AUDIT

Clauses 18, 19 and 20: provide for accounts, financial statements and reports.

PART 4

CONVERSION FROM GOVERNMENT IRRIGATION DISTRICT TO PRIVATE IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Clause 21: Interpretation: is an interpretative provision.

Clause 22: Application for conversion: enables landowners in a government irrigation district to apply for conversion of the district to a private district.

Clause 23: Grant of application: provides for the notice granting an application under clause 22.

PART 5

FUNCTIONS AND POWERS OF IRRIGATION AUTHORITIES

DIVISION 1—FUNCTIONS OF AUTHORITIES

Clause 24: Functions: sets out the functions of irrigation authorities.

DIVISION 2—POWERS OF AUTHORITIES

Clause 25: Powers: sets out the powers of irrigation authorities.

Clause 26: Further powers of authorities: enables an irrigation authority to do "contract work" for property owners and enables a trust to buy in bulk on behalf of its members.

Clause 27: Irrigation and drainage outside district: provides for irrigation and drainage outside a district under agreement with the owner or occupier of land.

Clause 28: Water allocation: provides for the fixing of water allocations on a fair and equitable basis.

Clause 29: Transfer of water allocation: provides for the transfer of water allocation. They can be transferred between properties with the consent of the authority or may be transferred to the authority itself. The authority may resell the allocation to another landowner.

Clause 30: Power to restrict supply or reduce water allocation: enables an irrigation authority to restrict or stop the supply of irrigation water for the reasons set out in the clause. Action under this clause (except under subclause (1)(d)) must be on a fair and equitable basis.

Clause 31: Supply of water for other purposes: enables an irrigation authority to supply water for other purposes.

Clause 32: Drainage of other water: provides for the drainage of water other than irrigation water.

DIVISION 3—ADDITIONAL POWERS OF MINISTER

Clause 33: Establishment of boards: enables the Minister to establish advisory boards which may also exercise powers delegated by the Minister.

Clause 34: Delegation: is the Minister's power of delegation.

Clause 35: Direction of trust by Minister: enables the Minister to take action against a trust to prevent irrigation water draining onto or into land outside the trust's district.

DIVISION 4—ADDITIONAL POWERS OF TRUSTS

Clause 36: Boards of management and committees: enables a trust to establish a board of management to carry out its day-to-day operation. A trust can also establish committees for specific purposes.

Clause 37: Delegation: enables a trust to delegate its functions and powers.

Clause 38: Notice of resolution: provides that the establishment of a board of management or the delegation of functions or powers must be by resolution of which 21 days notice has been given.

Clause 39: Regulations by a trust: provides for the making of regulations by a trust. The regulations can only be made with the approval of the Minister but cannot be disallowed by Parliament (see subclause (4)).

DIVISION 5—GENERAL

Clauses 40 and 41: provide for the appointment and powers of authorized officers.

Clause 42: Hindering, etc., persons engaged in the administration of this Act: makes it an offence to hinder or obstruct a person referred to in subclause (2) in the administration of the Act.

**PART 6
LANDOWNERS**

Clause 43: Right to water: provides for a landowner's right to water.

Clause 44: Restrictions on and obligations of landowners: sets out the obligations of landowners under the Bill.

**PART 7
CHARGES FOR IRRIGATION AND DRAINAGE**

Clause 45: Charges: gives irrigation authorities the right to impose water supply and drainage charges.

Clause 46: Water supply charges: sets out the factors on which a water supply charge may be based.

Clause 47: Minimum charge: provides for the payment of a minimum charge.

Clause 48: Drainage charge: provides for declaration of a drainage charge and the basis of such a charge. A landowner may be exempted if water does not drain from his or her land into the authority's drainage system.

Clause 49: Determination of area for charging purposes: provides the degree of accuracy required when determining the area of land for charging purposes.

Clause 50: Notice of resolution for charges: requires 21 days notice of the resolution fixing the basis for water supply and drainage charges by a trust.

Clause 51: Liability for charges and interest on charges: sets out the basis for liability for charges and interest on charges.

Clause 52: Minister's approval required: requires a trust that is indebted to the Crown to obtain the Minister's approval for the declaration of charges and the fixing of interest.

Clause 53: Sale of land for non-payment of charges: provides for the sale of land to recover unpaid charges or interest on charges. The wording of this provision follows the wording of the corresponding provision in *the Local Government Act 1934*.

Clause 54: Authority may remit interest and discount charges: enables an authority to remit interest in case of hardship and discount charges to encourage early payment.

**PART 8
APPEALS**

Clause 55: Appeals: provides for appeals to the Water Resources Appeal Tribunal.

Clause 56: Decision may be suspended pending appeal: enables a decision appealed against to be suspended pending the determination of the appeal.

**PART 9
FINANCIAL PROVISIONS**

Clause 57: Financial assistance to land owners in government irrigation districts: enables the Minister to give financial assistance to an owner or occupier of land in a government irrigation area.

Clause 58: Trust's power to borrow, etc.: sets out detailed borrowing powers of trusts.

Clause 59: Financial assistance to trust: enables the Minister to grant financial assistance to a trust.

**PART 10
MISCELLANEOUS**

Clause 60: Unauthorized use of water: makes the unauthorized taking of water from an irrigation or drainage system an offence.

Clause 61: Division of irrigated property: sets out provisions relating to the division of an irrigated property. This provision does not prohibit the division of a property but provides for certain consequences if a property is divided without the authority's consent. A person dividing a property would have to comply with any relevant planning legislation.

Clause 62: False or misleading information: makes it an offence to provide any false or misleading information to an irrigation authority.

Clause 63: Protection of irrigation system, etc: makes it an offence to interfere with an irrigation or drainage system without lawful authority.

Clause 64: Protection from liability: provides for immunity from liability in certain circumstances.

Clause 65: Offences by bodies corporate: is a standard provision making the persons who run a company or other body corporate guilty of an offence if the body corporate commits an offence.

Clause 66: General defence: is the standard defence provision.

Clause 67: Proceedings for offences: provides for proceedings for offences against the Act.

Clause 68: Evidentiary provisions: is an evidentiary provision.

Clause 69: Service etc., of notices: provides for service of notices.

Clause 70: Regulations by the Governor: provides for the making of regulations.

Schedule 1 *Repeal of Acts*: repeals the Acts listed in the schedule.

Schedule 2 *Consequential Amendment of Other Acts*: amends certain Acts. The title of the *Irrigation Act 1930* is changed to the *Irrigation (Land Tenure) Act 1930*. The parts of the Act dealing with irrigation are struck out leaving the land tenure provisions as the principal provisions of the Act.

Schedule 3 *Transitional Provisions*: sets out transitional provisions.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

**TOBACCO PRODUCTS CONTROL
(MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

The Hon. M.J. EVANS (Minister of Health, Family and Community Services) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Tobacco Products Control Act 1986. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

Illness and death attributable to cigarette smoking constitute the largest man-made epidemic of our time. Smoking is recognised as the largest single preventable cause of disease and premature death in Australia. There is no known safe level of consumption of tobacco products.

It has been estimated that approximately 16% of all deaths in Australia are due to smoking (Holman et al, 1988). Translated into 1991 figures, that equates to an estimated 20,000 lives lost in Australia that year.

Doll & Peto (1981) estimated that one in four smokers would die prematurely because of smoking. A follow-up study reported in the press recently indicates that the hazards of long-term smoking are far greater than previously thought—prolonged smoking is now thought to cause the premature death of every

second smoker. And smokers are three-times as likely as non-smokers to die in middle age. Those who start to smoke in their teenage years will be at a particularly high risk of death from tobacco in later life.

At last count, there were 13 225 twelve to fifteen year olds who were smoking regularly in SA. By age 14, one in five schoolchildren are regular smokers and by age 16, the percentage equates with the adult prevalence rate (1990 SA Schoolchildren Smoking Survey Devenish Meares et al 1991).

According to the US Surgeon General's Report, 1982, a child who begins smoking aged 14 years or younger is 16 times more likely to die of lung cancer than someone who never smokes. Australian research (Hill et al, 1990) shows that early adolescence is the developmental stage at which most experimental smoking and much uptake of the practice takes place.

Thus, as Hill et al relate, it seems clear that by the time children are ready to leave school, the stage is set for the rapid acquisition of adult smoking prevalence and consumption levels. Although it is now well established that tobacco smoking is addictive (US Surgeon General, 1988), children frequently underestimate the likelihood of their continued tobacco use. (Leventhal et al 1987; Oei, et al 1990). Experimentation with cigarettes often leads to dependency, resulting in many teenagers eventually becoming long-term smokers (Russell, 1990; O'Connor, Daly, 1985).

