

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 18 August 1993

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

TAXATION, WINE SALES

The **Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Premier)**: I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. LYNN ARNOLD**: I wish to advise the House of the action that this Government will be taking in response to the Federal Government's decision to increase the sales tax on wine in last night's budget. Last week I wrote to the Federal Treasurer—

Members interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. Leave has been granted by this House for the Premier to make a statement, and that leave will be upheld. The Premier.

The **Hon. LYNN ARNOLD**: Last week I wrote to the Federal Treasurer urging him to consider carefully the impact that any proposed increased tax on wine would have on the South Australian industry.

Members interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order!

The **Hon. LYNN ARNOLD**: While the Government is pleased that the Federal Government has moderated its position and not imposed an alcohol excise on wine, the increase in the sales tax has come as a great disappointment. As members will be well aware, the Federal Government last night increased the sales tax on wine from 20 per cent to 31 per cent. This increase would take \$70 million out of the industry in 1993-94, \$95 million in 1994-95 and over \$100 million in out years.

This rise will hit the South Australian wine industry particularly hard. South Australia produces approximately 60 per cent of the total wine output in Australia. While exports are increasing rapidly, 75 per cent of all wine produced is consumed in the domestic market. As members would be aware, the wine industry is aiming to achieve \$1 billion worth of wine exports by the year 2000.

This will require an estimated \$1.2 billion of new investment in vineyard and winery expansion. The tax announced yesterday by the Federal Government will severely undermine future investment decisions and I am sure that all members in this House join with me in opposing such an increase. It is estimated that the increased tax will mean that the price of a \$5 bottle of wine will now rise to about \$5.50 and a \$10 bottle to about \$11.

The wine industry could choose to absorb this tax as it did with the 10 per cent tax which was first imposed in 1984. However, to absorb the tax increase would cost the industry \$380 million over four years. That is \$380 million of investment that the industry could otherwise be making. Instead of helping the wine industry to invest in new capital and to cope with export demand the Federal Government has dealt the South Australian industry a savage blow.

My Government will immediately reconvene the Wine Industry Forum in South Australia. This forum was first established in response to the introduction in 1984 of a 10 per cent sales tax on wine by the Federal Government. It is a consultative group chaired by the Premier, including growers,

producers and wine association representatives. The Wine Industry Forum proved to be a successful vehicle in which the State Government could work and consult with the industry in opposing the tax increases which occurred in the 1980s and the forum has since done much work in promoting and assisting the wine industry in South Australia. The South Australian Government has actively worked with the wine industry in the past and will continue to do so in the future to ensure its continued success and growth.

I remind members that in 1992 the State Government provided \$1.5 million to the Australian Wine Export Council to help the South Australian wine industry establish new export markets. Today, I will be writing to all members of the Wine Industry Forum and asking them to consider joining with the State Government in preparing a detailed submission on the impact of this new tax—

Members interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The Premier.

The **Hon. LYNN ARNOLD**: —on their industry and on South Australia in particular. Following the completion of this submission the State Government will then meet with the industry to consider the need to provide further assistance in response to the Federal Government's tax increases. Once an analysis of the Federal Government's tax increases has been prepared I will then be available to lead a delegation to Canberra to present our case to the Prime Minister and Treasurer.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr **McKEE (Gilles)**: I bring up the fourth report 1993 of the committee and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

FEDERAL BUDGET

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

That this House—

—deplores the decisions in last night's budget which broke the Federal Government's election promises that there would be no increases in tax, no new taxes, no increases in the tax burden and two rounds of income tax cuts; and in particular—

—opposes the savage increases of up to 10¢ a litre in petrol taxes imposed by the Federal Government, because they will unfairly discriminate against low income earners, the unemployed and regional and rural communities;

—opposes the immediate 55 per cent increase in the rate of the wine sales tax because it will unfairly discriminate against one of South Australia's most successful industries and jeopardise jobs, livelihoods and investments, particularly in the wine and grape growing regions of South Australia.

—and calls on the Premier to communicate this motion and the outrage of South Australians that their State is being discriminated against in the Federal budget forthwith to the Prime Minister and the Federal Treasurer.

I move this motion as a result of the budget brought down last night by the Federal Labor Government. That budget quite clearly—

Members interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order!

The **Hon. DEAN BROWN**: South Australians are outraged by that budget because it quite clearly is devastating on South Australians, particularly the unemployed, those on low incomes, the retired, and those who work in particular South Australian industries. The budget discriminates against

South Australia because it picks on a particular industry in which South Australia dominates—the wine industry.

The budget imposes a very cruel impost on the rural communities of South Australia through its increase of up to 10 cents a litre in fuel tax on unleaded fuel, knowing full well that that will hit rural communities in particular. It will also hit many other people in South Australia, particularly those in the southern suburbs of Adelaide, who just do not have a public transport system to get into Adelaide.

The budget also lifts the sales tax on motor cars to impose an additional tax of between \$180 and \$200 per vehicle at a time when the motor industry is just coming out of the most depressed situation it has been in for at least 30 years; an industry that is about to make some very significant investment decisions in South Australia—at Mitsubishi and General Motors-Holden's. You could not choose a worse period to impose an additional sales tax on the motor industry. It comes right on the eve of crucial investment decisions being made, not here in South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN:—but in Tokyo, Melbourne and in other areas.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Well, it is interesting because the Minister, who should be out there protecting the interests of the wine industry of South Australia, the very man who should be out there fighting for it, is obviously now agreeing with what has been brought down in the Federal budget.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: There is the man who should be protecting the wine industry and who appears now to be out there supporting his Federal cohorts.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Last night's Federal budget will clearly increase unemployment in South Australia at a time when this State has record high unemployment. The last thing we want is further damage to that employment situation. Finally, last night's budget will severely damage any recovery in the South Australian economy, and no one can dispute that fact. Mr Keating, as Prime Minister, has betrayed South Australians. He has betrayed them because only months ago, just before a Federal election, he made certain promises, including no increase in taxation; no increase in tax burden; and very significant tax cuts in a two stage process.

Our own Premier has betrayed South Australians because he turned around and formally endorsed the breach of those election promises by the Prime Minister. Here we have our own Premier who, after the Federal election, when the promises were clearly going to be breached by the Federal Government, came out on 3 July and endorsed the breaching of those election promises. I refer to an article in the *Advertiser* headed 'Abandon tax cuts—Arnold', as follows:

The Premier, Mr Arnold, has called on the Federal Government to break its key election promise of delivering income tax cuts rather than slash funding to the States.

Clearly, we have a Premier who is prepared to sacrifice even the honour of election promises to save the neck of his Federal colleagues. He always puts the Federal Labor Party ahead of South Australia. No longer can this State put up with a Government that has a Leader with those intentions. It is quite clear that the Federal Labor Government has decided to cut the South Australian Labor Government, and Mr

Arnold in particular as Premier of this State, off at the knees. It has abandoned Labor South Australia and our Government—it has absolutely dumped them—because it realises they are a liability to the Labor Party; but in doing so, and because of the performance of this Government over the past 11 years, South Australians will now suffer, and suffer dearly. Of all the States in Australia that have been discriminated against through this Federal budget, South Australia gets hit the hardest. Why South Australia? Because we have a Premier who does not have the fortitude to argue his case adequately in Canberra. Let us look at the record of our Premier in dealing with Canberra, particularly Mr Keating.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is out of order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Prior to the Federal election, we found our Premier was constantly on his feet advocating that people should vote for Mr Keating and the Federal Labor Government. He embraced them fully. He urged South Australians to vote for the Federal Labor Party, for the very Government that has now brought this budget upon the heads of South Australians. He went further than that. Also before the Federal election he embraced Mr Keating when he wanted to impose world heritage listing on about a quarter of South Australia. He joined, without question, a study to look at world heritage listing for a quarter of this State.

After the Federal election campaign came the issue of Mabo. We found that we had a Premier who was prepared to clutch to the coat-tails of Keating regardless of what Keating said on Mabo and regardless of its impact on South Australia. I point out that our Premier is still clutching the coat-tails of Keating on this particular issue.

Shortly after that, in July, when it became obvious that the Federal Government was going to have to breach its election promises in terms of tax cuts, what did our Premier do? He came right out up front and said that the Prime Minister should breach that fundamental election promise—the most important election promise made by the Labor Party before the Federal election. It was put down in law: L-A-W. We have a Premier who has so little regard and so little integrity for what a Prime Minister should say before a Federal election that he urged that Prime Minister to break his fundamental and key election promise.

Of course, just prior to this Federal budget, we had a Premier who knew that an additional wine tax would be imposed, who knew that additional sales tax would be imposed on the car industry and who knew that whatever was proceeded with in the budget would adversely affect South Australia. We raised it in this Parliament only last week. We asked him to go to Canberra, to take on the Federal Government, and to fight for South Australia. Although our Premier knew that that was going to cost South Australia literally millions and millions of dollars, what did he do? He sent a 45¢ letter to the Prime Minister and said, 'Tut, tut, don't do it.' That is the sort of Premier that we have—a man who is prepared to commit a mere 45¢ when literally hundreds of millions of dollars are at stake in South Australia in our wine industry alone, let alone in the car industry.

That is why in the budget last night both Dawkins and Keating had no qualms about proceeding with what was going to hit this State very badly. They knew they had an absolute wimp in South Australia leading the Labor Party, and this State suffers. Here we have the Neville Chamberlain of South Australian politics—the man who is prepared to sell our State no matter what—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is out of order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Let us consider what the Premier had to say last night when he was asked about the wine tax. He said:

I'm certainly very concerned that the wine tax has been increased, but I want to make this point that the Federal Government—

and I would like all members to listen to this—

has obviously listened to the representations that we made.

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader will resume his seat. There is a point of order by the member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMING: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I draw your attention to Standing Order 104 (page 25 of the House of Assembly Standing Orders) regarding rules of debate, which states:

Members to address the Speaker standing.

A member who wishes to speak—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order before the Chair.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is out of order and the member for Morphett is out of order.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMING: I will not repeat it, Mr Speaker: I will just read the Standing Order, which provides:

A member who wishes to speak rises in his/her place and addresses the Speaker.

Most of the time, the Leader is addressing the television cameras.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. I uphold the point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! All remarks in the Chamber should be directed through the Chair. It would remove any debate, interjection and arguments across the Chamber if all remarks were directed through the Chair. I would ask the Leader to do so.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I will certainly do so. I was pointing out to the House that last night when the Premier was specifically asked about the wine tax, he had this to say—and I would suggest that the honourable member opposite should listen to what the Premier had to say; this is his Leader and he said the following:

I'm certainly very concerned that the wine tax has been increased, but I want to make this point that the Federal Government has obviously listened to the representations that we made.

We get a 55 per cent increase in the sales tax imposed on wine and the Premier has the hide to come out and say that 'the Federal Government has obviously listened to our representations'. I wonder what the Premier actually said to Mr Keating or to Mr Dawkins and whether they listened to what he said. Perhaps the Premier, when he gets to his feet, will be willing to tell us exactly what sort of case he put to the Federal Government. Why does he now seek praise for the fact that the Federal Government obviously listened to what he had to say and adhered to it? I find that an appalling statement. If ever there was proof that our Premier and the Labor Party have sold South Australia and particularly the wine industry down the drain, it is what the Premier said last night.

Finally, in terms of where our Premier stands, to rub salt into the wound, we have a Premier who has actually invited the Federal Treasurer to come to Adelaide on Friday, to join him and to boastfully tell the South Australian public about

his Federal budget and what it is going to do to South Australia. I have here an invitation from the Premier called 'The Premier's Business Forum' and it indicates quite clearly that our Premier, Mr Arnold, has invited the Federal Treasurer, Mr John Dawkins MP, to come to Adelaide on Friday to stand with him, to rub shoulders with him and to talk about the impact of this Federal budget on South Australia. I find it absolutely astounding that we have a Premier who is prepared to embrace the Federal Treasurer and apparently endorse everything that is in that budget, who is even prepared to stand on the same platform and welcome him to Adelaide.

An honourable member: It is probably a BYO lunch.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Well, they are charging \$50 for lunch—and that is very expensive—but that \$50 lunch includes beverages, and obviously they took into account the likely rise in the price of wine before they even sent out the invitation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Let me turn to the specifics of the impact on South Australia of both the petrol tax and the wine tax rise. In South Australia 250 000 motor vehicles rely on unleaded petrol. Those who have those older vehicles—the people on low incomes, the unemployed, the retired, including the pensioners and those retired on fixed retired incomes—are the people who are about to be hit with a double whammy.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, apart from my being in disagreement with the view being put by the Leader at the moment, I think he is anticipating debate on Notice of Motion No. 12 for this afternoon.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair cannot read the motion while he is looking at the House. Looking at it very quickly, it would seem to the Chair that the Leader certainly would not be able to enter into a full debate on the issues raised in the motion listed on the Notice Paper. However, I think passing references may be in order, and I would ask the Leader to be careful in his reference to the matter before the House and take note of Notice of Motion No. 12 on the Notice Paper, which is related to leaded petrol and taxes, and the use thereof.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Sir, but I point out also, if I may, that the motion I moved in the House today specifically refers to the increase in fuel tax and, of course, the fuel tax on leaded petrol goes up by 10¢ a litre. That affects the 250 000 vehicles that rely on leaded petrol here in South Australia. As I was pointing out to the House, that will have a double whammy effect on people. First, it means that those who can least afford it will now have to pay, when it comes through fully, up to 10¢ a litre extra for their petrol but of course, at the same time, those people who have the older cars, the pre-1986 cars, will find that the capital value of those cars has depreciated rather substantially as from today.

That has occurred because people who would be potential buyers of those leaded petrol engine vehicles will realise that from now until eternity, until the vehicle wears out, they will need to pay up to 10¢ a litre extra. It also particularly hits the rural areas of South Australia, and it is those areas that can least afford that, particularly at this time of rural crisis. We have some figures from a service station out in the country that suggest that the ratio of leaded to unleaded petrol sold is approximately 50/50.

In particular, it is the women in rural areas who invariably are driving an older family car to pick up the kids from school, to go shopping, and so on, and who can least afford the 10¢ a litre extra that they will have to pay for petrol. It also affects business in general and will have an inflationary effect across the entire State. But it will even hit the various charity organisations and those doing voluntary work. Figures this morning have shown that the Royal District Nursing Society could be paying up to an extra \$23 000 a year for its petrol, and that Meals on Wheels in South Australia could be paying up to an extra \$18 000 for its petrol.

Of course, this extra fuel tax comes on top of what our State Labor Government has already imposed as the highest petrol taxes in Australia when it comes to its own State taxation.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: The lowest in the country.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The highest petrol taxes of any State in Australia. In Adelaide motorists are paying 8.9¢ a litre in petrol tax; in Western Australia, 5.67¢ a litre; in Queensland they are paying nothing as a State tax on fuel. How is that the lowest? The fact is that South Australia has the highest petrol tax—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: In the metropolitan area.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: And our Treasurer knows it. We have the highest petrol tax of any State of Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader will resume his seat. The Chair has warned members before about this wall of sound that develops. I cannot ascertain who particularly is causing the trouble, but somebody will pay the price if it continues.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I now turn to the wine tax and the wine industry, and let us look at the Labor Party's record on this industry. In 1983 the Federal Labor Party made a promise: it pledged not to impose a sales tax or excise tax on wine, but what did it do? In 1984 it imposed a 10 per cent sales tax. In 1986 it increased that 10 per cent sales tax to 20 per cent, and then last night it increased that sales tax from 20 to 31 per cent—a 55 per cent increase in sales tax with another 1 per cent to come later.

Mr Olsen: All under Labor.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: All under Labor; all under another broken Federal Labor Party promise. Who could ever trust the Labor Party with one of its election promises? In 1987-88 domestic wine sales throughout the whole of Australia totalled 330 million litres, and by 1990-91 that had actually dropped to 300 million litres. It was already dropping because of the sales tax imposed by the Federal Labor Government. What will occur now? We all know it will drop very substantially, helped by the fact that this Government has done nothing whatsoever to protect the wine industry. The small and medium sized wineries, which are now entirely dependent on the domestic market, are already struggling. They are not involved in the export markets, because they are not big enough; they will suffer and they will be sent to the wall, as we know.

The most the Premier can do is talk about setting up his 'talkfest' by re-establishing the wine forum and offering to go off and talk to Canberra. Why did he not go to Canberra three weeks or three months ago? Why has he not been out there previously as Premier of this State protecting our wine industry? Because the Premier is a fool. The Premier is a fool in trusting the Federal Labor Government with any of its election promises. Because he is a fool, and because he does not now know where to turn in terms of the Federal Labor

Government and Labor promises, this State has suffered and will continue to suffer. South Australians have no confidence whatsoever in this Labor Government, and quite rightly so. They have no confidence whatsoever in Labor, particularly after what the Labor Party did to them last night.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have spoken to the Minister three times, and I will not speak to him again.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On behalf of South Australians, I move this motion so that the Premier, although it is too late now, can at least go to Mr Keating, Mr Dawkins and his other Federal Labor colleagues and tell them about the enormous devastation that their Federal budget will have on this State and the anger and anguish that now exist in this State from the Federal budget and the impost it is having particularly on the unemployed, low income groups and others who can least afford the increased taxes that have been imposed on all of us.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Premier): The Leader of the Opposition believes that he can embarrass this Government by saying that we are not prepared to criticise a Labor Government in Canberra. He is wrong. He is wrong because of the very fact that I was the first person on the steps of Parliament House last evening standing up for South Australia and attacking parts of the Federal Budget that I do not agree with.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Let me remind the Leader—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Bragg. The member for Bragg is well aware of what the Chair has said.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Let me remind the Leader of what I actually said last night (and it was printed in my press statement): I was shocked and appalled by the Federal Government's decision to increase the petrol tax. I also criticised very strongly the wine industry tax, and I will make some more comments about that in just a few moments. But let this House and the people of South Australia be in no doubt about this Government's position on the Federal budget. I disagree in the strongest possible terms with a number of the measures contained in that document. I am disappointed and I am angry, and I have made those comments about the impact of taxation on South Australia on a number of occasions and in a number of forums. I strongly disagree with the decision to slug motorists with the petrol tax increases. I do not believe it can be justified and have no hesitation in telling the Prime Minister so. I am also angry with the decision to hit very hard one of the State's most successful industries, the wine industry.