The message is clear — our children are at risk — at risk of an early death from a cause which is completely preventable.

Strategies to reduce tobacco use must be comprehensive and long-term. The 1988 amendments to the Tobacco Products Control Act and their progressive implementation to ban tobacco advertising and sponsorship, broke the nexus between smoking and images of sophistication, social success, wealth and sporting prowess. Obviously, the full effects of that initiative will not be realised immediately.

The next stage is two-fold — to target access or availability of cigarettes to children; and to ensure that the general principle of "informed choice", which is demanded and accepted for goods and services almost universally in Australia, applies equally to tobacco products.

The sale or supply of tobacco products to children under 16 years of age is illegal. Similarly, it is an offence for an occupier of premises to allow a child to obtain tobacco products from a vending machine situated on the premises.

However, recent research in SA (Wakefield et al, 1992) shows that the legislation in fact rarely prevents children from purchasing cigarettes, either over the counter or from vending machines. For counter sales, a random sample of 98 tobacco retail outlets in metropolitan Adelaide was selected, and for vending machine sales, a random sample of 29 retail outlets was selected. Ten children, aged between 12 and 14 years, visited the premises in January 1991 with the intent to purchase cigarettes. They did so successfully over the counter at 45.6% of the retail outlets and at 100% of the vending machines. Older children had a higher purchase success, with 56.9% of attempts by 14 year olds being successful, compared with 15.4% of 12 year olds.

Clearly, action is necessary to make cigarettes less readily available to children and to make sellers aware of the seriousness of illegal sales.

The Bill therefore proposes a three level approach:

- the minimum age for sale or supply is to be increased to 18 years;

- as from 1 January 1994, vending machines are to be restricted to licensed premises under the Liquor Licensing Act;
- penalties for sale to children are to be increased five-fold, to a maximum of \$5,000; in addition, a person who is convicted of a second or subsequent offence is disqualified from applying for or holding a tobacco merchant's licence for 6 months or such longer period as the court orders.

The message is clear sale to children is simply not on.

The general principle of "informed choice" is widely accepted in Australia. The consumer's right to know has underpinned much of the legislation found on the Statute Books today. For example, ingredient labelling, nutritional information and coded additive details on packaged food; content information, directions for use and warnings on pharmaceuticals; directions for use, safety precautions and first-aid measures on household poison containers — the consumer is provided with a plethora of information on what is in it; what it does; and what effects it may have.

By contrast, the warnings on cigarette packs merely advise the consumer that "Smoking Causes Lung Cancer"; "Smoking Reduces Your Fitness"; "Smoking Damages your Lungs" and "Smoking Causes Heart Disease", with limited information being provided on tar, nicotine and carbon monoxide levels.

The 1989 US Surgeon General's report states that there are over 4,000 chemicals in tobacco smoke, including 43 carcinogens and numerous other toxins. The link between tobacco smoking, illness, disease and death is well established. The principle of informed choice must be extended to tobacco products.

The Ministerial Council on Drug Strategy established a Task Force in March 1991 to consider health warnings and content labelling. Research was commissioned on current health warnings, which have been in place since 1987. An extensive literature review was carried out and surveys were conducted. Studies concluded that, to be effective, health warnings need to be noticed, persuasive and provide guidance for appropriate action. They need to stand out from the surrounding design, be understood and personally relevant. The Ministerial Council agreed at its April 1992 meeting that all tobacco products must carry stronger health warnings and detailed health risk information to try to reduce the harm caused by smoking.

They agreed that States and Territories would introduce uniform regulations to ensure that from July 1993 all cigarette packs carry:

- health warnings printed on the "flip top", occupying at least 25% of the front of the pack;
- detailed explanations for consumers of each health warning, together with a National QUIT line telephone number, taking up the whole of the back of each pack; and,
- information - on one entire side of the pack - to help consumers more readily understand the tar, nicotine and carbon monoxide content of that brand.

Studies indicate that early adolescence is the stage at which most experimental smoking takes place. A primary target group must therefore be young people. Those contemplating giving up smoking must be the other main target group. However all smokers and potential smokers have the right to know and must be afforded the opportunity to consider, the range of health effects before they decide to smoke a cigarette.

The Bill therefore revises the head of power for labelling of tobacco products and ensures that the regulation-making powers are broad enough to accommodate the enhanced consumer information proposed in the new warnings. Western Australia is

the first State to implement the national agreement, having gazetted its Regulations in December 1992. It is proposed that SA follows suit as soon as possible after the passage of this Bill.

Turning to other matters covered by the Bill, Hon. Members will be aware that retailers of cigarettes are currently required to display a notice prominently, setting out tar, nicotine and carbon monoxide content of a range of brands. The proposed labelling regulations will require such information to appear on the side panel of packets, in relation to that particular brand of cigarettes. In order to make the requirements on small business less onerous, but at the same time, ensure that consumers who wish to compare brands are accommodated, the Bill proposes that retailers be required to produce tar, nicotine and carbon monoxide content information on demand by a customer. This will also enable the information to be more readily updated without the need to produce new display posters.

The other feature of the Bill is that it enables limits to be placed on various forms of point of sale advertising. The principal Act allows for point of sale advertising of tobacco products (i.e. inside a shop or warehouse adjacent to where tobacco products are sold; or outside a shop or warehouse, so long as the advertising relates to tobacco products generally or prices of particular products).

Members of the public have drawn instances to the Health Commission's attention which indicate that this form of advertising has been expanded beyond the spirit of the legislation. A power is inserted which will enable limits to be set on various forms of such advertising.

The Bill before Hon. Members today is part of a comprehensive strategy, consistent with the overall goal of the National Health Strategy on Tobacco - "to improve the health of all Australians by eliminating or reducing their exposure to tobacco in all its forms".

The Government is under no illusion that the legislative response, in isolation, is the solution. There has long been recognition amongst those concerned to reduce smoking that the resolution of the problem lies not in a piecemeal approach, but in the adoption of a carefully planned, comprehensive, long-term approach, encompassing education and information, legislation and cessation services.

A number of initiatives have been taken at the State and Federal level. The 1988 amendments to the Tobacco Products Control Act set the framework for a comprehensive approach in SA. The banning of advertising and sponsorship; the establishment of Foundation SA with its charter "to promote and advance sports, culture, good health and health practices and the prevention and early detection of illness and disease related to tobacco consumption"; the setting up of the SA Smoking and Health Project - QUIT - and its encouraging results to date; community involvement; the work across Government agencies, and with industries and organisations, are all important and integral parts of a comprehensive strategy.

The reduction or eradication of the health consequences of smoking in Australia will do more to promote health, prevent disease and prolong life than any other action which governments and communities could take in the foreseeable future.

The impetus must not be lost. The lives of young Australians are too important - those lives are at stake.

I commend the Bill to the House.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Bill. Clause 7 (which bans tobacco vending machines except on licensed premises) will come into operation on 1 January 1994.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 3—Interpretation

Clause 3 amends the definition of child in section 3 of the principal Act by increasing the age from 16 years to 18 years. Paragraph (b) makes a technical amendment which accommodates the intention to prescribe health warnings in two parts.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 4—Sale of tobacco products by retail

Clause 4 amends section 4 of the principal Act to cater more precisely for the promulgation by regulation of the proposed packaging and labelling requirements.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 5—Importing and packing of tobacco products

Clause 5 makes similar amendments to section 5 of the principal act which deals with the importing of tobacco products.

Clause 6: Substitution of s. 8

Clause 6 replaces section 8 of the principal Act. The new provision requires a retailer of cigarettes to provide information to a customer on request instead of requiring the information to be permanently on display.

Clause 7: Insertion of s. 10a

Clause 7 prohibits the sale of cigarettes or other tobacco products by vending machine except in licensed premises. Section 15 of the principal Act provides a general penalty of \$5 000 for contravention of a provision of the Act. This penalty will apply to a contravention of section 10a.

Clause 8: Amendment of s. 11—Sale of tobacco products to children

Clause 8 amends section 11 of the principal Act. Paragraphs (a) and (b) remove the penalty from subsections (1) and (2). The result of this is that the general penalty of \$5 000 prescribed by section 15 will apply to these offences. The expiation fees are also removed. These were inserted by Act No. 71 of 1992 which came into operation on 1 March 1993. In view of the loss of licence imposed by new subsections (5) and (6) on a second conviction, the expiation of the offences is no longer appropriate.

Clause 9: Amendment of s. 11a—Certain advertising prohibited

Clause 9 amends section 11a of the principal Act. The purpose of the amendment is to enable the distance within which advertisements are allowed and the kind of advertisement allowed under subsection (3)(c) and (d) to be prescribed by regulation. This will give certainty to the operation of these provisions.

Clause 10: Amendment of s. 16—Regulations

Clause 10 amends section 16 of the principal Act by expanding the regulation making power to cater for the new packaging and labelling requirements.

Clause 11: Insertion of schedule 3

Clause 11 inserts a transitional provision that will give retailers the opportunity to dispose of stock that has ceased to comply with the Act or regulations after amendment.

Dr ARMITAGE secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (FISHERIES) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 10 February. Page 1909.)

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): In most respects, this Bill provides increased penalties for those fishermen who do not work within the Act, and the Opposition supports it totally. The sooner this Bill moves to the Committee stage for clarification on many matters, the better. There are some matters of concern, with respect to Gulf St Vincent, that we will investigate.

With respect to the area of marine mammals and rock lobsters, it is accepted by the community that we do not want people running around killing dolphins, and those penalties should be increased. We cannot put up with people who transgress in the rock lobster fishery. It is one that has to be shared fairly and equitably amongst the fishermen, and it is correct that those penalties should increase. For those who do transgress, it is proper that there should be some method of ensuring not only that a financial penalty is paid but that there is a way of reducing the pot allocation or, in the ultimate, cancelling the licence. All those who use the licences must understand that they have to consider other people and abide by the Act.

The abalone fishermen were keen to have some amendments included. There was a select committee into that area, and this Bill allows for changes to provide that licences be not restricted to natural persons. In other words, companies can be involved in the ownership of abalone licences. There is a control in that for foreign ownership where it exceeds 15 per cent. The Director of Fisheries (as he was then) will have the power not to renew the licence where foreign ownership is found to exceed that. I think that is a reasonable amendment to the Bill and something in which the abalone fishermen do concur. Again, the fines relating to the abalone industry have been quite severely increased, and they also reflect that merely stopping someone from fishing for a period of time when they have a quota in store does not really reflect the penalty that is needed, because they can then fish for the rest of the year. So, that is dealt with in provisions within this Bill.

I have some grave misgivings about the management of the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery over the past eight or 10 years. I believe that that succeeding Ministers of Fisheries and now Primary Industries have been negligent in the way in which they have managed and controlled that fishery. In fact, we have the quite ridiculous situation now where the fishery is closed. There is a debt of some \$3.4 million, which is a buy-back debt. Ten boats are left in the fishery after buying out six boats, and the financial burden on those people will make their licences virtually worthless. There are different ways of handling that.

In effect, what this will do is make those 10 fishermen severally liable for their equal portion of the debt. From the legal advice that I have taken on this matter, it would appear that if any of the fishermen wanted to hand in their licences today (or before the assent of this Bill), they could do so and incur no penalty other than what was owed by them for their fishing licence, not including the surcharge for the buy-back. They could get out of it

by paying back only what was due. The debt of which they had absolved themselves would go onto the whole; in other words, it would remain at \$3.4 million. If two people handed in their licences, the debt would be shared by the other eight. That is quite a serious anomaly.

The other serious part of this Bill is that, when it becomes law and the fishermen are severally due for that debt, the Crown will have an opportunity to recover its debt. This aspect of the Bill contains a lot of draconian measures and will lead to ongoing antagonism between the fishermen and the department, as has existed for many years. I believe there is fault on both sides but that succeeding Ministers have not addressed the problem in the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery. There has been a select committee, but no-one has been able to say that that fishery will return to its former prominence, and no-one can guarantee that the people who are saddled with this \$3.4 million debt will be able to pay for it in future.

I conclude by saying something about integrated management. I have been one of the great supporters of handing back management to fisheries. On the whole, fishermen are very responsible people. Of course, as in any industry, there are some people who must be covered by legislation because they are not prepared to toe the line and do what responsible people are prepared to do. However, if we are to get the responsible people to come forth, the best way to do so is to make them responsible for the management of the fishery. If we give them enough responsibility to make those decisions, they will soon root out those who are not toeing the line, and they will become self-regulating and self-managing. I have always supported that; in fact, it is Liberal Party policy and we will be pushing for it in all forms of primary industry.

The current problem in the southern zone rock lobster fishery is a typical example of where the Minister is trying to hand back management but where he is not prepared to go far enough. The Minister has been to some meetings and I have been to more of them. These people down there are responsible; they want to protect their fishery, but the unilateral action taken yesterday to close the fishery in the southern zone rock lobster fishery during the month of April has probably set back integrated management by five years.

What has happened is that the management team has been dictated to by the department. What should happen is that the control and management of the fishery is given to the management group; it should then make a recommendation on what it thinks it can do to protect and manage the fishery; that can then come back to the Minister or his advisers; and the Minister either concurs in it or, through negotiation, alters it. However, what has happened and the way this integrated management has got off to a disastrous start is that blackmail has been used to make that group do certain things.

Mr Ferguson: They are strong words.

Mr D.S. BAKER: They are strong words, and strong action is needed, too. All the fishermen down there to whom I have spoken are most concerned that the size limit on crayfish is protected, and that is right and proper; that is the Minister's role. On behalf of the State, it is solely his role to make sure that that fishery is preserved. The method of preserving that fishery is the size limit on the length of the crays that can be taken.

The other method of preservation, of course, is that berried females should not be taken in certain months of the year. There is a controversy about whether or not October should be closed, but most sensible fishermen agree that, if they are to protect their fishery, it should be closed in October. What happens after that is a commercial decision of the commercial fishermen, and if they overfish that stock that is there—if they take too much out of it—that is their financial problem and their fault, because they can take it only once.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: The member can interject all he likes, but he does not understand what he is talking about.

Mr Ferguson: What about their grandchildren?

Mr D.S. BAKER: What an inane interjection: what about their grandchildren? If you people on that side of the House had thought about your grandchildren, you would have handled the finances of the State a lot better in the past 10 years, I can tell you.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr D.S. BAKER: Don't you talk to me about grandchildren.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Victoria will address his remarks through the Chair, and interjections are out of order.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Yes Mr Speaker, and I am worried about your grandchildren, too. Do not talk that nonsense to me, because to protect that fishery is a very definite guideline, and that is the problem with the over regulation in the past. The restriction on the length of the crayfish prevents people taking fish that are still growing: all the fish which have grown beyond that and which are not spawning are available for harvest. That is a very commercial decision and, as long as the department is involved in telling the commercial fishermen what they can take out of that, it does not let them make the commercial decision. If they take too much this year, their incomes will halve this year and the next year. Again, that is a commercial decision.

The blackmail quota that the department is trying to force onto the southern rock lobster zone fishermen is 1 650 tonnes. Everyone who looks at the figures will say that the 20 year average of the tonnage taken out of the fishery comes to 1 633 tonnes. Sometimes, they take a lot more—well over 20 000 tonnes are taken—but that matters not. So, the quota should be set at an acceptable level so that the fishermen then decide whether they will bring it down to protect their future; it should not be arbitrarily brought down by a dictatorship from within the Fisheries Department. That is where the Minister of Primary Industries must make sure that if he believes in the integrated management he makes those very clear pronouncements.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr D.S. BAKER: No, and they have not even been to court yet, but the State had an obligation to protect the fishery. The harvest is at the behest of the commercial operators. That is a major problem that will have to be worked through again. I understand those fishermen are very upset, and I can understand why, because there has not been consultation. I have been at the meetings; 20 per cent of those fishermen are in my electorate, and the rest are in that of the member for Mount Gambier. Those

people are seething. This nonsense about the dictatorship has been going on for five years. I have asked the fishermen quite plainly, 'Why don't you employ a marine biologist and do your own research?' and they are very happy to do that. They can then advise the Minister what the take and the recruitment should be, and whether they should close for an extra month.

Of course, these spurious figures that we get thrown up from the members of the department who say that they have done the research is a lot of hogwash. The Minister will not put the research on the table, and why is that? Because it will not stack up. That is what integrated management is all about. The fishermen are prepared to put on a biologist to work with them on the boats to manage their own fishery. What better can you do? I will ask my other questions during the Committee stage, and they mainly involve the Gulf St Vincent prawn area. With those comments, the Opposition supports the Bill.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): It has taken the best part of two years to bring in some of the management changes to the abalone industry. In October 1991, the House of Assembly select committee conducted an inquiry into the abalone industry, and it was recommended, among other things, that the issue of abalone licences not be restricted to an individual person, as with the present situation, and that provision be made for abalone licences to be issued to partnerships and companies. That was a fundamental change in the fisheries management, something which the industry had sought for a considerable time, and the select committee was persuaded that that was the way to go.