In the wake of the Federal budget, I will continue (and that is the operative word) to stand up to the Federal Government—or anybody else, for that matter—for the people and industries of this State. My Government and I will not simply sit back and meekly accept what has been delivered in the budget last night. I have already outlined today what we intend to do in the first instance with respect to the wine industry, following last night's budget. This is in stark contrast to the Opposition, which simply sits back, whinges, criticises and proposes no alternative, no action, no policies for South Australia—no decisions at all. Let the Leader be in

no doubt: the situation for South Australia in the Federal budget could have been worse, much worse.

In the lead-up to the budget I went in to bat for South Australia on a number of occasions. My speech to the Special Premiers Conference in Canberra detailed the views that we expressed on the tax situation in this country, and I was quite prepared to stand up publicly and say that I felt there should be a deferral of the tax cuts rather than bringing them in at this stage, when I did not think it was in the best interests of our economy. I said publicly at that time, and I am on record in media interviews and the like as having said, that I did not believe bringing forward those taxes or leaving them as they were originally scheduled in the law of this country was the right thing to do at this stage, because it would open the possibility of other taxes being put in place that would not be of benefit to this economy, especially at this time of a tender recovery from a recession that hit Australia so very hard.

The rumours were around in the past couple of weeks or so about the tax on the automotive industry, and indeed I was asked a question in this place about the automotive and wine industry taxes. I remind members that the rumour was about a \$1 000-plus tax on the average family car. I acknowledged the point at the time that that would have been seriously damaging to the automotive industry in this State; I strongly opposed the \$1 000-plus tax, which was apparently what was being talked about prior to last night. Certainly, the 1 per cent increase in this budget in the sales tax on cars is not supported by me. It is certainly a lot less than it otherwise might have been, and I believe the stand made by my Government and my Ministers on matters such as this has been heard and has had an effect.

I can make a number of comments about the budget, and indeed will do so in a few moments, but I want to make this point. I am there criticising what should be criticised; I am there attacking the decisions that should be attacked, but I am also prepared to acknowledge that there have been other things in the Federal budget which do deserve some credit. When asked last night whether he saw any good points in the Federal budget, the Leader answered, 'None, absolutely none.' He was not prepared to acknowledge that anywhere there was anything of any benefit in that budget. He was not prepared to acknowledge the money that has been given for the export programs (\$94 million), the reduction in the rate of company tax, the extra number of South Australians who will benefit by the pension assets test changes, the extra money in labour market training programs, the child-care moneys that have been put in the budget and the allowances that are associated with that; apparently, none of that is of any benefit to South Australia.

That begs the question whether the Leader would rather not have seen any of those points. He would rather have seen all those points deleted from the Federal budget, and those tens of thousands of South Australians who will benefit from those points should not have benefited; that was the message we were getting from the Leader. It was interesting to note in his speech just now that he chose not to refer to any other part of the budget at all. His silence was noted, except for these two areas of the budget—the petrol tax and wine industry area—with the odd oblique reference to the automotive industry in this State. The rest of it was a total silence by the Leader on the Federal budget. I hope that that is corrected as the other members on the Opposition front bench start speaking about the Federal budget and that they do make comments on the other issues that were dealt with in that document.

What I ask is a fair assessment, because a fair assessment of the budget will be better heard than an unfair one; a fair assessment that says, 'Yes we will give credit where it is due, and some credit is due, but at the same time we will speak out strongly against those things that cannot be supported—the petrol industry slug and the wine industry tax impost being among them.'

The Leader attacked me for activities that I may have undertaken with respect to the Federal budget. He attacked me with respect to the Federal budget and with respect to the representations I made to the Federal Treasurer a few weeks ago. He made no reference, of course, to the work I was doing in previous meetings, the Council of Australian Government and the Special Premiers Conference, and other representations to the Federal Government, notwithstanding that his own Deputy Leader acknowledges that the deal we got out of the Commonwealth on the State Bank was a very good deal indeed.

Since he made so many references to my comments and actions before the last Federal election, I want to draw attention to the Leader's own actions and comments before that election. What would have happened, had he been successful in his representations to have John Hewson become the Prime Minister of this country? That is what he wanted, and he was happy to stand up and do that. The Leader of the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Kavel, the Leader and the members for Heysen and Coles are out of order. The Premier.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Leader made a number of tactical errors in his speech. He had a lot of difficulty getting through the speech, I might say, and got himself tongue-tied on various things. I noticed on more than one occasion he was criticising the impost on unleaded petrol; I think he meant to say that he was criticising the impost on leaded petrol, and there were a few other *faux pas* as he went through. One of the tactical mistakes he made was to bring in the ghost of Neville Chamberlain. Do you remember before the last Federal election, Mr Speaker, there was that meeting on the eastern seaboard at which Liberal leaders, be they Premiers or Leaders of the Opposition, had this great conference with John Hewson on the payroll tax deal that apparently was going to—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Don't shake your head, you were there. You didn't get seen on too many TV shots, but you were there. The Leader flew across to the Eastern States to have this meeting with the Federal Leader, and he brought back the piece of paper that he had signed. He waved it here in this Parliament, that same document that at least Stockdale in Victoria had the guts to criticise; that same document which Stockdale recognised was not in the interests of the States and, as we pointed out very clearly in this State at the time, which was not in the interests of this State. If ever there was a Neville Chamberlain act it was that, coming back to South Australia and making those very strong representations, apparently having defended industry in this State when in fact he was selling it out.

We then look at other issues. Members may recall one of these rallies John Hewson was having on the steps of Parliament House at the time to try to stir up a feeling of support. There he was photographed behind—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. The member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Sir, I do not recall anything about this matter in the Leader's motion, and I ask you to rule on the relevance of the Premier's remarks.

The SPEAKER: I suggest that the honourable member listen to the contributions from his own side. If the House wishes the Chair to confine the debate exactly to the points on the Notice Paper, it will do so, but it will be a very limited debate. I point out to the honourable member that his own Leader was allowed considerable leeway in the debate, and that privilege will be extended to all members in this debate unless the House decides otherwise. The Premier.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In my remarks I am responding to the comments of the Leader about my actions before the last Federal election, and I am talking about his actions before the last Federal election. We had a photograph of John Hewson being mobbed by Liberal supporters on the steps of Parliament House and there, with a Cheshire cat grin on his face, was the Leader of the Opposition behind him saying, with that grin on his face that was soon wiped away, that he supported what John Hewson wanted to do to this State, that he supported the GST, and that he supported the abolition of horizontal fiscal equalisation, that awkward and horrible sounding phrase that is worth \$380 million a year to the people of South Australia. The Leader of the Opposition did not care about that.

The Leader did not care about wanting to sell us out on that, and he was happy to stand up and support that kind of policy. It was not a policy that I was prepared to support and I actively opposed it. Even though some years ago the Prime Minister seemed to have somewhat two minds on the issue of horizontal fiscal equalisation, I was pleased to see that it was in South Australia that we got him steeled up to argue against any change to that policy. It was in South Australia where his commitment to maintaining the policy first appeared. It was here in South Australia and I am glad, because it is States like South Australia that really feel the benefit of that policy. It needs to be noted that, in the allocations with respect to State Governments, that was honoured at the special Premiers Conference and it was honoured in the figures last night, notwithstanding that the Leader has made all sorts of claims about money being stolen from South Australia.

Last night the Leader stood on the steps at the front of this building and said, amongst other things, 'Mr Keating has stolen \$35 million out of our State Bank rescue package. We were due to get \$150 million this year for that rescue package. We have effectively had that cut by \$35 million.' He was then asked about that—and rightly so—and gave the most amazing answer anyone has ever heard, an answer that no-one could understand. So uncertain was his performance that after he had gone back upstairs his press people, alarmed by what they heard in that amazing answer, went running around the press gallery afterwards to ask the press not to make any reference to it. They said that there had been a mistake and they needed time to check it out.

The Leader has to do better than that, if he purports to be the Leader of this State, when he talks about the financial impact of the Federal budget. He has to do better than simply come out and make statements and then have to send his own press secretary running around the place to fix up the damage of his own words, to let the press know that he had got it wrong, that he had made a mistake. If ever there was a case of the Leader being 'Can I do that again Brown', we saw it last night. The Leader made a number of other statements

about the impact on State revenue that simply do not stand up.

I turn now to the Leader's own statements, and I am not sure whether they are his statements or those of his research staff. If they are the words of his research staff, he should think about getting some new ones, because obviously they let him down badly. My guess is that the Leader decided to start speaking before he thought about it and then he discovered that he got it wrong. Let us look at some of the other arguments the Leader has raised. On the matter of petrol tax, it is a slug on ordinary Australians. It is a tax increase that I very much oppose, and it is not necessary. It will hurt ordinary Australians, because it will be a cost to business at a time that we just do not need those costs. It will also have an inflationary effect because it will feed through the CPI. I acknowledge and criticise all those points. One of my reasons for criticism is the fact that the Federal Government took no account of regional or rural South Australia, unlike this Government which has never received a word of praise from the Opposition for its actions.

This Government has a three-tiered system of petrol tax that tries to minimise the impact on regional South Australia. The Party that claims to represent and look after the interests of regional South Australia has let it down because the Opposition has never supported our policy on that matter, even though it is a supportive policy indeed. The Leader made a comment a moment ago about State Government petrol tax rises. Unfortunately, there was a situation last year where we had to increase petrol tax in this State.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, to give it to local government as part of the memorandum of understanding with local government, which is very appreciative and knows what it can do with that. Over the years there have been increases, but we have tempered the increases to ensure that we picked up the needs of regional South Australia. However, I started to feel as if a policy was just about to come forth from the Leader, who is almost bereft of policy statements. Those that he calls policy statements contain nothing and are simply bankrupt documents more full of holes than a sieve. Were we about to hear the Leader say that he would reduce State petrol taxes? Were we about to hear the Leader say that he would unwind any increases in petrol tax over recent years? Were we about to hear, at long last, a policy? Were we about to hear something specific for South Australians on which they could make a judgment?

One of the comments I made last night was that it is about time the Leader started coming out with his own decent policies on these matters if there is to be a proper debate about the economic future of South Australia. With respect to the petrol tax issue, the leaded and unleaded debate, we should remember that there have been discussions at the national level about this, and the Minister of Environment and Land Management argued heavily against the proposals that came out in yesterday's budget. I note that all other Australian States bar one also argued against that. In fact, they argued in line with the Minister of Environment and Land Management. They said to the Federal Government, 'Do not do this.' The one State that did not argue that position was Jeff Kennett's Victoria, but we forget that the Leader is no Jeff Kennett.

The Leader is in the line of not being anyone who does not suit his purposes at any point in time. I do not want to see us put in danger those things in this document that South Australia needs in respect of its economy and business and

those things that the ordinary people of South Australia need. I do not want to put them at risk. I know that the Leader and his Party are bent on a policy of trying to block Supply in the Federal Parliament, but I do not want to lose those things that are good for South Australia. I want to argue strongly against those things that are bad. Let us criticise those things that need to be criticised and accept what needs to be accepted. Therefore, I propose to amend the Leader's motion. I move:

Leave out all words after 'That this House' and insert—

—opposes both the Federal Government's budget decision to increase petrol tax by up to 10¢ a litre within two years, which will impact heavily on business and residents of outer-metropolitan and regional areas, and the significant increase in the wholesale sales tax on wine from 20 per cent to 31 per cent which will impact heavily on the domestic wine market.

—notes with approval the success of the Premier's representation to the Commonwealth to keep sales tax on non-luxury cars below the standard wholesale sales tax rate of 20 per cent and in maintaining the excise-free status of wine.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Deputy Leader. It would be a sad day for anyone to miss the vote.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The amendment continues:

—notes the tax cuts for low medium income earners and a range of socially responsible measures to help families, the aged and the unemployed.

—further recognises that, while these positive measures are partially offset by increases in indirect taxes, this change in the tax mix is minor compared to the hugely regressive tax policies of the Liberal Party, which include a GST, lower personal tax rates for high income earners, no capital gains tax and the re-instatement of tax free executive perks.

—calls on the Premier to communicate this motion and the outrage of South Australians that their State has been discriminated against in the Federal budget, forthwith to the Prime Minister and the Federal Treasurer.

The SPEAKER: I point out that the last paragraph of the amendment is in effect the same as the last paragraph of the motion and therefore would not need to be removed.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Mr Speaker, I appreciate that. It was just an awkwardly worded motion. In conclusion, the Leader made light of my invitation to the Federal Treasurer to visit South Australia on Friday to discuss the Federal budget. His own motion wants us to communicate with the Prime Minister and the Federal Treasurer, yet when we talk about bringing the Treasurer to South Australia to hear the views of South Australians he laughs. He says, 'What a joke. That should not happen'. That indicates his own political cynicism in moving his motion.

The fact is that at these lunches speakers are also questioned. I am very confident that the Federal Treasurer will be questioned about matters in the Federal budget on that occasion. I have already had people tell me that they are coming for that selfsame purpose. I have been speaking to people in different sections of the wine industry and indicating my views, which they know and support. I am pleased to see that the Treasurer is coming to South Australia on Friday so that he can have his say and hear our views about these issues.

We will go on speaking, in every possible and appropriate forum, for the people of South Australia. The petrol tax and the wine tax cannot be supported. This Party does not support them, and this Government does not support them. We oppose them and we will convey that message and go on conveying it until changes are made.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):

What an appalling performance. We have the Premier of this State congratulating the Federal Government for its efforts in respect of the budget. I will address the amendment before the House, because quite clearly the Premier is condoning the lying and the misrepresentation incorporated in the amendment. One of the clear matters that we wanted the House to acknowledge was the fact that we condemn the Federal Government for making false promises, promises that it will never keep, yet the Premier's amendment seeks to delete that from the motion. The Premier referred to the Federal Liberal Party policy. I remind the Premier that Federal Liberal Party policy has no excise on petrol; it has lower income tax; and, of course, it has no payroll tax. That would have been to the advantage of all South Australians. If he believes congratulating failure is a legitimate motion of this House, this Parliament has stooped to an all time low.

I ask the question of all members opposite: who are the true believers now on the other side? How often do the people of South Australia and Australia have to be betrayed by the Keating Government? How often does it have to break its promises? How often does it have to hit the poor, the handicapped and the people who cannot defend themselves? With respect to the poor and the underprivileged, even the Deputy Premier—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER:—got it right this morning on the ABC. He got it very right this morning. He said that the petrol tax would disadvantage the poor, and it was unconscionable for it to do so. He also said that the wine tax was unnecessary. When the Premier moves an amendment, which virtually congratulates him on his own performance, I believe everybody in this House should have a great deal of difficulty.

Let us put it on the record. If the Premier thinks that his representations saved the car industry from a big impost, he has another think coming. As we saw with the Federal budget, structured increases of one per cent will be added to each of the tiers in respect of sales tax. It had nothing to do with the Premier; he was a failure. He was a failure because the one job he had to do was to save our wine industry, and that will be spoken about in more detail. If the Labor Party thinks that the \$2 benefit for those earning less than \$20 000 and the \$8 benefit for those earning between \$20 000 and \$50 000 will pay for the \$5 a week extra in petrol tax and all the other wholesale taxes being imposed, obviously it has not done its sums.

It is important that we recognise the outer suburbs. We must recognise the people who need to drive to work and to school; and we must recognise the rural women who rely on older cars. It is important that we recognise that tourism is highly dependant on the price of fuel and, of course, we have heard the Minister of Tourism chortling on. What the Premier has not said is that the State Government will benefit from all these taxes. He has not said a word about that. We did not hear in the statement today that the Premier will adjust his taxes on licensing fees. We did not hear that the licensing fees were going to be adjusted.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: I beg your pardon?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier is out of order and the Deputy Leader is out of order and will address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On each of these measures the State coffers benefit. So, there will be a little voice in Canberra

saying, 'Look, I am sorry you did this but we are really going to do very well over in South Australia.' That has not been heard. We have not heard the Premier comment on that today. Whether it be fuel which is adjusted by CPI and which will go up because of the increase in the CPI, as a result of the inflationary effects; whether it be the licence fees, which will go up because the Federal Government has placed a further impost on wine; or whether it be cigarettes, which also rise as a result of Federal excises, the State budget will benefit. We have not heard anything from the Premier to say that we will draw back on any of those items.

Neither did the Premier mention such items and such important parts of our community as the credit unions and friendly societies. Everybody in South Australia has some relationship with a credit union or a friendly society. We have 10 per cent of the nation's assets in friendly societies and credit unions. They will be wiped out under the proposition we have before us—they will be devastated. The Premier has said nothing about that.

Who manipulated the system? Was it the banks that got the good deal for themselves to take out the credit unions, because the credit unions rely simply on deposits to generate capital, whereas banks and other financial institutions have the capacity to raise equity capital? They will be placed at a huge financial disadvantage. We have not heard anything from the Premier about that today, yet we have one of the strongest credit unions and friendly society organisations in the country. So, there is big finance, there are big deals and the Premier is in there supporting it all the way. How successful was he really in terms of turning Canberra around?

Let us look at the outcomes. The outcomes are quite clear. There will be no unemployment relief, and that is supported by the Premier. We heard him support the budget today. The participation rate of Australians is expected to decrease; that means less people wanting to go into the work force. The household savings ratio is expected to fall dramatically again from 6.1 per cent to 4.7 per cent. Quite clearly, further taxation will be applied to the small income earners to the benefit of the Federal coffers. We have inflation increasing from one per cent to 3.5 per cent because of the Federal Government policies. Our current account balance will continue to blow out.