I am pleased about that because, as most of the abalone fishermen come from my electorate—or adjacent to my electorate; it just depends on how one interprets that—it is of vital importance to our area and our industry. I add my full support for the Bill and the changes it makes in the management regime, particularly within the abalone industry. I trust that it does receive a speedy passage through both Houses so that this long awaited change to the abalone industry can be put into place and the industry can rebuild and obtain some stability with family licences, and so on. I support the second reading.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I support the Bill, although I express some reservation about the massive increase in fines as they relate to penalties for the killing of marine mammals. The penalty has increased from \$1 000 to a fine not exceeding \$30 000, and in anyone's language that is a massive rise. It may be not only a fine of \$30 000 but also a term of imprisonment not exceeding two years. Recently we had some debate in this community about capital punishment, and it was very interesting to hear the views from people in the wider community. I feel as though the penalty provided here for the killing of mammals could almost make murder look like a trivial offence, because no murderer would ever receive a fine of up to \$30 000, and in many cases they do not receive a prison sentence of up to two years.

I realise that the reason for this change was obviously the public outcry, and I guess Governments have to take notice of the emotional outburst. I am not condoning the act of those persons who killed the dolphins. However,

we all realise that animals, other than mammals, are killed daily and that the community relies on their killing for part of its food chain. We need to be careful that we do not get carried away, because of the irresponsible act of a few people, and change our law so that it becomes such an incredibly tough law that could hurt an innocent person who in no way sought to transgress that law.

As it relates to the abalone industry, I was very pleased to have served on the select committee, and certainly that select committee looked into the whole industry and recognised the importance of the abalone industry to South Australia. It saw that there is potential for great growth in that industry. It certainly recognised that those stealing abalone, the unlicensed fishermen, are causing a huge amount of damage, and thankfully some moves have been made in that area, although it will never be easy to stamp that out altogether.

Also, we recognised that we wanted to keep this industry in Australian hands, hence the move for having overseas ownership limited to 15 per cent. I can only support the Minister in this amendment. To be an effective deterrent, the legislation needs to confer on the Director of Fisheries the power not to renew a licence where foreign ownership is found to exceed 15 per cent. I agree: let us be tough; let us keep this industry here. If people transgress the foreign ownership rules, then I am afraid they will lose their licence, because so many people are waiting to get into the abalone industry if they can.

I was privileged to be on the select committee inquiring into the Gulf St Vincent prawn industry. In fact, as the then shadow Minister, I was the one who sought to move for the establishment of that select committee. I must say, that you, Mr Speaker, supported the establishment of that committee, and I think I would be correct in saying that, if the Opposition did not have your vote at that time, the select committee would never have been set up. The Government should be eternally thankful to you, Mr Speaker, and to the Opposition for having established the select committee. We really did look at the St Vincent Gulf prawn industry in fine detail, and all the evidence is still available for perusal. I would suggest to people who are not familiar with that industry and who want to find out more to study that evidence, because it would still be very current and only slight modifications may have occurred.

It was not an easy decision to determine what the fishermen should continue to pay. I support the Minister's amendment that changes are needed, if the debts are to be paid as individual debts. It is only right that, if the debt cannot be paid by the existing holder of the licence, that debt will have to be transferred to anyone who wishes to buy that licence. There is a long story behind the debt. There is no doubt that, whilst there was dissension among the fishing industry as to what exactly should occur, it recognised the need to meet that debt and it will have to continue to be met in the future.

I have one major concern, and that is as a result of the two year moratorium which the committee suggested be applied to the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery and which the Government took up. There have been significant changes in the fishing of the Gulf St Vincent. The one key change is that the crabs have come back in their

hundreds of thousands, if not in terms of millions. It has been the best crab season that we have had for many years, and people along the St Vincent Gulf coastline echo that sentiment. Hand in hand with the revival of the crab industry has been the apparent revival of the snapper industry. I remember hearing in evidence given to the select committee that the snapper fed on baby crabs, and that the St Vincent Gulf prawn fishermen had depleted crab stocks to such an extent that the snapper industry was being affected as well.

Now that the crabs are back the snapper are increasing, and one wonders therefore to what extent the ecosystem was put out of joint and thrown out of kilter by the over-exploitation of the St Vincent Gulf prawn fishermen. It is something that is always difficult to prove. One can say that it is simply seasonal variation, but I believe that the indications are that the gulf was overfished by the St Vincent Gulf prawn fishermen. Therefore, I think the Government is going to have to weigh up very carefully before the end of this year just what controls should be in place when it decides to reopen the gulf to the prawn fishery. I am sure that the Minister, and undoubtedly his departmental advisers, are familiar with the findings of the select committee, but they might want to have another look at some of the evidence to make sure that we do not repeat the tragedy that affected much of the fishing industry for so many years, including of course the prawn fishery as a result of earlier mismanagement. I support the Bill.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I support the Bill. I refer in particular to Part 3 of the Bill—Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery rationalisation. I think it is fair to say that the history of this industry has been deluged with allegation and counter-allegation about the department's management or mismanagement. I refer to the allegations of overfishing, and indeed some of the allegations made by the member for Victoria have been echoed to me by constituents from my electorate. I think you would understand who I am talking about, Sir. Those people are well-known to you, Sir, and indeed to me.

I have no problem with a constituent approaching a member of Parliament to help them address a particular problem. Rightly or wrongly they have the democratic right to approach a member of Parliament to address a particular problem, as has happened over the years. I believe the former Minister of Fisheries (Hon. Brian Chatterton), the Hon. Ted Chapman, the current Deputy Premier and indeed the current Minister were all approached about this industry, its closure and the associated problems.

The setting up of a select committee, which has been referred to, occurred under difficult and controversial circumstances. Rightly or wrongly, members of Parliament have been approached by people who have a vested interest in that industry, and they quite properly have a diverse range of opinions as to how the industry should be managed. As I recall, a split developed within the ranks of this group of fishermen, and that made it very difficult for the Government to address the issues. In all my years in this place I have understood that, in the main, Ministers and the department have dealt with representative organisations more often than individuals.

Mr Lewis: That is if they are gutless.

Mr HAMILTON: I will ignore the interjection as I am trying to be serious. I am trying to convey to the House that this is a very contentious issue. If the member for Murray-Mallee had been listening, he would have heard me say that some of the allegations made by the member for Victoria have been directed to me also. I do not raise those matters lightly. I have spoken to the Minister privately and have written to him on this particular matter. His staff were good enough to approach me today on this issue and they are well aware of the nature of the person who has approached me. I pay full credit to that person who has the intestinal fortitude to stand up for what he believes in. Whether he is right or wrong is beside the point. He has a large investment in that industry and he believes that there has been mismanagement of the industry. He believes that certain people should not have been involved in the management of the industry.

My constituent feels very upset and, I think it is fair to say, angry about what has taken place. The Minister is well aware of the allegations. The question of buy-back was addressed by Professor Coates, but my constituent does not believe that the professor had any proper knowledge of what was involved. He believes that Professor Coates based his findings on what was put to him rather than on his own research. That may or may not be the case, but that is the complaint put to me by my constituent. I believe I had an obligation to raise that with the Minister, and I have done that. I have intimated to my constituent, as I do with all constituents who approach me, that at the end of the day whether I am successful or otherwise—particularly otherwise—my constituent has the right to go to any other member of Parliament in this place or the other place, or the Ombudsman. The Minister would be well aware that my constituent is not easily deterred.

Mr Speaker, I raise these matters on behalf of my constituent. Of course, he made representations to you when he was a member of your constituency. Sir, you would know, as I do, that he has a very strong belief in the industry. In fact, in many respects he believes that the industry has been mismanaged. I do not have the expertise or the intense knowledge that my constituent believes he has in that industry, so far be it for me to say to a practising fisherman—particularly in the prawn industry—that he is incompetent. I listened with a great deal of attention to what the member for Victoria said, and I find his allegations of blackmail to be very disconcerting, if they are correct, and I hope that is not the case. Nevertheless, I will listen with a great deal of attention to the response from the Minister.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): The observations I want to make are consistent with the views I have expressed about both these substantial fisheries since before I even became a member of Parliament. I used to have an interest; I do not any more. I had clients in the industry and I also had, one might say, an academic and recreational interest, both as a lobster fisherman and as a scuba diver in the area covered by both fisheries. It is important to recognise from the outset that the capacity of the natural ecosystem to yield a particular quantity of any given species of animal for harvest is a complex thing to assess. Those ecosystems are not managed or

controlled in the same way as a farm and, therefore, it is quite erroneous for people to believe that fishermen are farmers of the sea. They are not, and they never have been. That might be the romantic notion that they want to promote, as has been the case in the past in advertising, but there is no analogy there whatever. In the case of a farmer, a given area of territory is occupied and managed specifically for the species, whether it be one or more that is farmed for commercial sale. In the case of people involved as fishers of wild species, they are like hunters of wild species, the only difference being that the fluid from which they take the species is water, whereas a hunter takes from the fluid called the atmosphere.