It is not a pretty picture. South Australians are affected, particularly by the wine and petrol taxes, and in Adelaide we have the highest petrol tax of any capital city of Australia. The Premier is the same person who supported the Treasurer when he reduced our budget by \$50 million. He did not get any special grants and, if members look through the budget papers, they will find every other State has some project for which they received a special grant. However, that did not happen in South Australia at all. Of course, the roads have been cut to ribbons in the process.

There is no gain but there is plenty of pain. This Government wants to confine people to their homes and make it unaffordable for them to get on the roads, and it does not mind wrecking the wine industry. The Premier says he will lead a delegation to Canberra, but his past performance does not imbue us with a great deal of confidence. He is quite content for the poor to be hit, and he is quite content for the Federal Government to continue to break its promises. I support the original motion.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Deputy Premier): I support the amendment. I think it is a more accurate representation of the feelings of South Australians than the motion.

I am always disappointed when speaking after the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. As soon as he stands up, the gallery empties and a man cannot get a line in the paper. However, I will do my best to do so.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Federal budget in its totality is absolutely unacceptable to me. I concede that there are some very good items in the budget but, in my view, they are principally of a minor nature. I am particularly outraged at the increase in petrol tax. It is totally unwarranted. I think it is discriminatory particularly of people who live outside metropolitan areas and are already ripped off by oil companies every day they go to fill up their cars with petrol. I point out that this State Government discriminates in favour of country people when it applies its own levy on petrol sales. Apart from Queensland, which has no petrol tax at all—but that will not last very long—we have the lowest State fuel franchise fee in the whole of Australia outside the metropolitan area, and I am very proud of that. It also happens to be where I buy all my petrol.

Besides being unfair to all motorists, it is extremely unfair to country motorists. It is also even more discriminatory against the poor. It is by and large the poor who drive cars that use leaded petrol. I think we can all remember when we got our first car, and I think we can all remember the little second car that we had around the place on occasions, not that I do. Inevitably, they use leaded petrol, and to discriminate against the poor like that is unconscionable. It will also go straight into the consumer price index and help to create another round of inflation.

It is appalling how the wine industry has been treated. This industry is making progress, and it has had its hard times. It is a very hard industry in which to make a dollar. There are not too many rich wine makers around and not too many rich grape growers around. It is an industry which, despite all the hardships that it has had to go through, still manages to come up with a superb product and sell increasing quantities overseas. For the Federal Government to say, 'Thank you very much', give it a box around the ears and take some more money is appalling.

If we are looking for something good to say about the budget, one of the things that we can say—there are not many—is that it is better than what was on offer. This budget goes part of the way to doing what John Hewson wanted to do. He wanted to reduce significantly income tax on higher income earners; he wanted to put a broad based goods and services tax on almost every commodity in the community, which would have been highly regressive; he wanted to do away with capital gains tax, one of the few progressive measures that we have; and he wanted to give back to the executives their tax-free perks. That was the alternative. I say to the Federal Government that I do not agree with most of the budget, but at least it is nowhere near as bad as what was on offer.

The biggest problem that we have is that Governments are not prepared to make some economic space for themselves. They go to election after election promising to make income and corporate tax cuts and to reduce the Federal Government's income, and at the same time they say, 'Here is a whole raft of promises of increased spending.' I can tell you, Mr Speaker, and common sense tells you, it cannot be done. I condemn all Governments for doing that at all elections. I wish that people would just wake up to the fact

that it is offensive to the electors, and I cannot understand why time after time the electors fall for it.

What we have seen in the last few elections—probably far too many—is something of an obscene auction to see who can offer the greatest tax cuts, who can cut the Federal Government's income the hardest and at the same time who can make the most grandiose promises that apparently are paid for with fresh air. They are not paid for with fresh air: they are paid for with borrowings. To me it is absolutely dishonest to go to elections making those kinds of statements. I would also have a go at some sections of the media which seem to think that that can be done. It cannot be done. We all know that and common sense tells us that.

I believe that the tax cuts that were promised prior to the last Federal election were utterly irresponsible. The only thing I can say about the Labor Government is that at least its tax cuts were less than the tax cuts promised by the Liberal Party. I do not want the Liberal Party to get any comfort from what I am saying. Those tax cuts should never have been offered and they should never have been given. What is the point of them? Apparently we are giving \$6 or \$8 a week to middle income earners—and we are giving about \$1.96 per week to the really poor—and for this privilege we are imposing a huge hike in petrol tax, a hike in wine tax and a hike in wholesale sales tax, all of which are regressive. That is what we are doing, but we have honoured our promises and given these particular tax cuts. What an exercise in futility! If that is not ridiculous enough, on the way the Federal Government has managed to skim a bit more off the poor. It has conceded that the really poor in our community, unfortunately, will have less disposable income after this budget than before. Quite frankly, I do not support that.

I conclude by making this plea: all Governments, if they are to be effective, have to make some economic space for themselves. They have to be prepared to stand up and honestly say, 'If you wish to have this particular standard of services delivered, it will cost you this in tax.' It is then perfectly legitimate for the community to choose between services or taxation. All I can say is that the people whom I represent, even if every one of them in my electorate and potential electorate paid no tax at all, would still not be able to afford to pay for their own health or education services. One of the principal purposes, as I see it, of a Federal Government's budget is to ensure that people in the community have access to the basic services of health, education, shelter and security. If that means not offering tax cuts at election times, I believe that is the policy that Governments should go to the electorate on. Unfortunately, I believe that this obscene auction and these lies that are told and the misrepresentations that are made will continue, and I think that is a great pity.

I believe the amendment more fairly represents the impact of the Federal budget on this State, and I urge the House to support it.

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): Once again, we have positive proof that when Bannon and Arnold fight, South Australia loses. In his ministerial statement today, the Premier indicated that last week he had written to the Prime Minister pleading South Australia's case. Everybody knows that in the preparation of a budget it is at least a week prior to its delivery that these settings are locked in. Too little too late. Let us also have a look at page 2. The Premier is going to action the wine industry forum. Let me quote some comments made a fortnight ago, as follows:

It is so long since the wine industry forum met that at this year's annual general meeting a fortnight ago they were wondering whether it was worth electing a delegate at all.

The Premier's ministerial statement is trying to use the wine industry forum as the mechanism to attack the Federal Labor Government on what it has done. Well, this Premier has done nothing with the wine industry forum. He has not used it effectively. Too little too late, yet again.

We on this side of the House find ourselves in quite good company: a person of no less standing than Martin Ferguson of the ACTU said last night, 'How can you defend the indefensible?' Clearly, you cannot. Yet, this Premier, this Deputy Premier and Treasurer and this Government are still trying to have half and half. They are not prepared to cut and they are not prepared to take the Federal Government on; they were not prepared to do so before the budget was brought down and they are not prepared to after the event.

The Premier also said how his Minister of Environment and Land Management had told the Federal Government, 'Don't do it. Don't put the tax on petrol.' That is what we heard not a few minutes ago. Well, what did the Minister of Environment and Land Management's press statement say? Once again, it was having a bob each way. Let me read two paragraphs of the Minister's press statement:

For the sake of future generations, we must act now to lower lead in the environment, and petrol is a major contributor. . . There are two main ways of encouraging people to change over to unleaded fuel—education and financial incentive. I'm not convinced that a price differential between leaded and unleaded fuel is necessarily the fairest solution, as those people who cannot afford to upgrade their cars in order to use unleaded fuel will be disadvantaged. Before the Federal Government acts, we should weigh up—

There was nothing in it, Mr Premier, telling the Federal Government not to take this specific action. Your representation to this House of your Minister's comments is wrong, yet again. That dispenses with and dispatches the Premier's weak and ineffectual rebuttal of the Leader's motion. It is pretty clear that the Federal Labor Government has abandoned you. It recognises that you are dead in the water and is now hanging you out to dry. Your Federal colleagues walked away from you—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. The member for Kavel will resume his seat.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I rise on a point of order. When a member has been here as long as the member for Kavel has he should avoid using the second person singular in his speeches, as is required by Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair did not pick that up, as my attention was diverted. However, the member for Kavel is well aware of Standing Orders.

Mr OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Again, Labor has a list of broken promises and they are becoming legendary. Winning is not only everything to the Labor Party: it is the only thing, and they are prepared to lie to win. Not only that but we have seen that the Labor Party is prepared to secretly use taxpayers' money to get over the line. That is the sort of calibre, integrity and honesty we have seen in Labor Governments. There is no doubt that we would have been better off with a GST on wine and petrol, because there would be offsets. The Federal Liberal Party proposed the abolition of fuel excise, which not only would have reduced the cost of fuel by 19¢ a litre compared to the 11¢ that this Government is putting on: that is 30¢ a litre difference between what Federal Labor and Federal Liberal were proposing.

The cost of petrol and these other taxes will wind their way into inflation, as the Deputy Premier said. What happens when they wind their way into inflation? They wind their way into interest rates, and what we are seeing as a result of these measures is a greater impact, impost, burden and cost of operating of small business. Does Labor not yet understand that unless there are businesses that are profitable in this country we will not create jobs for young Australians? Until and unless you understand that reducing the burden on industry and on business is the only way to proceed, there is no hope—no hope for reducing the unemployment queues in this country.

The extra burden of the freight cost of fuel is \$175 million a year. That is a cost going into the articles that we want to produce and export overseas. We saw what happened in 1970 when the Whitlam Government introduced an excise on brandy: the Berri producers in the Riverland had been the largest producers in the southern hemisphere, but four years later they hardly produced a drop. The net effect on Treasury was that instead of getting more money it got far less, because the consumer reaction to the price increases was to walk away.

What we are talking about here is an industry that is starting to make it, starting to look good and starting to achieve well in the international market. What does Labor do? As soon as it starts to look successful it wants to pull the industry back. It wants to chop it down. It wants to negate the benefits of getting into those international export markets. The industry is just starting to get there and it needs \$1 billion to put in new vineyards to meet the international demand. How will it achieve that with \$2.5 million currently in domestic sales?

With those domestic sales being reduced, who will finance the extra vineyards we need throughout this country to meet the international export market potential? Labor is killing the goose that laid the golden egg. What you are doing is destroying an industry that is just starting to make it, just starting to get off the ground and just starting to achieve. I could go on and talk about the impact that this will have on regional areas of South Australia.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Well, see what the former Premier, the member for Ross Smith, had to say at page 462 of *Hansard* of August 1984, because that is when they increased it from 10 to 20 per cent. What did we see—a great fight, I don't think, from the Labor Government! We supported an inquiry because an inquiry was going to sort it out. So much for sorting it out! What we have now is not 20 per cent but 31 per cent, and in 12 months time it will go to 32 per cent.

The Arthur D. Little report recommends certain directions and actions but what has happened? Federal Labor has totally walked away from the recommendations of the Arthur D. Little report. It has totally walked away from an industry that was starting to build our national export reputation internationally and, given that we produce some 60 per cent of that, the indirect effect on South Australia is more than that on any other State in Australia.

What do we get from this Labor Administration: nothing! No effort and no determination. They were not in there before the die was cast, and after the event they are weakly saying, 'You shouldn't do this to South Australia.' Too little, too late! You have lost for South Australia yet again. Instead of fighting when the fight needs to be taken up, you fight after the event. Given that my time has expired, I move an amendment—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: —to the Premier's amendment:

Delete the words in the second and fourth paragraphs.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will bring the amendment forward. The Minister of Business and Regional Development.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Business and Regional Development): Thank you for that support. Mr Speaker, I will not do the Leader of the Opposition the justice of following his style of turning my back on you and looking pleadingly up at the camera while I straighten my tie. However, I will say this: the Leader of the Opposition says that he is no John Hewson; the Leader of the Opposition says he is no Jeff Kennett; the Leader of the Opposition says he is no Richard Court. Well, we have seen today that he is no John Olsen. Quite frankly, as someone was saying to me recently, at least the member for Kavel looks like he believes in what he is saying, whilst the Leader of the Opposition sounds phoney because he is phoney.

The simple fact is that the Leader of the Opposition in this House is asking South Australians for the support that he cannot even achieve from the first four on his front bench. That is the simple truth and he knows it, and no amount of voice coaching; no amount of training from Caroline Ainslie; no amount of makeup; no amount of new suits; no amount of holding the tie and fiddling with it will explain away to South Australians that he is a complete and utter fake who does not give a damn about this State. We have seen that time and again. He certainly does not give a damn about ordinary South Australians.

So, let us not have any more of this phoniness. The Leader's handlers believe that he can get away without saying anything at all, without putting his moniker on any policy. He says today that we are not prepared to criticise the Federal Government. That is simply not true. We remember the debate over zero tariffs. We remember what the Premier said, what I said and what the Leader of the Opposition said. He ran to Canberra not just like Neville Chamberlain but, for the car industry in this State, like Quisling, because it was a treacherous move.

He came back here like a puny school boy waving a piece of paper, saying 'I support the GST.' I believe that the impost on petrol in this budget is a kick in the guts for the true believers, but it is a bloody sight better than the poison that would have been delivered by John Hewson if he had been in the position.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would ask the Minister to be careful in his use of language. There are words that are not necessary in this debate and I would ask him to be very careful.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Thank you, Sir. I am a working class lad from London who represents Salisbury. I say things as they are, unlike the Leader of the Opposition, who never says things as they are. He has a script, he has the makeup, he stares at the camera and says what he is told to say but, every now and again, he blows it—about three or four times a day.

As for the wine industry, there is absolutely no doubt at all that the Dawkins medicine is vinegar for the wine industry in this State. Let us go into the reasons for that. The simple fact is that the wholesale tax on wine will increase from 20 to 31 per cent to take effect immediately, with a further

increase of one percentage point to take effect from July 1994. The tax applies to domestic consumption and not, as the Leader was trying to imply, to exports. The simple fact is it will severely impact on small and medium sized wine producers. Preliminary estimates from State Treasury suggest that, as a result of the first round of tax increases, a \$5 bottle of wine will now cost around \$5.45, while a \$10 bottle will rise to \$10.90. Most wine makers will pass the full burden of this cost increase on to consumers, as current modest returns in the wine industry will make it impossible for any portion of the tax increase to be absorbed by wine makers.

What I would really like to see today is, for once, some straight talk, some honesty, from the Leader of the Opposition. Did he recognise that, whilst we are strongly and severely critical of a number of these imposts, in fact, there is a need on behalf of small business, on behalf of medium size businesses, to welcome the \$94 million spending initiatives for small to medium size exporters in the 1993-94 Federal budget? Where was the Leader of the Opposition when we brought Alan Griffiths (the Federal Minister for Industry, Technology and Commerce) to this State to meet with the car industry not last week, not today but months ago, on the invitation of the Premier and me? He spent two days with the manufacturers and with the car components industries to hear their concerns.

What was the Leader of the Opposition doing? He was advocating the destruction of the car industry in this State. And let him not think for a moment that they forget where he stood: they know exactly where he stood, no matter how much he tries to run away from it today. This Government on repeated occasions, including at the recent Trade Ministers conference, suggested to the Federal Government—and members opposite can ask their colleagues in Western Australia whom they are trying to run away from, and they can ask their colleagues in Victoria—we suggested, not them, that there be a major export incentive for small and medium size businesses to enter exporting for the first time and also to go into new markets.

And what did we see last night? We saw the South Australian proposals taken up in full. Included in the Federal Government's initiatives was a \$26 million injection into the International Trade Enhancement Scheme specifically targeted at small to medium size exporters. So, in this way we see the Federal Government with the State Government working in concert. Let us not deal with any more of this phoney nonsense.

We will see the launch of the submarine project in a week or so. I had a look through *Hansard* the other night to see what members in this House and members of the Liberal Party, including the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, said about that project. We saw an attempt time and again by Liberals to white ant our bid to get that project, and that is consistent with the quisling, treacherous stand of this Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: That is right. And they are so bereft of policies that I have been informed that they are actually doing a bit of renting out to have their policies written for them. I understand that the hapless number 3 there has asked a PR agency to write his tourism policy. I understand that they are also asking outside agencies to write their arts policy. This is how phoney they are. It is asking not just to rent a policy but to buy a job lot. So, let us see some sincerity, some bipartisan support to oppose a budget that, in

many respects, Phil Lynch would have been proud of in terms of that impost on working class people in cars.

But we do not see the Leader of the Opposition utter one single word of honesty or sincerity. And members opposite know it, because if I asked individually any of them in the corridors or in the bar who they are most proud of in terms of their performance today from their side of the House, not one would look me in the eye and say 'The Leader of the Opposition'.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): It is great to hear from the fabricator once again the same old rubbish that has been trotted out over the past eight years. It is very interesting that, on that fateful night of 13 March, Federal election night, out came the Prime Minister and said, 'This is one for the true believers.' And there they are over there: they are the true believers. They are the ones who have been supporting all this nonsense that is going on, and now the true believers have been dumped on. They have been absolutely betrayed. They have been cut loose and do not have the guts to go to the people to find out their final outcome.

The big problem about today's debate is that it is only two hours, because what this Government has allowed the Federal Government to do to the wine industry is nothing short of sacrilege. In all the talk about the overseas export markets we have to keep in mind that over 80 per cent of the wine produced in South Australia is consumed domestically. All this export hype is not doing anything for wine producers in South Australia. We produce 50 per cent of the wine in this nation anyway, but as soon as there is a hiccup in the domestic market there will be grape growers going out of business in droves.

The Hon. H. Allison: Up Dry Creek without a pub!

Mr D.S. BAKER: Exactly, as the honourable member said. But these people do not understand. They tell us that they wrote a letter in the past three weeks. They should have done it three months ago, but I will come to that in a minute. What will happen is that the wine industry in South Australia and its retail side will be decimated in the coming months. I quote from the *Financial Review* of 12 July 1993, as follows:

An analysis by the AFR in December revealed most major wine makers selling \$3.99 champagne were lucky to earn a 40¢ gross margin a bottle of champagne. After deducting advertising, promotional and incentive payments. . . suggesting a \$1 profit on every case sold.