The species in the water, like birds of the air, move through it. In some cases, where birds are farmed—and this is some analogy—they walk or move through the fluid and, in the case of farming, they do that on dry land. The kinds of input to the process of farming are different in that they are measured, and in consequence of the investment of cash in the application of those inputs a level is determined which produces profit. In farming, one avoids the excessive application of any one or more inputs to the point where profit is reduced below the margin desired as a yield on the outlay.

That is not the case in hunting or fishing, where the inputs are merely to overcome the risk of getting nothing and trying to maximise the prospect of getting something from the effort. Nothing is certain in fishing; not that it is altogether certain in farming, but at least it is more certain. Having made those observations about the nature of the enterprises and the places where they are conducted, let me turn, first, to the southern rock lobster fishery. We know that naturally we can expect to get about 1 600 to 2 000 or more tonnes of product of that species from the fishery annually.

When that species was first exploited for commercial purposes, that figure was not known, nor did we know much about the biology of the species, how it came to be there and how its stock regenerated. We now know that in no small measure and, accordingly, ought to collectively address the way in which recruitment occurs to more effectively utilise the capital that we have invested in the equipment used for the capture of the species from the area in which it is found naturally.

Therefore, I am advocating that, with a little more work as and where necessary in research into the hatching and development through the larval stages to the point of recruitment through metamorphosis to the small juveniles of the adult of the species, and with a little more money spent on that, it would enable us to remove the risk of failure or substantial failure of recruitment in any season.

Members would know, if they have read anything about the species, that at the larval stage they circulate in a great whirlpool (it is not really a whirlpool but certainly a circular current) off the Great Australian Bight and the Southern Ocean. Stormy weather at precisely the right time of the year results in the late larval stages being moved out of that circular rotation on the surface (where they occur as plankton) into continental shelf waters, with the on-shore winds, and they are carried over the area into which they then settle after metamorphosis into the juvenile form of the adult and are then rock lobsters in appearance.

From there they live on the available food naturally occurring in that ecosystem and grow to the point where they reach sexual maturity. The quaint thing is that we would only need a few kilos of fecund females to produce the berries, the eggs, which would give us all the animals we need to produce 1 600 to 2 000 tonnes a year. If we use our wit and do that research, we need not be bothered about open and closed seasons and so on. Let me make it plain that what I am trying to say is that the amount we harvest will remain the same, controlled then by the availability of food to the species in the ecosystem, but the time of the year at which we take that species from its wild ecosystem will be better determined by the weather and, therefore, we take it at a time when it is least risky and cheapest to do so. In my judgment the better way to ration access to the fishery, which should be and is managed in the public interest because recreational fishermen want access to it as well as professional fishermen, is to provide a rationing system like tags, where all animals taken have to be tagged at the time of taking.

It is crazy not to do that, because then the highest bidder for those tags in the professional fishery would get them. That means the most efficient operator, and that means the public interest, as is served by the public market place for access through the mechanism of the tag, produces the best yield in the public interest from the management of that resource in the public interest. All they have to do is to identify the microchip in each of the 10 kilo packs of commercial fish taken at sea which could be tagged. One would simply ration those microchips with a different signal for the different fisheries so that an amateur could not use professional tags and the professional could not take up amateur tags.

It is not possible at the present time to sensibly and fairly ration access to the amateur fishery by increasing the licence cost of the pots. That is not fair. But that is what the Government has chosen to do. I think that strategy is wrong. At least, in my judgment, tags ought to be available in the amateur fishery. That would mean that again the public interest was best served by people paying for their *pro rata* access to that fishery. If an inspector found a southern rock lobster on the boat or anywhere else, without a tag in it, the owner would be due for a heavy fine. It would not be long before anybody who was taking fish without tagging them would stop it. They would not risk being caught without the tags attached. If that were the case, the professional fishermen could easily and happily, I am sure, cooperate with the State in determining how best to provide access for tourists, the amateurs and themselves as professionals.

Having made those simple observations, let me also put before the House that I recognise that my suggestion is nothing new. It was not my idea originally. It is used elsewhere in the world, as it were, to control the rate of access to and exploitation of wild stock. There is no reason why we cannot do it here. For instance, it is done successfully in North America with deer. In many instances, across a large number of States where deer were commonplace previously, they had become extinct. They have now been returned to State-owned forests and reserves, and access to the animals is determined by this approach—by a tag—so that people are allowed to take a

predetermined known number of deer at a time of the year when it is appropriate to do so.

Let me refer to the prawn fishery of the Gulf St Vincent. It looked pretty clear to me as a statistician—and I told my clients at the time in the mid 1970s—that the fishery was being exploited beyond a sustainable limit. Yields on the boats were falling, although there was increased effort through technology, such as the speed with which they could trawl, the width of their trawl and the speed with which they could get to and from the grounds at hours of the day that were appropriate. Happily, all but one of my clients sold out while the market was good; they took my advice. I tried to explain all that to previous members who had been former Ministers of Fisheries in this place—the former member for Victoria, Allan Rodda, when he was Minister, and Gavin Keneally. I even attempted the same sort of explanation to the now Premier. None of them seemed to understand until it was too late. In particular, Gavin Keneally's intransigence and indifference to what I was trying to explain to him was very annoying to me. It was a pity that we did not wake up.

As a scuba diver, the other thing that annoyed me was that the Gulf St Vincent ecosystem was being destroyed; the trawls and the techniques that were being used to stir up the prawns were ripping the guts out of that ecosystem on the sandy bottom. It caused the destruction of such stock as *haliotus roeii* (small abalone), small cowries and other crustaceans in that general family which provided food for snapper, as well as such species as blue swimming crabs and so on that also lived on the animals dependent upon the vegetation on the sandy bottoms. They were being depleted, and those species in the gulf were therefore falling in numbers.

Now that the prawn fishery in the gulf has been closed for some time, many amateur fishermen have noticed significant continuing population increases in the recovery of those two species, that is, the blue swimming crabs and the snapper. If they were scuba divers and went to the bottom of the gulf and had previous experience of what the gulf was like before it was heavily dragged by the prawn trawlers, they would recognise that it is recovering somewhat to the kinds of conditions that prevailed before. But it has nowhere near recovered at this point.

In my judgment, great care now needs to be taken to identify the manner in which any prawn trawling is ever again permitted. Clearly, the extent to which the fishery was capitalised under the old licence system is way beyond the sustainable level and is not capable of being serviced by the income that can be derived from harvesting the species, and it is cloud-cuckoo-land for the Government to imagine it will ever get anything like the \$3 million-odd that it will try to recover in the buy-back scheme.

That was always nuts, in spite of the fact that some of the fishermen said they knew better than research officers of the Fisheries Department or other amateur research officers, such as people like myself who had gone down and had a look and made before and after observations just by coincidence. It was something to do from time to time. You simply cannot deny facts when you see them before your very eyes. It did not help anybody to ignore the changes which occurred. Those who have done so

simply belong to the flat earth society. The tragedy is that we did ignore what was happening and there were other things being done, too, which compounded the problem, such as the dumping of waste from sewage treatment plants and so on. These all had an adverse effect upon the seagrass meadows and therefore an adverse effect upon the balance in the food chain, altogether having an adverse effect not only on the prawns but on other fisheries as well, apart from the blue swimming crabs and the snapper.

I am therefore of the view that the Government is unwise to contemplate attempting to ever recover that money. It is simply not going to happen in the short run, and a discounted cash flow to provide a net present value of future cash payments the Government can get from that fishery leads me—if it ever allows it to be reopened for commercial exploitation by the current licence holders or their assigns—to believe that the most sensible way out of it is to cancel the licences and let access to the fishery be restricted to certain areas and tendered for on a cost per tonne yield obtained. That way the Government has some chance of getting some money back.

If the Government pretends to pursue the course of action available to it in this legislation, it is kidding itself, kidding the fishermen and kidding the people of South Australia. It ought to recognise that a rapid re-entry of the kind of effort that is available in tonnage of vessels, sophisticated equipment and so on will again reduce it to the mess we have just begun to recover from over these past three years.

I do not stand here to do anything more than put on record my own understanding of those fisheries, their biology and the statistical information and the observations which I have made of it in each respective biosphere. I do not represent a particular lobby viewpoint: in fact I wonder whether anyone else would share those views other than marine biologists and statisticians analysing their data. That does not mean that what I have had to say is necessarily irrelevant: it simply means that other people may not believe that it is politically necessary to ever face the truth.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I shall try to be concise, because the hour is late and it is time we moved into Committee. I was a member of the select committees on abalone and the Gulf St Vincent fishery that resulted in the proposition before us. I support the proposition that the Minister has put to the Parliament, and I must say that, although I cannot refer to any amendments, I would support the amendment that is on file regarding transference of the debt in Gulf St Vincent.