That is how fine the line is, and members opposite have allowed their Federal colleagues to increase the sales tax on that by 55 per cent. That is what you have done to the retail industry in South Australia, and that is what will happen to the grape growers in South Australia who will be thrown out of business. I rang a couple of grape growers this morning and asked, 'Have you got a contract with a major company?' They said 'No'. I said, 'Ring me back when you have rung them.' Do you know what the answer was? The answer from the wine companies was, 'If you haven't got a contract, we don't want your grapes.' That is what has happened overnight. That is what you did, Mr Premier—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier will resume his seat. The member for Victoria is well aware that direct comment on a person is not allowed. Direct comment through the Chair is the way to debate.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Mr Premier, you have allowed the Prime Minister of Australia to decimate the wine growers—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Victoria will resume his seat. Again I point out to all members that

remarks in debate in this Chamber must be directed through the Chair and not directly to any member. I ask the member for Victoria to direct his remarks through the Chair.

Mr D.S. BAKER: The Premier has allowed the wine growers of South Australia to be put in an impossible situation. I wonder whether the Minister of Primary Industries will call this 'exceptional circumstances', because that is what it is. If you did not know about it or if the Government did not know about it, that is what is happening to those people: exceptional circumstances overnight are wiping them out. The Minister of Tourism has gone. It is a pity he is not here, because he quoted some things that went on during the last Federal election campaign. I will quote part of an article by Ross Gittins in the *Age* this morning:

In fact, the budget does pretty much what Mr Keating accused the wicked Dr Hewson of wanting to do with his Fightback package. Dr Hewson would have raised the net take from indirect taxes by about \$2 billion a year; by the time Mr Keating's finished, he will have raised it by \$3 billion a year. There are two other differences between what Dr Hewson wanted to do and what the man who so vehemently opposed him has done. The first is that Dr Hewson worried about providing low income earners with adequate 'compensation' for the effect of the GST. Mr Keating hasn't bothered with that soppy stuff. The second is that Dr Hewson would have replaced a motley collection of indirect taxes with the much broader, sturdier and more efficient GST. Mr Keating complains about our ramshackle indirect taxes, but dares not reform them. All he did was jack up their rates. It doesn't make sense.

That is what the people out there are saying about this budget and that is what this Government wrote to them a week ago—not three months ago when the budget submissions were on—when they got a bit scared that things might happen, and that is why members opposite have not done one thing as a Government to look after South Australians. Look at the rural industries; look at what this is going to do on the petrol side of it, and we have already heard the Leader, the Deputy Leader and the member for Kavel talk about that. Those people who have to use transport and those people who use older cars will pay the bill. The Prime Minister said this morning on radio that he was worried about looking after only the inner suburbs. He said they were the people who used leaded petrol. But no, it is the people out in the country communities who are using leaded petrol.

An honourable member: Of necessity.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Of necessity, because they cannot afford anything better. The inane comment by the Prime Minister on the Conlon program this morning was that it will not affect them because they have the diesel fuel rebate. What a joke! I challenge the Premier to ask the Prime Minister whether he will go in and battle for a leaded fuel rebate for country South Australia when he has his meeting. It is about time he did. He said that he went in to bat for South Australia. He has not done one thing to help South Australia in the last three months. Talk about going in to bat: the only thing that has been happening on that side of the House is debate on whether, after the next election, they will have enough members to form a cricket team or a baseball team and who does not want to lead the team. The only thing they have agreed on is that the member for Ross Smith will be the ashes. South Australia has been betrayed by this Government. It is a pity you did not stick up for South Australians—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the member continues to use direct terms I will have to withdraw leave. The member for Victoria.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I am sorry, Mr Speaker. It is a pity the Premier did not stick up for South Australia as he stuck up for

the Viet Cong in the 1970s. You are a disgrace to South Australia; go to the people.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Both sides of the House will come to order. The Premier.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I take personal exception to those remarks, and ask the member for Victoria to withdraw them and apologise. I refer him to my personal explanation given in response to a speech by the member for Morphett in 1981 or 1982, when that matter was fully canvassed and explained.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. The Premier has taken exception to the terms used by the member for Victoria and asks him to withdraw.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Mr Speaker, I will not withdraw.

The SPEAKER: The Chair has no power to force the member to withdraw a remark unless it is unparliamentary. Has the member for Victoria concluded his speech?

Mr D.S. BAKER: Yes, Sir.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM (Minister of Primary Industries): That was a most disappointing contribution by the member for Victoria and a most disappointing response and allegation to level at the Premier in this debate. It highlighted that the Opposition is long on rhetoric and short on solutions that are in the best interests of South Australia. It is very easy to seek to take political advantage of this situation. It is a discriminatory act unnecessarily and needlessly aimed at South Australia, but the fact of the matter is that no-one in this Parliament has a crystal ball to predict exactly what the Federal Government will do with its budgetary measures. There are a variety of things it can do; it has the constitutional authority in this area, so it is not and should not be a matter now of simply seeking political advantage. I have heard four speeches where members almost took delight with regard to the present predicament, because there is an issue—

Dr Armitage interjecting:

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

The Hon. T.R. GROOM:—from which they can seek to extract political advantage. I have not heard one solution emanating from the speeches of members opposite in relation to this debate.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: That may be the case. I have heard plenty of rhetoric, but no solution has been advanced through that rhetoric, and the Opposition should not forget that it was prepared to support a goods and services tax.

Dr Armitage interjecting:

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

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: The goods and services tax was going to wreak havoc in so far as indirect taxes are concerned; it was going to hit every industry and service. The Liberals were going to tinker around with a few exemptions, but soon it would have moved from 15 per cent to 20 per cent and beyond at the retail end. That was the policy of members opposite in relation to this matter, but now we must decide what we do about the situation. The fact of the matter is that the Federal Government has constitutional authority in this area and it has brought down a budget that in this respect has discriminated against South Australia.

It is not now a matter of seeking political advantage and getting up speech after speech and making the sorts of attacks and the rhetoric that we have heard from members opposite;

it is what we do about the situation. The Premier has advanced the most constructive method of addressing the situation. The Opposition should be prepared to work with the State Government and the industry to effect a change of mind on the part of the Federal Government. This can be best done through the solution that has been offered by the Premier: to reconvene the Wine Industry Forum; and for the industry, the Government and the Opposition to join in that forum and that movement to bring about a change in the Federal Government's attitude.

The fact of the matter is that the South Australian wine industry is a low cost, high quality industry. It has been through some very difficult times and very difficult periods, the most recent being the restructuring that was forced by rationalisation. No Federal Government of whatever persuasion should belt around the head an industry that has been through this difficult time and survived, and not only that, but also positioned itself to be a great promoter of our export drive overseas.

The wine industry has been well positioned. It is a low cost industry, and we should not add to the cost, because the real danger, the real damage that can be done, is that there will be a dampening in domestic demand. There is no question about that; ordinarily you would logically say that the grapes that might therefore not be needed domestically could fill the export market, but the real danger is that it lessens the effort of wineries into the export market, as domestic markets become more difficult. There is no question about that. South Australia has been discriminated against. It is the hardest hit State because, depending on the figures you take (50 per cent or 60 per cent of the total), South Australia is the largest grape growing and wine producing State in Australia.

An honourable member: We all know that.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: That may well be; we should all know it, and the Federal Government should know it, but all members opposite have done, speaker after speaker, is get up and use political rhetoric. In other words, they have simply been seeking—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: You would have been honest.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: Why seek to impose a goods and services tax on Australia? That was the policy of the Opposition, and that would have done enormous damage to the rural community through the indirect taxation system. Make no mistake; it would have hit the rural community and every industry very hard, and it would have been a basis to increase the 15 per cent to 20 per cent—do not think you would not have done it. You ought not to be cynical enough to come before the Parliament and pretend you are holier than thou, because you are not. In Government you were going to impose the Hewson formula, and the member for Kavel was party to that, as was every other Opposition member who supported that policy. Do not pretend that you are holier than thou and that you would not have hit this industry if you had got into Government at the Federal level, because you would have.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The member for Hayward has a point of order.

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, the Minister has been in this place long enough to know that the use of the second person singular is not allowed in this House.

The SPEAKER: I do uphold the point of order, but we do seem to have lost the intent of this debate.

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I simply say to the Opposition that what has occurred is now a fact. The Federal Government has the constitutional authority, it is its budget and it can do what it likes. Now it has to stand community anger in relation to its decisions, and the Premier is the only speaker, supported by this side of the House, who has offered a positive solution. In other words, the forum can be reconvened, the Government can work with the industry and, I hope, the Opposition to seek to change the Federal Government's mind.

The Opposition speakers, particularly the member for Victoria with his most disappointing contribution, are seeking nothing more than political advantage out of this situation, out of a discriminatory act done to South Australia. There are a number of positives. In relation to petrol, as the Deputy Premier said, it is a blow to the entire community—the rural community as well as the metropolitan community. It is a blow. In relation to the diesel fuel rebate, at least the Federal Government has not gone that far and taken away an advantage—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: You can laugh. If the member for Murray-Mallee thinks it is a joke, if he thinks the rebate for the rural community is a joke, perhaps that is an indication of what his Party would do if it ever got into office federally. The fact of the matter is that the retention of the diesel fuel rebate to primary producers is an advantage that needs to be maintained in the system. That cost is a very significant part of farm costs, and there is no doubt that it is an advantage that properly should be retained by the rural community. There are some serious losses.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: I agree; the petrol impost in this budget is a severe blow, to both the metropolitan area and the rural area, and make no mistake about that. In relation to the rural community, I am pleased that there have been some positives. I did not hear any speaker opposite incorporate in their contribution the positives that will accrue to the rural community.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.R. GROOM: There are. There will be \$406 million over the next four years in relation to rural assistance. There will be something like \$157 million for 1993-94, and South Australia will actually gain because at the Ministers conference the exceptional circumstances moneys were recognised as being over and above the ordinary RAS allocation. Some of our RAS figures will have to be revised downwards as to what is now expected in the final outcome, but the exceptional circumstances money will be over and above ordinary RAS. A considerable amount of money will therefore go to primary producers in rural South Australia, because we have had about 2 850 applications for rural assistance, and that is in respect of exceptional circumstances.

The ordinary RAS combined with exceptional circumstances money will provide relief for primary producers in South Australia. There will be \$105 million for the national land care program during 1993-94, and this will support ecologically sustainable development in rural and urban communities. That is a plus for rural communities. I have already adverted to the retention of the diesel fuel rebate for primary producers, and it is important that we hang onto that and that we do not lose sight of that advantage. It is important that we

stress that it is an advantage to be retained for the benefit of the rural community.

We have \$1.3 million directed to a clean food export program for this financial year, and that is extremely important. Another \$22.6 million will go to assist farmers in the processing and distribution areas to become more competitive and assist in boosting exports. So, there are some positives for the rural community. In South Australia we all know that the rural community has been extremely hard hit. In the past 12 months South Australia's rural community has suffered from just about everything that nature could dish up, such as storms and floods, locust and mouse plagues and infestations of downy mildew in the grape industry, all of which has meant some serious setbacks.

It is an extreme blow, a blow of one of the worst types for a Federal Government to inflict on South Australia, because the wine industry is one of our centre pieces; it is a means of enhancing our exports overseas; and it is a tourist attraction. The wine industry just means so much to this State, and to see the Federal Government doing this to South Australia is an extreme blow. It is no good seeking now to take political advantage and simply making the sorts of speeches that I have heard from members opposite today. Quite frankly, the Opposition would have done much the same as the Federal Government has done but in a different form if it had been in Government today.

The Opposition would have imposed a GST, which would have hit hard South Australia's industries, particularly the wine industry in this State. However, we must now concentrate on what we do about it. The only way we can affect a change of mind is to invoke the Wine Industry Forum in the way the Premier has said. Members should support the Premier and the South Australian Government and, more importantly, the industry. The Opposition should join in that process.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition):
Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Leader speaks, he closes the debate.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: In closing the debate—

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Mr Speaker, I have a point of order that I can easily bring up after the Leader has closed the debate. Are you saying that when the Leader speaks, he closes the debate?

The SPEAKER: Points of order always take precedence. Does the honourable member wish to raise his point of order now?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I was going to take my point of order after the Leader closed, Sir. I draw your attention to Standing Order 170, which provides:

A member may not vote in any division on a question in which the member has a direct pecuniary interest, and the vote of the member who has such an interest is disallowed.

My point of order is that the motion, the amendment and the further amendment deal extensively with the threat to winegrowers. The member for Victoria has extensive wine holdings and the member for Chaffey likewise.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! To extend that principle would mean that anyone here who drives a car should be included as well.

An honourable member: Or who drinks wine.

The SPEAKER: Or who drinks wine. I suggest the point of order is not valid.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: In closing the debate, I reiterate the importance of this matter to South Australia and I highlight the intention of the Premier in the amendment he moved this afternoon. This afternoon the Premier virtually said that he is prepared to endorse the breach of Federal Labor Party promises made at the last Federal election. The part of the motion he has specifically sought to delete is that part that relates to the breach of promises by Mr Keating, Mr Dawkins and other members of the Labor Party.

How can we have a Premier in South Australia who is prepared to stand up and endorse the breaching of election promises and the breaching of the most important election promise of all concerning tax cuts? The second factor that came out of the debate this afternoon is the complete ineptitude of our own Premier in going to Canberra and arguing any case on behalf of South Australia. He thinks that he has won; he thinks that he succeeded; and he thinks that he achieved something for South Australia in terms of what came down in the Federal budget last night.

I put it to the House and to South Australians: should we accept what was achieved by the Premier as a result of the case he put forward to Canberra? The Premier's efforts can be compared with last night's Federal budget, which has a 55 per cent increase in the wine tax, a significant increase in the impost on all South Australians, particularly in relation to fuel tax, and an enormous impost on low income earners, the very people one would expect the Labor Party, if it adhered to its principles, to support. Following the next election the Liberal Government will take up the banner for South Australia, and once again this State will have a Premier, a Cabinet and a Government that is prepared to fight for South Australia. Labor has let South Australia down badly over the past 11 years.

The final point I take up quickly is that the Premier's only effective response to the imposition of this huge impost through the wine tax is to once again establish the Wine Industry Forum. I point out that he has been Premier for almost 12 months—almost 12 months to the week—yet in that entire time he has not called the Wine Industry Forum together. However, the Premier purports to represent the interests of not only South Australia but the wine industry. He has let the wine industry down and, as a consequence, we have a Labor Government in Canberra prepared to impose on this State's wine industry the most severe increase—an 11 per cent increase in sales tax—of all. It is the Australian Labor Party which has hit that industry with three successive and massive wine tax increases over the past 10 years. It is for that reason that we have moved this motion; it is for the sake of all South Australians who want to express their anger to Canberra about the fuel tax increase, the wine tax increase and the breach of election promises by Keating and his Labor cohorts.

The House divided on Mr Olsen's amendment:

AYES (22)

Allison, H.	Armitage, M. H.
Arnold, P. B.	Baker, D. S.
Baker, S. J.	Becker, H.
Blacker, P. D.	Brindal, M. K.
Brown, D. C.	Cashmore, J. L.
Eastick, B. C.	Gunn, G. M.
Ingerson, G. A.	Kotz, D. C.
Lewis, I. P.	Matthew, W. A.
Meier, E. J.	Olsen, J. W. (teller)

AYES (cont.)

Oswald, J. K. G. Such, R. B.
 Venning, I. H. Wotton, D. C.

NOES (22)

Arnold, L. M. F. (teller) Atkinson, M. J.
 Bannon, J. C. Blevins, F. T.
 Crafter, G. J. De Laine, M. R.
 Evans, M. J. Gregory, R. J.
 Groom, T. R. Hamilton, K. C.
 Hemmings, T. H. Heron, V. S.
 Holloway, P. Hopgood, D. J.
 Hutchison, C. F. Klunder, J. H. C.
 Lenehan, S. M. Mayes, M. K.
 McKee, C. D. T. Quirke, J. A.
 Rann, M. D. Trainer, J. P.

PAIR

Evans, S. G. Ferguson, D. M.

The SPEAKER: There being 22 Ayes and 22 Noes, I cast my vote for the Noes.

Mr Olsen's amendment thus negatived.

The House divided on the Hon. Lynn Arnold's amendment.

AYES (22)

Arnold, L. M. F. (teller) Atkinson, M. J.
 Bannon, J. C. Blevins, F. T.
 Crafter, G. J. De Laine, M. R.
 Evans, M. J. Gregory, R. J.
 Groom, T. R. Hamilton, K. C.
 Hemmings, T. H. Heron, V. S.
 Holloway, P. Hopgood, D. J.
 Hutchison, C. F. Klunder, J. H. C.
 Lenehan, S. M. Mayes, M. K.
 McKee, C. D. T. Quirke, J. A.
 Rann, M. D. Trainer, J. P.

NOES (22)

Allison, H. Armitage, M. H.
 Arnold, P. B. Baker, D. S.
 Baker, S. J. Becker, H.
 Blacker, P. D. Brindal, M. K.
 Brown, D. C. (teller) Cashmore, J. L.
 Eastick, B. C. Gunn, G. M.
 Ingerson, G. A. Kotz, D. C.
 Lewis, I. P. Matthew, W. A.
 Meier, E. J. Olsen, J. W.
 Oswald, J. K. G. Such, R. B.
 Venning, I. H. Wotton, D. C.

PAIR

Ferguson, D. M. Evans, S. G.

The SPEAKER: There being 22 Ayes and 22 Noes, I cast my vote for the Ayes.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold's amendment thus carried.

The House divided on the motion as amended:

AYES (22)

Arnold, L. M. F. (teller) Atkinson, M. J.
 Bannon, J. C. Blevins, F. T.
 Crafter, G. J. De Laine, M. R.
 Evans, M. J. Gregory, R. J.
 Groom, T. R. Hamilton, K. C.
 Hemmings, T. H. Heron, V. S.
 Holloway, P. Hopgood, D. J.
 Hutchison, C. F. Klunder, J. H. C.
 Lenehan, S. M. Mayes, M. K.

AYES (cont.)

McKee, C. D. T. Quirke, J. A.
 Rann, M. D. Trainer, J. P.

NOES (22)

Allison, H. Armitage, M. H.
 Arnold, P. B. Baker, D. S.
 Baker, S. J. Becker, H.
 Blacker, P. D. Brindal, M. K.
 Brown, D. C. (teller) Cashmore, J. L.
 Eastick, B. C. Gunn, G. M.
 Ingerson, G. A. Kotz, D. C.
 Lewis, I. P. Matthew, W. A.
 Meier, E. J. Olsen, J. W.
 Oswald, J. K. G. Such, R. B.
 Venning, I. H. Wotton, D. C.

PAIR

Ferguson, D. M. Evans, S. G.

The SPEAKER: There being 22 Ayes and 22 Noes, I cast my vote for the Ayes.

Motion as amended thus carried.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Department of Recreation and Sport—Report, 1991-92.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): Mr Speaker, I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr D.S. BAKER: There seems to be some concern by the Premier about remarks that I made in closing my contribution to the debate today. There are always two sides to a story. I had a very close friend who was sent to Vietnam and was killed there. In those days I read the letters that he sent back to his parents while marches were going on: I read what was going on with our troops who were fighting over there and how it undermined them. The Premier might have been embarrassed at being involved in those demonstrations. As I said, that person was killed in Vietnam. However, never in this House have I made personal allegations against anyone. If the Premier thinks that was a personal allegation, I have an abhorrence for all people who undermined our troops when they fought in Vietnam. If it was a personal reflection, I unreservedly withdraw it.

GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT AND EMPLOYMENT ACT REGULATIONS

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I move:

That the various regulations under the Government Management and Employment Act 1985 made on 24 June and laid on the table of this House on 3 August 1993 be disallowed.

The reason for my moving the disallowance of these regulations is that, during the debate on the GME Act in this House, there was mention of the difficulties that might be created if the appeal system were changed to such an extent that public servants below executive level did not have some rights in areas of nepotism and patronage. Very late at night we agreed that that issue should be looked at further in another place. The debate took place at great length in the other place and

an amendment was carried, which was later approved in this House. In that amendment it was recognised by the Parliament overall that there should be a reasonable appeal system.

It is important to note that, having had that debate and the Government having agreed to it, within six to eight weeks the Government brought in a very wide range of regulations and slipped underneath everybody's cover the change which removed the appeal rights of a significant group of people who were not covered at executive level. In consequence of that, the Liberal Party, in consultation with the PSA, agreed to move a motion to have these regulations disallowed.

As the House will be aware, it is impossible to deal with the specific regulations on this issue so we have to knock out the whole lot. As I have said many times before in this House, the Parliament ought to consider in future either allowing specific areas where there is disagreement to be debated and allowing the rest of the regulations to be issued or looking at some other mechanism that better covers this problem.

Apparently, these changes could affect 2 000 to 3 000 public servants. I am surprised that a Government, which has its base in the union movement, would move to get offside a group of people who have traditionally not only been their financiers but also been very strong advocates for the Labor Party publicly. It seemed strange to us, so we thought that, as we understand issues affecting public servants, we would step in and help. The reason for my moving the disallowance of these regulations is to uncover the attitude of this Government to the lowly paid public servants in this State.

In the contribution on this issue in another place, the lead speaker put forward his personal view that we ought to come down to EL1. That means that every person below executive level should have these appeal rights. I think that is a very good idea. We have discussed it at Party level. If the Government brings back new regulations that recognise that any person below executive level should have appeal rights granted to them in this area, we will support that. This is an important issue. It is one that the PSA, representing public servants, not only put to us prior to the introduction of the Bill but has been putting to us again in the past six to eight weeks. It gives me pleasure to move to protect the rights of public servants in this State. This is an issue from which the Government has walked away. I hope that, once these regulations have been disallowed, this issue will show who does and who does not look after the interests of public servants in this State.

Mr McKEE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

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

That the fifth report of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee, being the annual report of the committee, be noted.

The first annual report of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee deals with that period of the committee's operation involving some 16 months and, as members will know, the report contains an overview of the year's activities and an assessment of the year's achievements. It would be fair to say, and I am sure most other members of the committee would agree with me, that the period has been extremely productive. The committee has

finalised four major inquiries and produced five reports on the supplementary development plan. The committee has reported on the redevelopment of the Waite Campus and the University of Adelaide; the Mount Lofty Ranges development, which was in two reports; procedures for supplementary development plans; and individual plans such as Craighburn. The committee believes that its role in the supplementary development process should be reviewed, and this is the subject of its third report awaiting a reply from the Minister.

The committee's reports reflect the bipartisan nature of the committee. Members from the three Parties have cooperated and put aside their political differences to solve difficult problems, and they have my congratulations for the way in which they have all pulled together in what have sometimes been difficult circumstances. At present the committee's inquiries include the Port Bonython oil spill, the Hindmarsh Island bridge and the Port Macdonnell breakwater and south end erosion.

The committee has much broader terms of reference than those of its predecessor, the Public Works Committee, including quality of the environment, the State's resources, planning, land use or transportation. Unfortunately, the committee has not had the time to take up some of those broader issues for which it was established. The pressure of references from the Parliament takes priority, and the committee's limited resources have forced it to defer some of these indefinitely. I think it would be fair to say that, in general, the committee's reports have been favourably received by those involved, especially the community and interest groups. Unfortunately, however, Ministers have chosen to disregard some of the committee's recommendations. The committee believes that its role is to work constructively with the Government of the day and that opportunities for a cooperative solution to difficult issues can be found.

The committee's investigations have shown that the communication process between departments and client groups has often left something to be desired. It is easy for agencies to become separated from the needs of the community at large. I think that it is also fair to say that some Government agencies are of the opinion that standing committees of this Parliament are a hindrance and can be ignored. I give advice to those agencies that we will be ignored at their peril. I sometimes wonder whether Ministers actually support agencies' attitude to the standing committees of this Parliament.

We have found in all our deliberations that one of the main problems involved in any major development or any major supplementary development plan is that there is no proper consultation or communication out there between the agencies and the community. So, in our report we do say that proper consultation and communication processes must be set up and adhered to and that those terms of reference and guidelines must be incorporated within all the agencies when they are dealing with the community where the Environment, Resources and Development Committee has some input.

The committee realises the complexity of planning issues and the importance of facilitating property development in this State. It believes also that, if issues are presented in such a complex way that the people affected cannot understand them, the process has failed and it has failed miserably. A typical case in point involved the Mount Lofty development plan, the key to which involved the transferable title scheme—and it is interesting that the Minister who was then

responsible is present in the Chamber. We found that the steering committee knew nothing about it and really did not understand the TTRs. The community definitely did not understand the TTRs and, when we questioned officers of the department, which is now OPUD, we became aware that very few of those officers understood the transferable title scheme.

In our opinion, we were coming up with reasonable recommendations to the Minister which would, if they were adopted, actually open the way to orderly control and management of the Mount Lofty Ranges. I think the reason why OPUD did not respond in a positive way to our recommendations is that it did not itself understand what the TTRs were all about. I think that is something that the current Minister needs to take up with officers of his department.

Parliamentary scrutiny plays an important role here and provides a last avenue for people to influence the Government process. I, and many others, have said that the committee has no role in the reviewing process of supplementary development plans. In fact, when we receive a reference we have a time frame within which to work, and if we do not work within that time frame the Minister of the day can ignore us. When the new Development Bill was being debated in this House we highlighted to the Minister and to the Government the increasing problem of the time restraint under which we were operating, but our protests were again ignored. So, it is my view, as the Presiding Member of that committee, that if the Government of the day is not prepared to give us a positive input into the review process we would rather not be involved and would prefer to look at the broader issues concerning which we were set up in the first instance.

I have briefly touched upon our relationships with agencies, and I say that at first the committee's investigations were not taken as seriously as they might have been. Then it was just like a courtship, and we had this period of antagonism. Now we hope that a more constructive and cooperative phase is starting so that we can all eventually get into bed together and work to the benefit of this State. This relationship involving the Parliament and agencies perhaps underlines the view that agencies often have of the parliamentary system. We are there to be tolerated, not to be taken notice of, but can I again issue a word of warning to those agencies. The Environment, Resources and Development Committee does intend to play a role in the parliamentary scrutiny of those agencies and we intend to do so, to take up a phrase often used by my colleague the member for Albert Park, without fear or favour.

The committee believes that as the standing committees have been in operation for 16 months it is time for a reassessment of such issues as resources. We are not asking for unlimited funding or unlimited officers to be made available for us to use, but we do think we should have resources that are appropriate for the task we are carrying out. A case in point is the issue involving the Hindmarsh Island bridge. The Government had made a decision to go ahead with a bridge at Hindmarsh Island. As a result of the reference that came from the Legislative Council, we were given some terms of reference to deal with.

The time constraints were very tight and we asked the Government for further assistance. You will recall, Madam Acting Speaker, that within our own Party room we backbenchers argued strongly for additional resources, and that was picked up in the second reading explanation given in this House by the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations, who had carriage of the Bill in

this House. I quote from that second reading explanation (page 508 of *Hansard*) as follows:

This may also apply to research staff where the capacity exists. However, where that capacity does not exist within the Parliament or where specialist knowledge is required, the committees may approach the relevant Ministers for appropriate staff, again much in the same way as select committees do now.

That was what I would call a very reasonable compromise, but the first time our committee actually wrote to a Minister and asked that an officer with the necessary expertise be made available, much in the same way as a select committee does, to facilitate a complete scrutiny of the project so that we could come up with the correct recommendation to the Parliament, we had that research officer for one day and one day only. And then, to get that officer for any longer than that, the Parliament had to pay for the services of that officer, not the salary but all the oncosts.

The standing committees have no money, Madam Acting Speaker. You are a member of one; you know that. The Parliament has no money, so we cannot get resources. We were forced to dispense with the services of that person, a person who had the skills and experience to give a valuable input into the deliberations of that committee. Either the Minister was fair dinkum in what he said on 27 August 1991 or he was just putting it in as a sop to appease the backbenchers of his own Party. I would like to think the Minister was serious when he made that contribution and did actually mean it.

So, we in our committee are waiting with bated breath for the response to our second letter, in which we draw the Government's attention to its commitment in August 1991. I am sure that my colleagues who will be following me will enlarge on that problem. But having said all that—and I am glad the Speaker is here, because he is a great supporter of the standing committees of the Parliament—I believe the first 12 months have been successful and productive, and the committee has consolidated its position as an integral part of the parliamentary process.

In conclusion, apart from passing on my thanks to my colleagues on the committee, the member for Chaffey and the member for Price, I wish to thank the committee staff for its hard work and cooperation. Hopefully, when resources have been adequately dealt with we will not have a position where our staff members are forced to work through weekends just to get out a report for the benefit of this Parliament. The parliamentary standing committee system will work: all it needs is a bit of cooperation, not only from the Parliament and the parliamentary officers but also from the Government.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I support the noting of the first annual report of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee. As we are all aware, the committee was set up under an Act of Parliament to look at aspects referred to it and issues that the committee itself believed should be considered. When we take into account that the committee is responsible for considering environmental issues, development issues within this State and also the resources of this State, we find that there is a natural conflict in many instances between environmental issues and those involving resources and development.

Of course, I believe that this committee, if it is given the opportunity and if it has the genuine support of the Government of the day and the particular Ministers concerned, can play a very significant role in helping with the orderly development of South Australia and, at the same time,

protecting the environment. Issues such as the Waite campus, the Mount Lofty Ranges development, Craighburn and also the proposed bridge to Hindmarsh Island are all extremely controversial. There are very wide and diverse opinions in the community in relation to those matters, and the fact that these issues are referred to the committee when, in almost all instances, the decision of the Government is a *fait accompli* makes it very difficult for the committee effectively to carry out its work.

If the Government of the day were to refer the issues to the committee earlier in the piece, I believe the committee could save the Government many problems, because the committee is in a position to take on board all the varying attitudes in the community and try to bring together a consensus, a realistic and workable position, and I think it can be said that in many instances, in the reports that have already been placed before this House, the committee has been able to achieve that in relation to issues that have been highly controversial in the community.

To give the committee the opportunity to look at the various issues before the Government actually locks itself into a position (and then has great difficulty amending or varying that position), the Government of the day would do well to change the procedure whereby the references go to the Environment, Resources and Development Committee much earlier and the input from that committee could be of enormous benefit to the Government of the day in determining a position that is in the best interests of all South Australians.

The member for Napier has referred to the lack of resources available to enable the committee effectively to deal with the issues placed before it. Experience has shown that the main lack of resources has been to the committee itself in the backup services of specialists, perhaps in the form of accountants and economists who can have a specialist input into a reference that is before the committee. Also, there is a lack of resources available to *Hansard* in the workload that has been put on it to try to cater for the reporting of not only both Houses but also all the standing and select committees that this Parliament has operating from time to time. Without adequate resources for both the existing staff of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee and *Hansard*, committee members cannot adequately do their job.

I suggest the Minister give very serious consideration to increasing the resources in that area—not for the benefit of members of the committee but for the benefit of the Government and the people of South Australia because, with extra resources, the committee will be able to report more quickly. Further, it would save the Government a great deal of controversy which occurs from time to time with respect to many of the references. I support the noting of this report. I hope the Government will give serious consideration to the issues that have been raised by the member for Napier and me, and that additional resources will be forthcoming to enable the committee to give greater assistance to the Government of the day.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I support the motion to note the fifth report, being the first annual report of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee of this Parliament. This excellent committee was established in February 1992 as a successor to the Public Works Standing Committee, which had existed since 1927. Although the new committee has been operating for only a short time—as was mentioned by the previous two speakers—in my opinion it is working

extremely well. I previously served on the old Public Accounts Committee and also on the old Public Works Standing Committee. I believe that the new Environment, Resources and Development Committee, with the expanded membership including an Australian Democrats representative, is working very smoothly and more cooperatively than any other committee I have ever served on. The reason for this, I believe, is the qualities and personalities of the members of the committee, and I thank them for their cooperation, fairness and diligence.

I would also like to mention the staff of the committee—the secretary and the research officer—who do an excellent job under, at times, very difficult circumstances. The Environment, Resources and Development Committee has an enormously wide brief to investigate environmental and development issues. This brief is as wide as a piece of string is long and covers an enormous amount of area. The nature of the committee and the issues which it attracts make it a forum for grievances to be aired by the general public at large. The committee is quite time consuming, holding its own meetings, taking evidence, conducting public hearings, and carrying out site inspections around South Australia and sometimes interstate.

I refer to the four previous reports that have been tabled in this Parliament by the committee: the Waite redevelopment, the Mount Lofty Ranges Management Plan and SDP, supplementary development plans and the Craighburn Farm SDP. These were all fairly difficult and complex issues, and it was due to the way the committee worked together that all those reports were very well received by all members of the public, including those with differing arguments. The committee is currently investigating the Hindmarsh Island bridge, and that will go on for some time. Unfortunately, quite a few references have been put on ice (and these were taken up at the committee's own volition), including the MFP, Riverland, and other wide-ranging issues.

Unfortunately, because some of these other issues were referred to the committee by the Upper House, and also because of the supplementary development plans, those other issues will remain on ice until the committee has time to get back to them. I support the Chairman of the committee, the member for Napier, and also the member for Chaffey in respect of their remarks about the committee's resources. It does run on a shoestring budget, and it is not really fair. The staff really work hard, and until we can get more resources the committee will be somewhat hamstrung, so that needs to be addressed by the Parliament and Cabinet. A lot of things have been said by the two previous speakers, so I will conclude by saying that I am pleased to support the noting of the report.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): While I do not serve on the committee, I congratulate the Environment, Resources and Development Committee on this its fifth report and its first annual report. These committees are an integral and very important part of the Parliament, as all members who have served on them would be well aware. I think we are most fortunate in having someone with the skills and the expertise of the member for Napier serving on this committee. I do not have to praise him in this place. Over the many years that the member for Napier has been in this Parliament he has made a tremendous contribution. I know, Sir, you do not always agree with his style and sometimes his bad-mannered approach in the Parliament, but one can forgive him when one weighs up the scales, because he comes out a mile in

front. His skill, expertise and jovial approach, not only on this committee but also on previous committees and as a Minister in various portfolios, have served this Parliament very well indeed.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: And as a father and husband.

Mr HAMILTON: As a father and husband I would hope he has served his family well, but I will leave it at that. What I really want to talk about in relation to this is a matter that I consider to be very important. When the Parliamentary Committees Bill came before Parliament (and I do not want to go into a great dissertation about it), I warned the Parliament and expressed very strong concerns that the committees would not be adequately resourced, and I am still of that opinion. I believe that the Parliament erred in this and erred badly. It is one of the reasons why I did not wish to continue as Chairman of the new Economic and Finance Committee.

It is no reflection on the staff; I believe the staff and the people on the committee, past and present, have done an excellent job, but I suspect that the amount of money that was utilised to reorganise these committees would run into many tens of thousands of dollars. It is quite clear that I did not agree with the manner in which the committee system was organised. I wanted to place that on the record. It may not endear me to some of my colleagues—so be it—but I warned the Parliament, and I believe it to be unfair on the staff and on the committee members that we do not have adequate resources to service these committees.

Motion carried.

ENVIRONMENT AND LAND MANAGEMENT MINISTER

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I move:

That this House condemns the Minister of Environment and Land Management on his failure to provide a coordinating role for recycling programs and give sufficient attention to the urgent need to obtain markets for recycled goods and further condemns the Minister for attacking local government regarding its role in creating recycling programs and threatening heavy-handed legislation while refusing to take a more responsible role in this important matter.

Fortunately for this State, considerable interest has built up recently in support of waste minimisation, waste management, recycling and kerb collection. One of the very good things that have come out of that is the involvement of councils in many parts of the State in wanting to support and facilitate appropriate recycling and waste minimisation programs. At the outset I want to commend those councils and the individuals who have a part to play in those programs. One of the most frustrating things (and I receive representation on this matter with regular monotony) is the concern on the part of those people who are responsible for those programs over the Government's failure to provide an appropriate coordinating role. I believe that it is an important role—in fact, the most important role that Government can play.