In a sense, I support the member for Victoria in respect of, wherever possible, allowing self-management of the fisheries by the fishermen themselves. I was convinced of this after having been a member of both select committees. However, in my view there is a responsibility that the fishers must exhibit before any State could allow them to take over their own fisheries. In the first place, they have to be able to control themselves. They must be able to produce sensible judgments and resolutions for meetings and come up with sensible management plans where the majority view will be accepted and there will be no division.

I was impressed by the abalone industry. When we travelled to Spencer Gulf and looked at that industry I noted that the people within the industry have got a good grip of the industry. They are maintaining the fishery; the fishery is not depleting. The export market that is being developed by these people is something which the State does not really recognise but which is huge. The amount of research that is going into that industry by the abalone people is something to be commended. Quite frankly, I would have no hesitation in allowing the abalone fishers to control their own industry.

I was also fairly impressed with the Spencer Gulf prawn industry people and the way in which they are prepared to contribute to research and look after their own fishery, in the way they manage themselves and their own organisation and how they conduct themselves generally. Therefore, I would like to see these fishers have an increasing say in the control of their own industry.

The Gulf St Vincent is, I am afraid, a very different story. We took hours and hours of evidence from these people and unfortunately there is dissension among them. They cannot agree amongst themselves; they cannot even elect their own representative. I would not be confident at the moment to allow these people to manage the fishery. In fact, I would not be confident in allowing them to manage the fishery in any way.

We did make recommendations—and I accepted the recommendations of that committee; in fact, I played a rather leading part in providing those recommendations—and I am happy with the results that have occurred thus far. But there is a demonstration that has to be made to the community before self management can take place. Not only is it in respect to the managerial side of the equation but also the people themselves must demonstrate that they are prepared to reinvest in their own industry so far as research and development are concerned if they are to take on a full managerial role. You cannot have, on the one hand, the State and community paying for all the research and necessary organisation in order to maintain the fishery, while some people just clear off the profits.

That is where I am at variance with the member for Victoria. Purely to give people self management of their fishery, just for the sake of it, is not, I am afraid, the way to go. Those people have to demonstrate their managerial ability and they have to be prepared to invest and put the right research in and maintain the fishery. That fishery does not belong to those fishers, Sir, and it does not belong to you and me, either: it belongs to this generation, the next generation and the generation after that. If the fishing grounds are so exploited that the people who follow us and those who follow them are no longer able to profit from what should be a renewable resource we should not in any way put power in their hands.

There has been a suggestion that the debt of the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery should be wiped off and paid for by the State. I could not agree to that; I believe that that would be irresponsible. I do not believe that the community should have to invest the millions of dollars that have been invested in this industry so that somebody may make large profits out of it and receive no return.

It is yet to be seen whether large profits are to be made out of Gulf St Vincent. It is yet to be seen when Gulf St Vincent will be open again. If and when it is, I believe that the debt that has been paid by the people of this State should be properly paid back by those people enjoying the benefits of that fishery.

The time is late, but I could have a lot more to say. I enjoyed my stint on those two committees. It does seem to be a long time ago. It seems to have taken a long time for these measures to have reached the Parliament. I have had the opportunity before, but I publicly thank all those people in the industry who took the opportunity to look after the committee and show us their hospitality, their very openness and their friendliness. I hope the results that we are bringing to them now will prove to them to be of some satisfaction.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): As the Chair of the committee that inquired into the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery, I will make a few remarks with respect to the way in which the committee's recommendations have been accepted and the way in which progress has been made over the past 15 months since that report was presented. It was brought down, from memory, in November 1991, as one of the last activities of that parliamentary year.

Some of the key recommendations over which the committee agonised for six months we thought would set what was an ailing, and some would argue a dying, fishery back on the road to recovery. We had to make a number of very hard decisions. The committee agonised over those decisions. It was not satisfied with the first run of evidence, so it called back experts to further examine them and test out a number of propositions.

One thing the committee was absolutely committed to do was to try to restore that fishery to its former glorious days when many hundreds more tonnes of product regularly came out of the gulf. The first issue was the question of how many prawns were in Gulf St Vincent. One of the hardest recommendations was to close the gulf for two years to allow a restocking of that fishery. Since that time, as I understand it from the two Ministers of Fisheries with whom I have discussed this issue since November 1991, the surveys carried out in the gulf indicate that progress is being made. We will know that once the decision is made to lift those bans and resume full-scale fishing in the gulf.

Some of the more controversial elements which were included in those recommendations, although closing the gulf for two years was a brave step, and which Government accepted was the question of debt. I welcome in this Bill and in the amendment that will canvass that issue the various provisions with respect to the debt. This is a very significant issue. Much money was advanced at the time for a buy-out. I must say that I learnt one thing from that committee: it reinforced my views about buy-outs. I do not know that it would be a good idea for the Government to buy out a pile of chemist shops now and give the rest of the chemist shops the bill for buying them. I do not know that that is the smartest of moves that has ever been made.

Since our report has been presented, other Governments in Australia have gone down exactly the same road only with a great deal more money. I think

they will find it very difficult, particularly if the stocking of the fishery is such that the total available catch is insufficient to pay off the debt and provide a reasonable livelihood.

A number of other provisions were recommended at the time which are enshrined in this legislation. I support the legislation. We are hopeful as a committee and as a Parliament that many of the issues that have, in many respects, besmirched the reputation of that fishery will be resolved as a result of this legislation and the actions that have stemmed from the recommendations that the committee made 15 months ago.

One of the great problems that the committee had concerned the people from whom it should seek information. We did not have any problems when we were dealing with the Department of Fisheries, but we certainly had a lot of trouble when we were talking to the fishers themselves. We found that from one month to the next different representatives would come along to give evidence. Further, we found that occasionally they would have a meeting and the former chairperson would have been removed and replaced by someone else. I support—and in many respects this measure allows—a level of self-development and self-management in the gulf.

The committee had a problem with organising adequate representation for the owners of the boats. I understand that the Electoral Commission has conducted a ballot to elect a representative to sit on this board; a representative of the Department of Fisheries has been chosen by the Minister, and the independent Chairman, who is well known to this House, has performed his duties without fear or favour. I know that, because both sides have complained to me about the role he has played. Suffice to say, I have a great deal of faith in the Hon. Ted Chapman's role in this exercise. I am happy to indicate that my advice was sought as to whether or not he would be the appropriate person to do the job. Not only did I recommend him without any hesitation but I understand he has done an excellent job in that area. It is a difficult area, and most members who have had anything to do with either of those committees will concede that it was pretty heavy weather in many respects.

I commend the legislation before the House. It contains many further recommendations, some of which stem from the committees I have mentioned, but because of the lateness of the hour, I think it is sufficient to say that I am pleased that this Bill has finally appeared before the House, and I hope that the Gulf St Vincent, in particular, is a fully recovered fishery and that the 10 boat-owners who will be left in that fishery will have enough money not only for their wives and families but to pay the Government the debt.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM (Minister of Primary Industries): From the outset I want to thank all members who have participated in this debate. In particular, I want to thank the member for Albert Park, the member for Henley Beach and the member for Playford for their constructive input over many years with regard to this industry. Likewise, I want to thank the Opposition because it, too, has played a most constructive role regarding the management of the fisheries and, in particular, this legislation. I am sorry that the debate has

been marred by the comments of the member for Victoria relating to the closure of the southern zone rock lobster fishery for the month of April, but I will come back to that matter.

A survey of Gulf St Vincent was taken last November, and it has been suggested that that survey has been suppressed. That is nonsense. The Chairman of the management committee, the Hon. Ted Chapman, has my complete confidence. He has supplied me with a report, and I am quite happy to make it available to members opposite if they do not currently possess one. I do not think the report has been released by the committee; however, I want to ensure that it is made available. The member for Albert Park has spoken to me about this prawn fishery, and some further surveys will be conducted during the month of April and probably later this year before the final outcome of the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery is determined.

I want to address some remarks in relation to integrated management and the decision I made yesterday with regard to the early closure of the southern zone rock lobster season. The member for Victoria used words such as 'blackmail' and 'dictatorship', but none of that is the case at all. This issue has been going on for many years, and discussions with the industry have been in process over the past two years in particular. During the 1992 winter closure, what are now South Australian Research and Development scientists undertook port visits within the southern zone to find out the present biological status of the stocks, based on scientific data. Their report recommended a total allowable catch of the order of 1 600 tonnes as being the most appropriate to sustain the long-term level of the resource. I am happy to make that report available. It is no secret; it went to all licence holders, and I am quite happy to make it available to the Opposition, through the shadow Minister.