I do not believe that Government should be telling councils how these programs should be run, and I do not believe the Government should be jumping on the councils if they are not run in a particular way, but I do believe that it is essential that the Government provides a coordinating role in regard to these programs across South Australia. My concern is that, if this does not happen, we will have a situation where in different parts of the metropolitan area—and indeed in the country—we will have programs going in different directions using different expertise. I believe that a

considerable amount can be gained from councils and individuals involved being able to learn from each other and supporting each other in their various programs. This Government has sat on its hands for a considerable period and has refused to recognise the importance of providing incentives and providing in particular a coordinating role for recycling programs.

The involvement of local councils is an important matter. All members of the House would be aware of the support that is being given to these programs, particularly in the metropolitan area, although I must say that in recent times during visits to country regions I have been most impressed with the work that is being carried out in regional areas by councils and by community organisations in organising appropriate recycling programs in various parts of the State. Councils are no longer overlooking the vast piles of waste; they are becoming green and, I would suggest, councils are becoming smart. Innovative recycling schemes are beginning in different parts of the metropolitan area, including the eastern suburbs. Mitcham and Marion council areas, for example, are putting together a very successful recycling program. In the eastern parts of the metropolitan area, five councils have introduced a user-pays garbage collection system; Burnside council took the lead by deciding to charge householders \$50 a year to own more than one bin; and at this stage the eastern region waste service, East Waste, is beginning to charge by weight for rubbish removal.

That relates to the eastern part of the metropolitan area. I am aware also that the Northern Adelaide Development Board has become involved. The board was established in 1975 by the four councils of Elizabeth, Gawler, Munno Para and Salisbury. The organisation is a regional economic authority charged with the responsibility to facilitate economic development in the northern Adelaide region.

It may seem a little strange for an organisation such as that to become involved in recycling, which has been recognised for some time as being more the responsibility of environmentalists rather than economists, but three years ago the four councils in forming the Northern Adelaide Waste Management Authority decided that they should do something about waste collection. I know that the members involved in those districts would be very much aware of what is going on out there and I hope they would be very supportive of the authority.

The public's acceptance in that area and demand for a recycling service was recognised by a special committee that was set up. However, the introduction of a kerb side program for the region was delayed to allow the State Government and local government to establish a metropolitan-wide strategy. The extent of delay in these discussions prompted the northern region to implement its own program in May this year. The response to the program far surpassed expectations and has received considerable support from people throughout the region. Again, I would commend that development board and the people involved in that program because it is one that is supported strongly by local ratepayers, and I recognise that this area will go forward and show significant initiatives in regard to waste minimisation and the formulation of recycling programs.

Another area that I have been interested in is the work carried out in Tea Tree Gully by the City of Tea Tree Gully. I think that all members received material relating to the work of Tea Tree Gully council in this area. We received a brochure 'Making Recycling Work by Understanding the Community'. The Tea Tree Gully Recycling Research Project

was developed to evaluate consumer recycling habits in the South Australian situation. It represented the first foray into establishing a recycling behaviour data base for a State that has container deposit legislation in operation. The intention was to build on interstate expertise and to provide a benchmark for general use by South Australian councils.

Tea Tree Gully council recognised the need for councils to be actively involved in planning waste minimisation strategies and to assist their communities in learning to minimise and recycle their waste. In early July 1991, the Tea Tree Gully council implemented the first phase of the consultant engineer's total domestic waste management plan for the city. The plan aimed at minimising waste and associated costs while improving worker health and safety. The report with which we have all been provided represents one way of evaluating a major part of that plan that recommended the move towards introducing a kerb side recycling collection service. The outcomes from the project also provided a means of quantifying the success of the waste minimisation strategy through the measurement of participation rates, product yields and other outcomes from the shift to a more frequent collection service.

Yet again, a very successful program is being implemented by one of the councils in the metropolitan area. As I said earlier, in referring to a particular program in the metropolitan area I do not want to take away from the excellent work and initiatives that have been undertaken in rural areas, not just by councils but by community organisations. Day after day I am made aware of such programs being introduced in various parts of the State. Some are very much in outback regions and are organised by people who have a concern for their community, who have a concern for the use of energy and who recognise the need for recycling and the collection of recyclable goods and the need to ensure that their own area is kept free of litter as far as possible.

While recognising that superb work being carried out by those people, we all know that recycling is absolutely useless if appropriate markets are not found for recyclables. Throughout history industries have recycled materials for one basic reason—because there was an economic incentive. For example, when raw material supplies were limited and difficult to obtain during the Second World War, steel cans and other materials were collected and re-used in the war-time effort.

Today, for example, in the United States over 40 of the States have recycling mandates. Many of these mandates require collection of recyclables but they do not require that the materials be utilised again in products. Now the desire to recycle is crashing head on with economic reality. People in the States have discovered that, without a market for the recyclable materials, it is not possible to 'close the recycling loop' and, when there are no markets, there is no recycling. That is the point I want to make, because this Government in this State has a responsibility to do much more than it is doing at the present time in finding appropriate markets for our recyclable goods. I repeat: when there are no markets, there is no recycling. People become cynical about recycling just for the sake of recycling. They want to ensure that, if they put something out to be recycled, it is not just going to be put in landfill just to get rid of it.

Finally, I hope that the Government will place more emphasis on the need to obtain appropriate markets. It is an important area and one that I would hope the Government would recognise. I want to say how disappointed I am, particularly given the work done by local government in

South Australia—and I have referred to some of that work—that the Minister found it necessary to come out publicly and say that, unless councils started doing more in recycling, he would be forced to bring down what I refer to as 'heavy handed' legislation. I believe that that view is inappropriate. I believe that what councils and people in South Australia are looking for is support for incentives to be provided. People and local government are looking for the State Government to provide a coordinating role to ensure that those programs are effective throughout South Australia. I urge the House to support the motion.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I oppose the proposition and do so for many good reasons. Members will recall a debate that took place yesterday although, as we are all aware, under Standing Orders I cannot refer to it.

I have no difficulty at all in supporting recycling of goods, but the community must support such propositions. A classic case in point is a proposal for a recycling plant at Royal Park. Sir, you would know the area very well because I suspect you go past it regularly. The proposed site is on the corner of Old Port Road and Tapleys Hill Road, Royal Park.

I have had a number of representations from local residents who are opposed to such a proposition. I asked, 'What proposition?' They said, 'The proposition for a recycling plant.' I said, 'Where is this information?' They said, 'Well, there is a proponent and we understand the information is with the local council.' I had to ring up the local council—and I offer no criticism of that authority—to obtain a copy of this proposal. I ask the question: if the community is not to be consulted in a way that makes them aware of what recycling plants are all about, what they intend to do and what a particular plant or plants are all about, how are we going to encourage the community at large to support such propositions?

In the Royal Park/Hendon area, and specifically in Royal Park, I am advised by my constituents that only 29 residents were advised that a recycling plant was to be located at the aforementioned locality. The area of Royal Park, as you, Sir, would be well aware, was for many years an area that needed to be refurbished; it needed to be upgraded; and it needed footpaths and roads, and so on. All that has happened in at least the past 14 years. That area is a credit to those residents who reside there. Young people have moved in with their families; new homes have been built and we have a very good suburb.

That suburb comprises people of many European nationalities. Some of them, because of their experiences during the last war and since, are afraid of authoritative figures. They are reluctant to sign petitions and in the main they are reluctant to respond to surveys when you knock on their door. As a local MP, I am reasonably well known within my electorate. I think I have a fair understanding of the feelings of my constituents. They feel aggrieved by the fact that they have not received adequate information, as late as yesterday, from the proponents. No information has been disseminated by the proponents of this proposal for the recycling plant in the areas of Royal Park and Hendon.

If I was to set up a recycling plant, one of the first things I would do would be to letterbox the area and let people know about my intention as a developer. I would invite them to the plant to view the plans of that proposal. This, I understand, has not occurred. Hence, I believe, the antagonism and the fear of what this recycling plant may do to the area. There are

many valid criticisms which I have enunciated in the Parliament in recent days.

If people want to set up recycling plants then, as I said, I believe they should be looking seriously at consultation with local communities. The bottom line is that local communities have a right; residents have the right to know. When I received the information, I distributed 2 000 leaflets in a matter of a day and a half to let people know that there was a proposal.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: They were indeed environmentally safe and on recycled paper, I hasten to add. In a day and a half, I walked every street in Royal Park distributing those leaflets into every letterbox in that area to let people know about that proposal for a recycling plant at the location I mentioned.

I advised them that they may wish to go to the local council to view those plans. I also advised them that, if they were unhappy with that proposal, they could lodge their complaints with the Planning Commission. I further advised—if they were aggrieved by the decision of the Planning Commission—of the appeal provisions and how they could go about that.

After receiving a number of responses from constituents, I found out—and this is something that I do not think many of us are aware of—that there is an environmental lawyers group operating out of the Bowden/Brompton area which can assist residents with their submissions to the Planning Commission.

Residents are entitled to know what is available to them. If the proponents of a particular recycling plant want that plant to pass the test, that information should be freely distributed amongst the residents in that area. It is my belief, based on the number of petitions and the number of people who have spoken to me when I have been letterboxing, that the residents are strongly opposed to this proposition, and in many respects I believe that the proponents have themselves to blame.

Nothing is worse than people being taken for granted or seemingly being taken for granted. I indicated what was available to my constituents in relation to this proposal. I received feedback from that, subsequently raised the matter in the Parliament and disseminated that information back into the community as to how I felt about the proposal. There is no doubt from the number of petitions which have been taken up to be presented to the Planning Commission, the Parliament and, I understand, to the local council that the proponents of that development really have a fight on their hands. I think it is sad.

The consultant's report is the only one available, as I understand it, in the Woodville Council Chamber for my constituents to view. It is only natural, I suspect, that a consultant be engaged to promote that development. There is no criticism of that plant or development. So, what can people expect of it? They say, 'You are only agents there. You are promoting it. We want the facts. What is a balanced approach to this proposal?'

It gives me no pleasure to make these comments, because I am a great believer in recycling. Over the years, in terms of the environment—whether the pollution of the West Lakes waterway, the sand dunes, the beaches, the drains into the Port River or noise control matters—I believe I have been equal to most members in this Parliament in pursuing those issues.

The issue has to be solved and it has to be solved by a process of education of those people in the community. And, in particular, we cannot and should not take our ethnic communities, our European cousins, for granted.

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

RURAL SECTOR

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I move:

That this House recognises the extent of the rural recession and the importance of rural South Australia to our economy and social structure and urges the Government to implement both short and long term policies which will ensure the rural sector is once again restored to a place of importance.

We know only too well the situation as it applies to the rural sector at present. Almost every area we look at has been hit hard in the past few years. I could consider wheat, barley, wool, pigs—the list goes on. The rural sector has had nothing but bad luck for too long. On a weekly basis farmers come to me and say, 'John, are you aware of just how bad things are?' I guess it is easy for me to say, 'Yes, I am', but every person has their own individual story of hardship and they have to overcome it to the best of their ability.

It goes back many years, but principally to 1989 when wool prices first started their downward trend, which culminated in the crash in 1990. I have highlighted before how some farm incomes went from a real surplus of about \$30 000 to a negative income of \$10 000 to \$20 000 in one year simply because of the collapse in wool prices. At the same time, commodity prices, particularly for wheat and barley, were also experiencing considerable downturns. Farmers found that it was hardly profitable to grow crops, particularly in areas where the climatic conditions were not as good as they could have been. They were also hit by rising costs.

At that stage interest rates were very high. Many farmers had been affected by the high interest rates of the late 1980s and early 1990s. We well remember that the then Premier, Hon. John Bannon, in answer to Opposition calls for a lowering of interest rates and for help to the rural sector, said that interest rates were not a critical factor to the rural sector. How wrong he was. It hit people hard, and many are still suffering from the effects of those interest rates even though interest rates have come down considerably. They are suffering because their debt went up. I recall that one farm enterprise in my electorate borrowed about \$600 000 and by the early 1990s that had increased to \$1.2 million. It had doubled because of the high interest rates, and they still have to pay off that double amount of debt.

Let us consider the cost of chemicals, machinery and fuel. We have had a debate today on fuel and how the Federal Government has shown no mercy to the rural sector at all. It even went through my mind last night that the Federal Government had not been happy enough to disadvantage the rural sector through high interest rates and so many other imposts, but now it wanted to get more people off the land by imposing even higher fuel costs. It is a great tragedy. As one Opposition member said, not only will the farmers and the rural producers generally be hit, because the whole of our transport costs will increase and, therefore, the cost of all goods will increase, but women and children will be among those hardest hit because they rely on the family car for which there is no reimbursement of fuel taxes. They will have to limit their outings; they will suffer as much as anyone.

How we wish that a Federal Liberal Government had been put into office. Today, instead of the latest petrol price rises, we would be paying 30¢ less per litre than we will be paying.

Not only increases in costs and lower prices for commodities but many other fees will hit farmers, particularly through the businesses with which they deal. I refer to fees for licences for holding dangerous substances, a separate fee for a fuel seller's licence, licence fees that a rural air-conditioning repair firm, for example, must pay. Now we find that many rural businesses have to take out tax audit insurance because they may be subjected to a tax audit. The cost is so great, between \$10 000 and \$20 000, that they have to take out special insurance. That is another impost on top of the many imposts they already have.

We recognise that many of the factors causing the rural recession exist outside this country. World commodity prices are one such example. Also, there are the unfair subsidies that the European Community and the United States have applied to their commodities. It goes against the spirit of the GATT negotiations, and it hits Australia, as a small country, much harder than most other countries.

We then have the natural occurrences. We have had unusual weather in the past year through storms and floods. It appeared that farmers in my area, for the first time in many years, were going to have a bumper season. In many cases they were going to get out of debt but, just when the golden harvest was ready to pick, storms flattened, ruined and downgraded it, and farmers were often left with nothing or very little.

Now the mice have come on top of that. The number of farmers who have had to resow hundreds, if not thousands, of acres has been phenomenal. A thousand acres resown represents an enormous cost. The mouse plague has cost most farmers thousands, if not tens of thousands, of dollars in additional cost that they could well do without.

The weather has not been performing as it should. We have not really had an opening rain. It has been dry, and many areas have had only just sufficient rain to keep going. Thankfully, we are now getting 10 to 20 points, and occasionally some areas have received 50 points, but it is very unseasonal. One farmer said to me, 'We have got the mice and we are going to get the locusts. Let's have the drought this year and get it all over and done with—we will all be flattened—so that we can start again next year.' That is the attitude of many farmers. I admire and commend farmers for their resilience: they keep going even though one negative factor after another besets them.

My motion refers to the effect on our economy. We should recognise that the rural sector contributes in excess of \$2 billion to this State's economy in most years. It is estimated that it will be nearer \$2.5 billion for the financial year just ended, and that is a phenomenal amount.

The Hon. T.R. Groom interjecting:

Mr MEIER: As the Minister interjects, if we add fisheries, which is only fair as it comes under the Department of Primary Industries these days, it comes to nearer \$3 billion. It is the mainstay of South Australia's economy, and it must be looked after if we want this State to have any hope of making a recovery. In that respect, the Government has to come in for its fair share of criticism. It goes back quite some years. During the debates in the early 1990s, when I sought help for the rural sector, the then Minister, now Premier, invariably pooh-poohed the idea.

I will remember addressing the United Farmers and Stockowners, now known as the South Australian Farmers

Federation, on the concept of diversification. A few days later I was ridiculed in this House by the then Minister of Agriculture, the now Premier, for having suggested some of the diversification measures. He laughed at me. The irony is that some years down the track, belatedly, the now Minister at least has seen the light and is actively encouraging diversification, and I must give him full credit for what he is doing. It is a tragedy that it was not started some five years ago and certainly some three years ago. Another example is what happened with respect to emus.

Back in 1990 I pleaded with the Government, the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Environment and Planning to change the regulations so that emu farming could start immediately, and at that stage Western Australia had been farming emus for at least two years. When did it finally occur in this State? The farmers are certainly about to start processing and so on, but I do not know whether it is legal yet—it will be later this year. Too late, once again. There is also the oyster industry. In the early years, when the oyster industry was establishing, five Government departments were all trying to get a share of the tax grab. The oyster growers, many of them ex-farmers who had diversified into oyster farming, were screaming and saying, 'Please lay off us. Let us get going.' Five different departments were trying to get their grab—it was an indictment on this Government.

The Hon. T.R. Groom: I have given them \$130 000.

Mr MEIER: Well, the Minister says he has given them \$130 000. Again, he is acting. Why did his predecessors not give them anything over the past five years? I can refer to live sheep exports. We all remember the name Al Mukairish and what that company did for South Australia. We exported hundreds of thousands—if not millions—of sheep from South Australia. I had a very good working relationship with the chief executive here in South Australia. Some years ago he said to me, 'If South Australia does not do the right thing by us, you can say goodbye to our live sheep export trade'. I pleaded with the then Minister of Agriculture, the now Premier, to personally intervene when the dispute was on back in 1990, and he refused to do so. He said that it was out of his hands. Members know what happened—we lost the whole of the AL Mukairish trade. It set up operations in New Zealand, and South Australia has never recovered. It is an absolute indictment on this Government.

It is high time that the Government started to take more note of the rural sector. It is time that it started to implement more positive programs. We heard the Minister say earlier today that 2 850 rural assistance applications for exceptional circumstances have come in, but when a farmer tries to show initiative such as undertaking hay baling in addition to his normal farm activities he is refused rural assistance for interest rate relief. So, the poor farmer who tries his best to keep going—because if he did not diversify and expand he would not get anywhere—is penalised by this Government still today. I could cite other examples. I am sure my colleagues will highlight other areas such as sales tax, the anti-dumping legislation and the like and the many positives that a Liberal Government will undertake for the rural sector. I urge all members to support this motion, and I hope that the Government will rethink the attitude it has adopted towards the primary sector over a long period.

Mrs HUTCHISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):

I move:

That this House views with concern the lack of response by the Government to the issues raised by the Government Management Board in its report on SAFA and demands that immediate action be taken to rectify areas of deficiencies and malpractice identified in the report.

In April of this year a report was brought down entitled 'A Report on the Review of the South Australian Government Financing Authority'. It was, in fact, a very significant report but to date we have no reaction or response from the Government. The difference with this report compared with some of the others that I have seen is that there is normally a summary and recommendations in the front. I am sure that, if the committee had summarised the activities of SAFA, it would have been very critical about SAFA's practices in recent years.

I will outline some of those areas of conflict and where I believe there has been misuse and lack of attention to detail. Of course, there is potential for future damage because of the way in which SAFA has been conducted. I will report on a number of matters in the very limited time that I have available. First, the report highlights the fact that SAFA has had \$3.8 billion in arbitrage; in other words, it has been playing the money market. In fact, the report states that this was a very risky business and that the Government was getting only \$20 million worth of gain from the exercise. A retort that I heard at a recent function was that we need it to balance our various liabilities. Well, I have checked with some of the other financing authorities and they tell me that they would not place at risk \$3.8 billion out there in the market place where it was earning only \$20 million.

The report mentions the capital gains on the SAFT assets of \$93 million in 1991 which were brought to account and which should have been used to offset long-term liabilities. In 1991-92 some \$247.5 million was brought to account which should also have been offset against long-term liabilities. The report mentions the common public sector interest rate of \$70 million being gained from the 1 per cent levy that is placed on departments and authorities. That is an unconscionable practice. In some cases it really amounts to a capitalisation of interest in the non trading enterprise areas. The report also mentions the fact that ETSA gives a \$45 million extra contribution over and above what it should be paying on its borrowings. It talks about whether guarantee fees should be treated as revenue for budget purposes and it suggests that they should not.

The report questions the equity interest in Woods and Forests and the fact that SAFA has provided capital to Woods and Forests. When Woods and Forests defaulted, it was treated as equity. It questions the exposure to 333 Collins street and the ongoing losses associated with that venture. In terms of the Torrens Island Power Station, the leaseback deals have come back to kick the Government in the face in terms of taxation liabilities, and that should be looked at in terms of the capital gain that was made from those leaseback deals. These were taken into account at the time of the deals, therefore a false profit was created. It fed more money into the 1989 election budget, and that must be questioned.

Debate adjourned.

At 5.35 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on Orders of the Day: Other Motions.

LEADER'S STATEMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Meier:

That this House congratulates Liberal Leader Hon. D.C. Brown on his recently released statement 'Make a change for the better' and acknowledges the vision and positive benefits for South Australia's future contained within the 'Freedom to grow' Liberal vision statement.

(Continued from 11 August. Page 197.)

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Obviously, I oppose this motion. Some time ago I endorsed in this House some actions taken by the member for Goyder when he was unceremoniously dumped from the Opposition front bench, when his obvious talents had been completely ignored by the then Leader of the Opposition (the member for Victoria) and, being the person that I am, I made a speech in this House—

Mr Hamilton: An impassioned speech.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: It was an impassioned speech, yes, praising the member for Goyder for the dignified way he had accepted this slap in the face from the member for Victoria. In fact, my contribution was printed in full by the *Yorke Peninsula Times*. I understand that not only did the stocks of the member for Goyder go up but also my own, which was quite surprising, because that is deep redneck Liberal country. For a Labor member such as I to be held in some degree of esteem was quite encouraging.

Having said all that, I would like to turn the clock back and say to my friends in *Hansard*, 'Disregard what I said way back then; shred it,' because what we had last week in this motion was the biggest piece of downright grovelling and crawling I have ever had the misfortune to hear in this House. It was a blatant attempt by the member for Goyder, because the Liberal Party feels that victory is in its grasp, to get back on the front bench. That is all it was. You can shake your head, Sir, but I can assure you that it was.

I will not upset the many readers of *Hansard* by again quoting it in this House, but it reads like a story in the *Readers Digest*. It starts off:

On Saturday 26 and Sunday 27 June a very important function occurred in this city.

You were in Sydney, Sir. You were lucky: you did not have to hear it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the member for Napier that the actions of the Presiding Officer in the conduct of his duties in the service of this House are not a matter for the motion before this House.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The honourable member earlier today took a point of order in respect of the use of the word 'you'. He referred to 'you' then, Sir.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The member for Napier well knows that reference to any member here will be by way of his or her electorate or the position he or she holds in Parliament.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I take your warning, Sir, and I would like to ask: do I get 15 minutes, because I am the lead speaker opposing this? I do not think I have gone through eight minutes already. The member for Goyder continued:

It was the Liberal State convention, held at the Convention Centre, at which the many hundreds of people present enjoyed a

stimulating two days. In fact, they also enjoyed a magnificent speech by my Leader. . .

That is not my Leader, Sir, but the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Dean Brown. Then the member for Goyder read into the *Hansard* the complete speech. He did that because the media had taken no notice of that 'vision speech' that the Leader of the Opposition had made at the Liberal Party convention. Nor, in fact, had the television media taken any notice—

Mr MEIER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the member for Napier said that I read the whole of the speech into *Hansard*. I hardly touched on it because of the time limit of 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The member for Napier.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Thank you, Sir, and I thank you for your protection. He went on about it because no-one had taken notice. All the Liberal faithful were there, along with the affiliates. They were all there with their coloured balloons, and no-one reported it. So, the member for Goyder had to get the salient points of that speech into *Hansard*, thus inflicting misery on those faithful people who read the words that appear in *Hansard*. I would not be at all surprised if, when those people do read it, they need to take a couple of Quick-Eze or something like that to settle their stomachs, after reading some of the garbage and drivel that the member for Meier read in this House—member for Goyder, Sir.

Mr MEIER: On a point of order, Sir, the honourable member got my electorate wrong, and also I do not like the way he referred to the excellent material that I used in the debate last week.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is having trouble working out what the points of order are. Is the member for Goyder serious?

Mr MEIER: I was very serious, Sir. The honourable member referred to me as 'the member for Meier', and it is the second time this session that has occurred. I am the member for Goyder.

The SPEAKER: I ask the member for Napier to use the right terminology for members in this House.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I do apologise: I was confused. I called the member for Goyder the member for Meier. That was not a malicious attack—

The SPEAKER: The Chair does not believe it was.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: No, Sir, it is the last thing I would do. In fact, I have nothing but pity for the member for Goyder when he has to bring motions such as this in an attempt to move onto the front bench. It just shows what people will do to get a big white car and a hefty increase in salary. They say that some men cannot be bought. That is a fallacy: all men can be bought, and the price of the member for Goyder is a big white car and a Minister's salary, if they ever make him one. That is the way he is prepared to lower any integrity—

Mr MEIER: On a point of order—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Goyder will resume his seat. The Chair believes that the member for Napier is now reflecting on the member for Goyder, and I would ask him to withdraw that and be careful of the comments he makes.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Gladly, Sir. I do withdraw that and humbly apologise to the member for Goyder. I did get carried away. I will now go into the substance of my

opposition to this rather frivolous, trivial motion that he puts before the House. In fact, one can give some credit and praise to the member for Goyder because, for the first time, the world has heard of the policies that the Liberal Party will pursue at the next election. It was right at the far end of the speech, when the member for Goyder outlined the principles for promoting economic growth. He stated:

1. To encourage a competitive outlook in the south Australian economy.

I could not think of any more pure gobbledegook than that sentence. What does it mean? It means nothing. Motherhood: pure rhetoric, aimed at five year olds, in effect saying, 'If you behave yourself, I will give you an extra lolly and you can go to bed'. The second point was:

To recognise that businesses are best run by people and not the Government.

Where is the substance to the philosophy of the Liberal Party at the next election? The member for Eyre—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:—will really like the third point, as follows:

Minimal Government regulation of business.

I ask you, Sir, to recall that, every time a Minister of Labour in this House has brought forward legislation to reduce regulations against small business, we have been defeated. Members opposite voted against us every time in respect of eggs, potatoes and bread. The member for Eyre is the champion of small business, and the member for Kavel professes to be the champion of small business yet, every time we have brought in legislation to reduce the constraints on small business, the Liberal Party has been the first to wimp and scream and talk about the need to have those regulations in place.

The fourth point refers to the lowest possible Government taxes, charges and fees. What does that mean? The good people of South Australia want that spelt out; they want to know whereabouts Government taxes, charges and fees will be reduced. We almost had an indication from the Leader this afternoon. I know that I should not refer to a debate and I will not do so but, when the Leader hinted that there would be a significant reduction in petrol tax, is that what the member for Goyder is on about? I do not think so, because in all probability the fact is that when the Leader's speech writers prepared his speech they had only five minutes to spare and cobbled up these eight points so that the Leader could fill up his time.

The fifth point—and this would sound really hollow to members of the South Australian Institute of Teachers—refers to world-class education and employment training institutions. I have yet to hear any member of the Opposition stand up and give any form of praise to any initiative taken by either this Government or the Federal Labor Government referring to employment training in any form whatsoever. Such initiatives are ridiculed all the time, and members opposite come up with this bland statement, 'We don't want training, we want jobs.' I suggest that the member for Goyder remind his Leader that the next time any employment training program is announced—and there were plenty announced last night in the Federal budget—the Opposition should give it some support.

The sixth point is 'to ensure that institutes of vocational education are real alternatives to universities': what does that

mean? I ask the member for Goyder, who was a teacher—a very good teacher, I understand—what that means. Perhaps during the dinner break he can come over and explain it to me. He should explain it not only to me but also to his Leader, because the Leader does not understand what it is all about.

The seventh point is 'to work on an industry by industry basis to support improved standards of production and specific new types of investment with a focus on various areas'. That long sentence was the way it was put out by the Leader. The Liberal Party, with its industrial policy, has been hell bent on destroying the trade union movement, the wages system and the great record that we have in this State in having fewer stoppages than any other State in the country. This Liberal Party's policy is a blueprint to create industrial havoc. The member for Goyder knows it, his colleagues know it and so does the Leader of the Opposition, but they dare not release it before the next election: it will be a typical Kennett-Court style of policy release—if they get in they will release it the day after.

The eighth point and final point is 'in partnership with specific industries, to develop plans for their growth which remove Government impediments to that growth'. In the time that I have had the honour to be a member of this place I have continually heard members opposite, at different times and in differing degrees, demand that there should be Government involvement in the private sector. On the one hand, they say that the Government should get out of the private sector, but every time they say we should promote growth in the private sector (in particular the member for Kavel is always saying this) they demand some form of Government subsidy, incentive, tax relief, coddling and pampering, etc., and then they will be able to get on with the job. The member for Kavel looks a little bemused: he has every reason to be, because he knows nothing about what is going on. Obviously, the Leader of the Opposition does not let him know what is going on because today's performance proved that the member for Kavel is still a real threat to the Leader. The member for Kavel may give us a modest smile, but it was a damn fine speech, John; I appreciated it. I oppose the motion.

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): I support the motion, and I will outline the backdrop. The last time a Liberal Government was in power, it put in place the Roxby Downs project, the most significant project in this State, which will generate royalties for the benefit of this State and future South Australians for about 100 years. No other Government has put in place a project of such significance for the long-term benefit of this State. The last Liberal Government also put in place the Stony Point plant and the establishment of Technology Park. We were involved in the establishment of the first international hotel for South Australia. We cajoled the Federal Government to put in place our international airport.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: At least we got the airport there, and we established it with international flights for this State and this city. We put in place the O-Bahn, a new system, and people from around the world now come to look at its successful operation. The River Torrens Linear Park was the last Liberal Government initiative and, of course, there was land rights and the negotiation of the agreement with the Pitjantjatjara people and putting in place significant land rights legislation in South Australia. That is the backdrop of the significant achievements of the last Liberal Administration in this State.

We can compare that with the legacy that we now have as a result of the Administration of the past 10 or 11 years. We all know we are bankrupt; that is the first point. Let us look at the failed projects: the Glenelg foreshore redevelopment; Tandanya, Kangaroo Island; the Wilpena development; the Mount Lofty project; the Marineland redevelopment; the Marino Rocks development; and the paper recycling plant that was highlighted during the last State election campaign as a bold new initiative of the then Bannon Government—where are they? We have not seen any more of them. Then there is the Victoria Square facelift; desperate on the Monday of the last week of the campaign, the Labor Party trotted out some plans to reshape Victoria Square. Where is that? The O-Bahn to the southern suburbs, the third arterial road and the major expansion of our Art Gallery are failed initiatives.

The Labor Administration is bankrupting this State and leaving a legacy that this State and future generations will have to pay for. There is a stark contrast: achievement and failure. And it is on the basis of that stark contrast of the achievement of the last Liberal Administration and the failure of the past 10 years that we talk about, as Arthur D. Little said, the decade of lost opportunity, the decade of wrong policy direction of this Administration. To cite the Arthur D. Little report, the Labor Administration would shoot at any bird that flew past; so bereft was it of policy initiative, planning and vision that it would grasp at any straw that floated past on the basis of policy initiative. What did it bring it? Clearly it has brought it failure after failure after failure.

In the mould of the last Liberal Government, there will be the next Liberal Government, whenever that might be—and I hope it is sooner rather than later. Based on the current polls, I hope we go to the election sooner rather than later, and certainly, given the result of the Federal budget last night, I have no doubt there are one or two more members over there counting the cost of the Federal budget, because it will cost them their seat. We will be delighted to sit on the other side of the House to look at different pictures for a change; there will be a large number of members on our side with very few people on this side as a result of people judging the track record and the performance of Labor Administrations nationally and in this State.

It was based on success versus failure, the stark contrast between the two styles of government, the two policy directions of government, that the vision statement was delivered by the Leader at the convention in June. It sets out the parameters upon which a future Liberal Government would operate—clear parameters that have an underlying theme in them and a very important theme, namely, to restore incentive for people to do things for themselves, to encourage them to go out and earn more and to expand and to restore incentive in the small business sector.

We have heard over the past decade only lip service about small business—the engine room of the economy. If it is the engine room of the economy, why has Labor been starving it through costly regulations and through high taxes and charges to the extent that, where we had a competitive advantage in this State *vis-a-vis* other States of Australia, it was totally wiped out—totally destroyed? That is why Email, Kelvinator and other companies are leaving South Australia to establish in the eastern states, because it is cheaper to run a manufacturing plant in the eastern States now rather than in South Australia. The great Playford foundation of building up manufacturing and job opportunities in this State on the basis that we are a low cost State has been totally destroyed by Labor Administrations.

Mr Venning: It will get worse, too.

Mr OLSEN: And it will get worse, there is no doubt about that, if they have the opportunity to continue in government. They will not, because the polls are clearly indicating they will not. What we need to do is to restore incentive and encourage people to come back to South Australia to access those boardrooms where the decisions are made about the plant—the infrastructure—that creates the jobs. We have to set the climate, and the vision statement released by the Leader in June sets those parameters: to restore incentive and to give freedom for people to grow again rather than the shackles, the restrictions and the constraints that we have seen Labor Administrations put on small and medium business in this State.

What we want is what the vision statement says: a vibrant economy, growing and exporting to the rest of Australia. Instead of our getting white goods back into South Australia from the eastern states, we want to reverse that trend, as it was in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s. We want to cut out what we have seen in the 1980s in the reversing of that trend. We are in a global market situation now, and we have to access those global markets. We have to be competitive in this State. To be competitive in this State, we cannot have WorkCover costs greater than in other States or in countries that are our international competitors. We cannot have electricity tariffs greater than those interstate or internationally.

It is no longer good enough in this State to compare our costs with those of the eastern States. We have to compare ourselves with Indonesia, Korea, Taiwan; that is where the competition is coming from now. They are the markets we have to access. It is all very well for the member for Mitchell to chuckle away, to chortle away, in relation to that; if he does not think that we have to meet global competition, he is living in a dream world, much as the one in which the former Premier operated—if you have a problem, ignore the problem, hope it will go away, do not address it, do not correct it, do not put the State on an even keel to overcome the hurdle of the problem until the problem comes and hits you in the face and causes devastating damage. We have seen that with the State Bank, with Scrimber, with Marineland and so we can go on, list after list of projects which this Government has mishandled, bungled and mismanaged.

South Australian businesses need to make a world mark with the quality of their production. That means encouragement and education to meet the quality standards of the world and getting Government regulation and unnecessary restrictions off the business community. This Government has been working for almost a decade on a one-stop licensing operation; we still have not got there. The deregulation adviser presented the first draft to the Government but it was too difficult for it to tackle, because I presume South Terrace told North Terrace, 'That is not the legislation you will put in place.' So, we had to do not one but two drafts of the original before the Government would release the deregulation report to the Parliament and before it was acceptable to the Government.

It is about time the advisers to Government who are putting up practical solutions to the problems had the capacity for those practical solutions to be put on the table in the Parliament. It is certainly the basis upon which the vision statement tackles it, that is, you give encouragement to new policy directions for the future. We need regional growth to help our primary industries. The fact is that 30 per cent plus of our export income is coming from our rural areas in South Australia. They are very important to us. Last year the

increase in State fuel tax added the cost of \$1 000 per farm, per year to the cost of operation. At a time when those small farming units—small business operators—were impacted by the cost of operation, this Government compounded it by putting in extra costs, taxes and charges.

We have seen the widening of the wholesale sales tax and the increasing levels of those sales taxes. The Federal Government says that that will not impact on our exports. That is wrong; as economists will tell you, some 60 per cent of that will wind its way into the cost of exports.

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

Mr S.G. EVANS: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I am extremely pleased to support the motion of the member for Goyder. The Federal budget that came down in the past 24 hours again condemns the Labor Government for its appalling lack of concern for the Australian people. We have seen the Premier stand in the House today and again show his lack of concern because, although it was pointed out to him that there were areas of the Federal budget that undoubtedly would affect the people of this State in many different areas through tax increases, the Premier refused on behalf of this State to appeal to the Federal Labor Government prior to budget submissions to look at the effect that those increases and measures would have on this State.