When the member talks about blackmail and the report not being up to scratch (which is nonsense), he should realise that the Port MacDonnell Fishermen's Association did what the member for Victoria suggested and went ahead and got its own independent assessment. It has declined to release that report, but we know what is in it. That report substantiated the department's report—the SARDI scientists' report—that the most appropriate TAC for the southern zone rock lobster fishery was 1 650 tonnes. It has not released that report. If everything is open and above board, let us have responsibility with regard to the management of the fishery; let us put the report on the table. But the association has not circulated the report, and the reason why is that it does not support the wishes of a minority.

To suggest that there has been some sort of dictatorship on my part is nonsense. The discussions have been going on for some time. The member for Victoria and I were present at one of the management committee meetings at Millicent, towards the end of last year, and the argument about fixing the tonnage for the 1992-93 season at 1 650 tonnes was on the table and being discussed. Everyone agrees that it has to be fixed at

1 650 tonnes, but the methodology has to be approved. At the end of the day, I had meetings with the southern zone rock lobster management committee delegations. I did not take this decision lightly. I assessed the evidence and consulted very widely. I know the position of the

processors and everybody else, but they have all been signalled over a considerable time that the appropriate catch level for 1992-93 tonnes and 1993-94 was 1 650 tonnes.

One of the alternatives put up to me was an October closure to allow the fishery to operate until the end of the season—to the end of April. Effectively, that would have meant a total allowable catch of about 1 940 tonnes. On the advice I have received, probably only an extra 170 tonnes would have been fished, but it would have exploited the resource. If we cannot agree on the total allowable catch for the 1993-94 season of 1 650 tonnes and it comes to 1 940, and therefore argue that you will save 300 tonnes by closing in October and that it will bring it down to 1 650, that all sounds very nice but, at the end of the day you have permitted the exploitation of the resource by whatever the difference would be between 1 940 tonnes and 1 650 tonnes for the 1992-93 year.

That was what was put to me, in other words, to allow an over-exploitation of the resource in that area. As the member for Henley Beach said, this does not just belong to the fishers in the South-East: this is a multi-million dollar industry for South Australia, and it belongs not only to this generation but also to future generations. One can see the paradox: here we are on the one hand talking about the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery, which will be closed for two years because of overfishing, and the member for Victoria gets up and slates me for taking a responsible decision—one that I am required to take under section 20 of the Act—to preserve and protect the resource, which is a requirement imposed on me as Minister by this Parliament. The member for Victoria gets up (and the member for Mt Gambier: he was on the radio this morning) and says, 'Let them fish it: let them over-exploit it. We will take the risk.'

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: Yes, but it would not do the job. The honourable member could not have listened, because we looked at the October closure. It still would have over-fished the resource for this season, which was against all the scientific evidence that the catch level for this season had to be at least 1 650 tonnes and no more. That will be exceeded by the end of March. That is why I have had meetings throughout January and February in relation to this issue. Of course there has been a very vocal minority on that management committee. I think one of the members on the Government side said that they have to learn to take genuine responsibility for the management of the resource, not to go taking a point of view, saying, 'We have an independent assessment, but you are not going to see it because it supports you.' I do not think that is responsible behaviour.

At the end of the day, after hearing all the arguments and after asking them to reconvene a meeting—and I signalled an obvious position with regard to April, but I have listened to further arguments—the integrated management committee went back and voted 9 to 7 in favour of an April closure. If it had been a minority vote, and I was acting against that vote, then it would have been a setback for integrated management. However, I have supported those nine people on that management committee who are prepared to take and did take genuine responsibility against their own interests and

looked to the public good and the good of this industry for this generation, the next generation and for South Australia.

What the member for Victoria and the member for Mount Gambier have done is take the position of the minority. If anything is undermining integrated management it is the stance taken by the member for Victoria and the member for Mount Gambier, because those nine people had to take what is a very courageous step. There are five other management committees functioning and working adequately. I think one has yet to convene some meetings, but they are functioning all right. The only way integrated self-management will work properly is when people are prepared to put their personal interests second for the good of the industry, for the good of South Australia and for the good of the resource—to protect the resource—so that next season and the season after an industry is available.

However, if anyone has undermined integrated management it has been the member for Victoria and the member for Mount Gambier. Those nine people, who were prepared to accept the scientific data—the best data available—have been undermined. The member for Victoria and the member for Mount Gambier know those people will be under great pressure down in the South-East because they have actually been courageous enough to recognise the scientific data, while the member for Victoria and the member for Mount Gambier simply play parochial politics. I am disappointed. I know they will stir up all the local hostilities.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I know you will do that. It has been shown that there is a significant section of that industry that is really not ready for full self-regulation or self-management. The member for Victoria and I were both present at a meeting when the issue was raised in October/November and we heard all the arguments. Everyone on that management committee knows that the proper total allowable catch for this season was 1 650 tonnes. They all know it will be exceeded by the end of March and they all know that if there is fishing in April there will be over-exploitation of this resource. On the best evidence available to me, if I as Minister permit this to take place, this industry will collapse further down the track.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: You can say, 'Rubbish.' Yet, on the one hand we are debating a measure that has the Gulf St Vincent closed until at least December of this year. In relation to every other issue involving this industry both the member for Mount Gambier and the member for Victoria have been most responsible and constructive. But on a parochial issue like this they will ignore the scientific data and they will undermine integrated management for purely political and parochial reasons.

What we are trying to set in place is proper industry self-regulation, that is, people taking responsibility, and those nine people were prepared to stand up and be counted regarding integrated management and responsibility for the fishery. To accuse me or the department of blackmail is nonsense. We have put everything on the table. The department has been most open, most patient, the matter has evolved over two

years, and the Port MacDonnell Fishery Association which obtained the independent assessment, and which supported the department's scientific data, will not make its report available. I do not believe that can be regarded as having responsibility.

On the radio this morning the member for Mount Gambier and others who oppose the closure (and the member for Mount Gambier has egged them on) said, 'We are now going to go out and fish day and night until we take what we can.' What sort of responsible attitude is that? That is the very attitude we are fighting against with regard to integrated self-management. That is the very attitude that we are seeking to get out of the system. The proper attitude is to respect the position of the majority vote, to respect their own scientific data on independent assessment and not react in that way, because that is irresponsible and cuts across the grain of taking genuine responsibility for an industry.

At the end of the day, integrated management is a difficulty but it will survive. It will survive because the majority of people on that committee have supported it. They will be brought under great pressure. I urge the members for Victoria and Mount Gambier to stop playing parochial politics and to take a broad view of this matter, notwithstanding their own interests within their own electorates. They get up and grandstand and they play politics, but the corollary of their actions is setting back integrated management. They are undermining a very difficult decision that came out 9:7 in favour of an April closure.

I believe that I have acted most responsibly as Minister. My charter under the Act is to ensure, through proper conservation, preservation, and so on, that this industry is not endangered or over exploited. When you weigh up the risk, the risk to delay closure was completely unacceptable, because on the best scientific advice it could lead to a collapse of this fishery, and we cannot afford to have another Gulf St Vincent on our hands. There are plenty of examples in other parts of the world, in other countries, where Governments have not shown the proper strength that is required. Governments have succumbed to the convenient arguments similar to those put up by the members for Mount Gambier and Victoria. Governments in these places have succumbed to taking the easy option, and what has happened? The fisheries have collapsed.

There are dozens of examples—and the member for Victoria knows this—in other countries throughout the world where, through over exploitation, the fishery has collapsed because Governments have not shown proper resolve. In this instance, the decision evolved over two years. I am disappointed that seven people still held out for parochial reasons against the overwhelming scientific evidence. We looked at all the options, we looked at the October closure, and at the end of the day it would have resulted in continued exploitation. There was no agreement from those people who took a minority position with regard to the total allowable catch for the next season. So, at the end of the day there was no option other than to announce the closure. It was not done lightly, and it was done responsibly. No dictatorship was involved, because I went along with the majority: I supported those nine people. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 19 passed.

Clause 20—'Regulations relating to fisheries and fishery.'

Mr D.S. BAKER: Why is the Chief Executive Officer of SARDI included? Half the problem in the industry has been caused by the Director, who is now the Chief Executive Officer. That is the problem in the industry all around South Australia, and I do not believe he should be included.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: It is just going to happen, because there is no other alternative. SARDI receives all the returns and the Chief Executive Officer of SARDI is the appropriate officer. The returns go to the Director of Fisheries and Mr Lewis is the Acting Chief Executive Officer of SARDI—South Australian Research and Development Institute. He is not the Director of Fisheries at the present time: there is an Acting Director of Fisheries. When the honourable member asks, 'Who gave you advice as Minister?' for example, or 'Who proffered advice?' it must be remembered that Mr Lewis is the Acting Director of SARDI, not the Director of Fisheries.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Would it not be possible for it to go to the Minister, and then the Minister can nominate someone on his behalf, rather than going to the SARDI Director?

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: No, it just has to be, because there is simply no research arm in fisheries any longer. It has all been transferred to the South Australian Research and Development Institute, so there is not an alternative course.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Since the Chief Executive Officer of the South Australian Research and Development Institute is to have quite strong powers under this legislation, will the Minister recommend to the CEO that some research should be done into the possibility of artificially spawning the reefs of the south-east coast of South Australia and elsewhere? I ask this question, because it is one that I have raised with our *soi-disant* expert on crayfish breeding, the Director elect, and he informed me several years ago that such a thing was impracticable, that the larval stages of the *Jasus novae Hollandae* were in about nine separate stages and that it was difficult to predict where any one of those stages would be at any one time.

I find it strange that, in the United Kingdom, lobster fishing takes place around the entire coast—in the Irish Sea, towards the Shetland Islands, off the Orkney Islands, off the east and west coasts of Scotland, in Yorkshire, off the coast of Wales, off the coast of Cornwall. Wherever one goes, there are lobster pots abounding and, in some cases, there are hundreds, into the thousands, of pots on the little harbor sides. There is no closed season, there is no licensing, and the boats that go out are small. In Yorkshire they are cobbles with a Rolls-Royce engine—an open boat—and the fishery is still doing quite well.

One of the things that was pointed out to me while I was discussing this issue with George Theaker in Yorkshire, himself a lifetime fisherman, is that, around the coast of Britain, the reefs are being seeded, and there do not seem to be any problems associated with that:

they are doing it as a positive step towards maintaining the stock. I did not have time to talk to the Director of Fisheries in London while I was there: I was more busy with forests when I was with the Government officers. But I think it is something worth looking into, and I wonder whether the Director—elect will have the same mental block against the potential of lobster culture in the South-East at a time when almost every other fish product that one can think of is being considered for culture.

As to tuna fish, we are going to fish out the whole of the pilchard industry in order to feed the darn tuna. Talking about fishing an industry out, they have fished out the pilchards in the northern hemisphere. Are they going to feed the tuna with tonnes and tonnes of pilchards? From where will they come? Will we have to get carp out of the Murray River? Will they be an alternative to pilchards? It seems strange that one cannot try to seed the stock in the South-East when we are so concerned about the industry there.

Another point I would mention in passing is that I took exception to the Minister's comments when he said that he did not hear me say, 'Go and fish for all you are worth.' I said that on television and that is tonight, not this morning. This morning it was Mr Gribble who said that and I thought, 'My, what a good idea.' What I did do was to discourage the South-East fishermen from coming up to Adelaide to hold a big demonstration on the steps of Parliament House. I said, 'Think of your own livelihoods and fish as hard as you can during March.' That was the advice I gave, but the Minister did not hear me say that.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I am glad that I have been able to accurately predict what was on the honourable member's mind. The earlier suggestion is the most constructive one by the honourable member. The latter suggestion is not. It is a destructive suggestion to encourage people to go out and over exploit an industry. The honourable member should reflect on the path he is going down with that suggestion, but the earlier suggestion is a matter that probably should be put to the integrated management committee. The honourable member can either do that himself, or I will ensure that it is put before that committee. Anything relevant to research can be properly undertaken and considered by the committee.

Clause passed.

Clause 21 passed.

Clause 22—'Suspension or cancellation of authorities by courts.'

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I move:

Page 7—

After line 9—Insert new paragraphs as follows:

- (aaa) by inserting 'or convicts the registered master of a boat registered by endorsement of the licence of an offence against section 69(4)' in subsection (2) after 'prescribed offence';
- (aa) by inserting 'or convicts the registered master of a boat registered by endorsement of the licence of an offence against section 69(4)' in subsection (3) after 'prescribed offence' first occurring;

Line 14—Leave out paragraph (b) and substitute the following paragraphs:

- (b) by striking out from subsection (4)(b) 'or a previous holder of the licence' and substituting 'a previous holder of the licence or a registered master, or previously registered master, of a boat registered by endorsement of the licence';
- (c) by inserting '14a,' in subsection (10)(a) after '41,';
- (d) by striking out 'or' between paragraphs (a) and (b) of subsection (10) and inserting after paragraph (b) the following word and paragraph;
 - or
 - (c) an offence against section 69(4).

This is a tidying up provision that came to light in going through the Bill. It is an evidentiary provision which I explained to the honourable member. It has not been properly discussed with the industry but, between the time that we pass the Bill in this Chamber and it goes to another place, I will make sure it is circulated, but I do not anticipate any problems.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 23 passed.

New clause 23a—'Offences committed by bodies corporate or agents or involving registered boats.'

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I move:

Page 7, after line 27—Insert new clause as follows:

23a. Section 69 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after subsection (3) the following subsection:

- (4) Without limiting the effect of this section—
 - (a) Where—
 - (i) the registered master of a registered boat is not the registered owner;
 - and
 - (ii) the registered master, while on the boat, does an act that constitutes an offence against this Act or that would, if done by the registered owner, constitute an offence against this Act, the registered owner is guilty of an offence and liable to the same penalty as is prescribed for the principal offence or to the penalty to which the registered owner would be liable if the act, if done by him or her, constituted an offence against this Act;
 - (b) where a person other than the registered master or the registered owner of a registered boat, while on the boat, does an act that constitutes an offence against this Act or that would, if done by the registered owner, constitute an offence against this Act—
 - (i) the registered owner is guilty of an offence and liable to the same penalty as is prescribed for the principal offence or to the penalty to which the registered owner would be liable if the act, if done by him or her, constituted an offence against this Act;
 - or
 - (ii) if the registered owner is not the registered master, the registered owner and the registered master are each guilty of an offence and liable to the same penalty as is prescribed for the principal offence or to the penalty to which the registered owner would be liable if the act, if done by him or her, constituted an offence against this Act.

This new clause follows from the previous amendment.

New clause inserted.

Clauses 24 and 25 passed.

Clause 26—'Charges on licences.'

Mr D.S. BAKER: If one or more of the licence holders in the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishery handed in his licence before this amendment is assented to, the total

debt of \$3.4 million would then be spread over the remaining fishermen and could increase their debt dramatically. That example shows what a great hole there is in the Act and how, if fishermen decided that the fishery was not going to recover, their way out of the industry would leave the Government and other fishermen in an untenable position.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: That is one of the reasons for the correction of the anomaly. If people did hand in their licences, one option would be to put the licences out for auction and I am sure that they would bring a significant amount. There are a number of options, but the honourable member has identified correctly the anomaly which presently exists and which has to be rectified.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I gather that if they were 'handed in you would divide the debt by the number of people left. If you put those licences up for auction, would those licences then be free of debt?

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: No, that is the exact problem, because the remaining licence holders would pick up the whole debt, which 'is quite unjust and untenable.

Mr D.S. BAKER: So, if all the Gulf St Vincent prawn fishermen decided to hand in their licences tomorrow, the Government is left with a debt of \$3.4 million. That closes the matter and I guess anyone they let back in they can let back in on terms and conditions that the fishermen will accept.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: That is exactly right. The debt would fall to the Minister, because the Minister is the one who signed the agreements with SAFA, and it would be a most unjust and untenable position. The only alternative to the Government in that situation, if these people opted out of the industry, would be to put the licences out for auction, which obviously would be a viable proposition.

Mr D. S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: Exactly. That is quite a risk, and that is not really the intention of the previous agreements.

Mr S.G. EVANS: Is the Minister saying that the licence reissued would not necessarily have to pick up in the purchase price the full debt that was owing as a proportion of the \$3.4 million?

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: It just depends. It is only an option. I do not expect anyone to do that because it is still a very valuable asset and, of course, they would have great difficulty getting back into the industry again. You have to remember that a very substantial capital sum is attached to these licences. But the member for Victoria has properly identified the problem and the anomaly that, if people actually surrender their licence, there is not any current provision for that debt to be picked up. If a few went out, the remaining licence holders must absorb the debt, which would be most unjust and unfair. There are 10 of them all told. If everyone opted out, the only recourse for the Government would be to put the licences up for auction and go for the best price.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (27 and 28) passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**PUBLIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
(REVIEW) AMENDMENT BILL**

upon its amendment No. 3 to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

**PUBLIC FINANCE AND AUDIT
(MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist

ADJOURNMENT

At 6 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 9 March at 2 p.m.