The Premier's answer was to contact the Federal Labor Government, but only last week and well out of the time when any submission to the Federal Government would have any impact on any changes to the Federal budget. In contacting the Federal Labor Party last week, the Premier admits, his contact was in the form of a letter. That was a letter with a cost of 45¢. That reflects the amount of concern that the Premier has shown for the people of South Australia. It is no wonder that the people of this State are calling for a change, and this motion contains the words 'Make a Change for the Better'. No-one need question the reasons we need a change for the better or why we need the freedom to grow. The Liberal vision inherent within our policies and those still to be released is definitely, and will be found to be, for the benefit of South Australia.

There is no reason to question that, because the Government of this State has no policies itself, it has no direction and it has no vision. The only statement that this Government has made that is at all positive for the people of this State is, 'We can guarantee that we will give businesses more bankruptcies, and we can guarantee that we will take more business head offices out of this State, we can guarantee that we will mismanage your money as we have mismanaged your money in the past.' That is a statement of this Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Newland.

Mrs KOTZ: Thank you, Mr Speaker. More than 40 000 people seek emergency help in this State. Is that not an indication of why this State needs to see not only a change of Government but a Government that will look to the protection and the concerns of the people? We can look at the emergency financial assistance paid out by the Department for Family and Community Services for people in this State to buy food and other essentials and we can look at the fact that that area of financial assistance has increased more than four-fold over

the past 10 years. We can see it has increased from less than \$500 000 in 1981-82 to more than \$2 million last financial year. We have more than 40 000 people a year seeking emergency financial assistance in this State, and that is a disgrace.

That is why the people of South Australia are looking for a change. That is why there is a vision within the Liberal Party and it is why when the policies are released no further questions will need to be asked about where this State will be going and who should be taking the people in a more positive direction. We have not seen any positive direction from this Government in the last term of Government or even over the last decade. If we wanted to look at the supposed achievements of this Government, what type of achievements could we actually list? The only achievements that I can think of—and it appals me to think that I am misusing the word ‘achievement’—involved the loss of taxpayers’ funds. The very loss of those funds is now being reflected in the services we no longer have. The education systems are being totally run down. The children of South Australia are being put at risk because of a lack of financial assistance to schools.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

Mrs KOTZ: The Minister sits there and tells me that that is a nonsense, but 10 schools in the District of Newland require assistance with maintenance grants, assistance with resources and assistance for disabled children, which is a policy that this Government put into effect. It has placed disabled children into schools without giving schools the resources to back up the integration that is necessary to support those disabled children. That is a disgrace, because it is putting a greater strain on the parents of those children, the teachers, the staff and the community within those schools. It is an absolute disgrace, because it is the children and the students who are being disadvantaged because of a lack of financial assistance. This Government can no longer hope to provide that assistance in this State because of its State Bank debt and other money that it has lost.

I will cite some of the funds that could be used now if they had not been lost by the Government. We have State Government liabilities of more than \$13 billion, a State budget deficit of \$600 million over the past five years and State taxes are up 173 per cent in real terms. Let us look at the losses other than the \$3.5 billion lost by this Government through the State Bank. The Government also bailed out the SGIC with \$350 million of our money, we had Scrimber losses of about \$60 million and \$11 million in Marineland losses. The Entertainment Centre is a white elephant. I only wish that the former Premier would take his retirement soon, because his thespian antics are far more suited to the Entertainment Centre than to this Parliament, and on that centre we lost \$55 million.

Further, capital projects worth \$1.7 billion have totally disappeared. Where are they? They would make up for some of the job losses and provide some of the opportunities that this State has not seen. They are only some of the areas in which this Government has mismanaged the funds of this State—it has mismanaged taxpayer’s funds. As I say, we have only to look in other areas—never mind education—such as the health system.

Mr Holloway interjecting:

Mrs KOTZ: The member for Mitchell sits there with a silly grin on his face, but I wonder whether any of his constituents—and I am sure there must be some—require access to the hospital system and cannot get into it, and so

they have to sit at home waiting to see even a specialist before they can get onto a waiting list to go into a hospital.

The Minister stands here and tells us he has found \$34 million in the budget and we have patients in the hospital system who are not in the beds that this Government should be providing on behalf of the people of this State, but in chairs in corridors, and you—excuse me, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs KOTZ: —the member for Mitchell has the temerity to sit there with a silly grin on his face as if none of that is important. I assure him that it is. And the constituents—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mrs KOTZ: We have another member over there who wants to throw a comment in. Apparently Government members do not have constituents who require some of the services that are being denied because this Government has totally misused, misappropriated and mismanaged State funds.

What this country needs and what this State needs is open and honest Government. We are not getting it from the Labor Government; we are not getting it from any of the Ministers we have seen parading one after the other with no policies, no vision and no idea where this State is going—Ministers who continue to take us down a road where more and more of our funds are being lost. This Government is a disgrace. What we need is a change for the better, the freedom to grow, but we shall get the freedom to grow only with a change of Government, and that Government is going to be a Liberal Government.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I have much pleasure in supporting this motion. The Leader’s statement is in complete contradiction to what we have seen from this Government in the past three and a half years. It is a Government without vision, without hope, without any idea of where it is leading South Australia. Each Government member’s share for the State Bank alone is \$130 million. I include the member for Price who has just entered the Chamber and point out that that \$130 million could have been spent in his electorate or in the electorate of the member for Stuart. That is their share of the debt, for which their children and grandchildren will be responsible.

What are my long suffering constituents in the vast outback of South Australia getting from this Government? Under this document put forward by the Leader they will have the opportunity to again participate in helping to develop and provide income, jobs and a future for their children. That is what they will get; not vague promises; not half truths; not nonsensical statements coming from the member for Briggs, solely designed to get a headline and do nothing. They will have the opportunity to participate. This document clearly indicates that we are going to open up South Australia for business, whether it is in the primary industries—

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: What about education?

Mr GUNN: Mr Speaker, for the benefit of the Minister, of course education is important. The basis for any successful economy or community is to have highly educated, professional people but that opportunity has got to be there. My long suffering constituents who live in the isolated country areas cannot afford to send their children to participate. Look at what the Queensland Government does for its people living in isolated communities compared to what this Government has done.

Mr S.G. Evans: That is a Labor Government.

Mr GUNN: That is a Labor Government. It has carried on the Bjelke-Petersen tradition of looking after isolated people. The former Tonkin Government was the first Government in the history of this country to give any assistance—\$500 a year—to outback and isolated parents. This Labor Government has only increased it by \$200 in about 12 years, and inflation has far exceeded that. But in that time, of course, the economic situation has deteriorated. People are at their wits' end to know how they can participate and utilise the education facilities in this city or in the regional centres.

If the Minister wants to help I can give her a list. It is on my list of things to do this week to have a little chat with the Minister about one or two matters in my electorate requiring urgent attention. I am delighted that the Minister has interjected this evening because I will be again talking to her and bringing these matters to her attention. I am delighted with her interest in this particular matter.

Why is it that this Government has no vision and no understanding of how the real people are hurting? Why is it that there is such despair, heartbreak and anger in the community? Why is it that people do not regard politicians highly? It is because their confidence has been misplaced. They believed the political rhetoric that was put forward by the Labor Party who unfairly and unreasonably lifted the expectations of the community with no hope of ever delivering. What is required in this community above everything else is the creation of some incentive so that industry, business and commerce have the ability to employ—the creation of economic conditions so that the 30 to 40 per cent of young people who do not have a job are given the opportunity to participate in this community. The document released by the Leader will ensure that. Any society that allows such a large section of its community not to be employed is creating a social fabric that will have disastrous consequences in the future.

You cannot have such a large number of young people without any hope, without any future; otherwise you will destroy a whole generation and cause social unrest, crime and everything else that goes with that situation, and the overall cost to the community will be tremendous. There is no point in building more gaols: that is merely trying to hide the problem. There is only one thing to do and that is get rid of the nonsense, red tape, bureaucratic humbug and everything else for which this Government is responsible, and give the employers a chance to put those people back to work and create some export income.

The only thing that will save this community and this nation is to produce more and to create more wealth: there is no alternative. Nowhere else in the world has it been possible to lift the standards of living and provide better facilities for the underprivileged and the less well off. There is only one way, and that is to create a bigger cake so that it can be cut up and everyone can participate.

It does not matter what section of the economy is involved: that is the only way. Employers, companies and small primary producers must be given the opportunity to participate. You can have the best working conditions in the world but if you do not have people who are able to work it does not mean a thing.

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

Mr GUNN: As my colleague says, if you cannot sell the goods, what does it matter? What is it going to achieve? In the past 12 months the current Premier has done nothing to create the economic conditions which are absolutely essential

to resolving the current problems. Last night his bungling Federal colleagues drove another nail into the economic coffin for people who live in the isolated communities. I put it to you, Mr Speaker, how do you expect people to travel hundreds of kilometres to participate in normal social activities or to transport their goods when you have falling commodity prices; when we are competing under the most corrupt international subsidy arrangement that has ever been in place? The answer apparently is to increase your local producer's costs. Those people cannot afford to buy new motor cars.

I suggest that this Government go into some of those country towns and look around. Go to Coober Pedy and those places and look at the age of the vehicles there. See how those people are going to get on. See what their views are. They live hundreds of kilometres from Adelaide. I live farther west than any other member of Parliament has ever lived, some 650 kilometres from Adelaide. There are people who live a lot farther than that from Adelaide but who do not have a member of Parliament's salary to support them. They have to live on what they can earn.

Mr S.G. Evans: No STA bus.

Mr GUNN: They have no STA bus like those operating in the city which they are helping to subsidise to keep them on the road. This document put forward by the Premier-elect gives those people some hope, some opportunity, to participate and build a better South Australia. Surely that is what we all want. This Government has failed miserably. It should have the guts to go to the people so that this document can be put to the test and the electorate can make a judgment. They have been fooled for too long; they have been let down. However we make a judgment, this Government has failed.

No Government in the history of this country has so mismanaged the affairs of this State, yet this Government does not think it has done anything wrong and will not face the people. I challenge the Government to cut out the nonsense, dissolve this Parliament, face the State and allow the people to make a judgment and get a Government they deserve—a Government that will be hard-working and honest, putting the welfare of the people of this State first. There will then be no more State Bank disasters, no more Scrimber disasters, no more mismanagement and no more domination by minority extremist groups, but a Government which is interested in the welfare of the average South Australian citizen.

I have much pleasure in supporting the motion, which endorses the document put forward by the Leader. I have great confidence that Dean Brown will lead this State back into the kind of era that existed when we had a decent society. The best time in the history of this State was when Sir Thomas Playford was Premier and Sir Robert Menzies was Prime Minister. The people came first and commonsense prevailed.

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

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I was wondering for a moment what motion we were addressing. The document referred to, 'Make a change for the better', is interesting, and I must say one thing about it in particular: it does not require a great deal of intellect to read it and it does not require a great deal of time. Dean Brown and his team have learnt that telephone books are not the way to impress the electorate.

I remember when the 650-page document 'Fightback' came out—I think that was mark 1 and eventually it became

mark 2—there was a debate going on here about the goods and services tax. Following that debate, in which I participated, a member opposite said to me, ‘I suppose you have read the whole of the document.’ I said, ‘That is not the point. The point is that you have got to get the world out there to read it.’ I must say they did not do a bad job in the 18 months. They got quite a few to read it—or some of the key bits, anyway.

But this document we are now discussing does not suffer from that problem. I understand the education section is only two pages long. I was looking through the whole thing to find out what they were going to do about tertiary education. I was concerned about that, because from time to time a number of Opposition members have made a few statements about tertiary education. I could not find a reference to it at all. It is not there; it does not exist. One wonders why someone would offer such a ball up in the air to get smashed over the net.

A motion like this at the end of the day seems to me to be a silly waste of time in this House. I have no doubt that members opposite think that their two-page document on education and all the rest of it is something that they can sell to the electorate. I should have thought that would be a better use of our time than debating this stuff. I can understand that they have this issue to consider now and they want to turn every post into a winner but, really, in many respects there is not a lot going for it.

The debate this afternoon was puerile. I do not want to tell Opposition members which tactics to use, but I think they would have got much further this afternoon if they had not had that debate. Indeed, if they had had Question Time, I think they would have got a lot further. The reality is that they had a lame duck performance from the Leader that was so bad that a number of us on this side thought that he was going to go for a walk with the member for Murray-Mallee tonight. If he carries on like that, that is probably what will happen to him. He is going to go for a long walk: two are going out and one is going to come back.

There is no doubt that the best speech on the Opposition side today, which was not all that sincere—and I will come back to that in a moment—was that of the member for Kavel. He poured his heart and soul into it. Half of his speech was crying in his beer, or his wine, that they do not have a GST. That matter was included in most of the contributions of members opposite: if only things had been different on 13 March.

The reality is that they did not get the agenda up then. That agenda was a nasty, anti-social, arrogant agenda for supposed political reform in this country. One cannot say that about Dean Brown. One cannot say that he has an agenda that thick that he has yet taken to the public of South Australia. In fact, we are still waiting to see what half of the stuff is. We want to know on what issues, on what promises and on what agendas the future of the Liberal Party in this State hangs. We want to see what their attitude will be to education. A policy was released on industrial relations, although if one blinked one missed it. The reason is that there was nothing in it. We would like to know what they are going to do about health, education and a whole range of other issues. We and the community of South Australia would like to see what is going on.

I must say that the Opposition has been pretty cocky in the past few days. Walking around the corridors here today a couple of them were saying that the Federal budget was worth another 2 per cent to them and that they were going to make

the most of it. Then they came in here and cried crocodile tears about the cost of petrol and a whole range of other issues. I can only say that the debate this afternoon was particularly shallow, and I am sorry that a lot of it was not televised on the news tonight. I can well understand the media’s decision not to televise it, because it will upset their image of the way they would like to see things go in the future.

This motion is indeed a waste of time. I should like to see a motion like this come before the House when we have some policies with some meat and we know exactly where the Liberal Party and the leadership stand on issues before the electorate of South Australia. Unfortunately, we have been waiting for some time and we still have not seen that. They do not want to do a Dr Hewson. Dr Hewson gave us a telephone book full of nasties. These blokes do not want to bring out anything at all. They will sit there, and their assumption is that people will be fooled: they will not think that these blokes are the same as the Kennetts, the Courts and the Hewsons; they are not the same as all those other Liberal Parties that are running agendas all over the countryside attacking the basic living standards of working men and women and destroying the education standards of kids in our schools.

For instance, what will they do about all the small schools around the State? Will they do what their Victorian counterparts did? I bet they will. They will close all the schools. They will get up here and react to this and say, ‘No, we won’t do that,’ but at the end of the day, if they were to win, they would close all the unprofitable schools around the place irrespective of who will get hurt in that whole exercise.

Mr Meier interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: The good member over there is interjecting. I can only speculate that he wants to get back on the front bench with a motion like this. I must say that it was unfortunate that he was evicted from it some time ago under the last leadership. I know that in the past year or so he has been trying very hard. Indeed, most of us on this side find him very trying during Question Time.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr QUIRKE: I understand that he pulled the wrong chain twice. In this motion he is saying how good the leadership is and that this document has all the answers for the future. Indeed, most of us who have had a look at bits and pieces of this document can find very little in there at all, so the future does not have very much to offer. I must say that, where this is concerned, this is a much more constructive use of the time of the member who moved this motion. He spends most of his time in this place yelling abuse at members across the Chamber. In fact, this afternoon during the debate I think it is fair to say that the honourable member and many other members did their best to put a brave face on the fact that the Liberal Party is not up to this debate. Recently, I took my kids to see Disney on Ice, where they all met Mickey Mouse. One of them asked Mickey Mouse what he received for Christmas, and Mickey said that he got a Dean Brown watch.

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): What an appalling performance by the member for Playford. It is very clear that the member for Playford, and indeed other members of the Government who have spoken tonight, do not even understand what a vision statement is and do not understand that many businesses, including many Government organisations, use a vision statement to plan for their future. That is what this document is about. It is about planning for South

Australia's future and showing South Australians what it is that a Liberal Government is using as the basis for formulating its policies. I refer members to the top of page five of the Liberal Party vision statement, which states:

'Freedom to Grow' is not a detailed policy statement. As we approach the next State election, the Liberal Party will release a series of detailed policies based on our vision and policy directions announced in this statement.

So, for Labor members who have misunderstood what a vision statement is about and who do not understand how these statements are used worldwide, it is not surprising they did not understand what they had in front of them. If they had read the top of page five, they would have found out just a little about what it is they do not understand, because it explains what a vision statement is all about. We have a document that sets a vision for South Australia's future and details the problems that face our State. It also details some historical aspects of where our State once prospered and gives a vision for the future. In so doing, a number of pertinent directions are detailed in the statement.

First, I refer to the six principles of Government that are detailed in the vision statement. It is an important basis on which to start any policy formulation, and I will read them into the record for the benefit of Labor members who have not had the opportunity or the ability to read the statement, or did not ask us for a copy or have never attempted to obtain a copy. The six principles as set out by Liberal leader Dean Brown are:

1. Recognising that the single purpose of politics is to serve people of all ages and backgrounds and that Government policies must be made for people—people are not made for policies.

2. Having, as a Government, a well planned and clearly defined strategy for the growth of our State and its people.

3. Encouraging all South Australians to share common goals for our future through a genuine community partnership—one in which the public sector works with the private sector not against it—a true partnership between the Government and people at all levels from Parliament through the Public Service to community organisations, employers and their employees.

4. Leading with consistency and pragmatism from a strong philosophic base that strives to encourage the greatest possible freedom of the individual by running Government in the interests of the people—politicians must again be seen to be fighting for people before fighting for narrow Party interests.

Mr McKee interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: Mr Acting Speaker, it is interesting that the member for Gilles, of all members, interjects at that point, because I would have thought that the member for Gilles, beyond any member in this House, would be aware of the damage that can occur through internal Party bickering and faction infighting. The member for Gilles has the biggest cross of all to bear at this time. It continues:

5. Underpinning all actions and decisions of the Government with ethical principles of honesty, probity and equity.

I reflect on those words again—honesty, probity and equity. It was in this Parliament only today that we heard of a Premier who urged the Federal Labor Government to break election promises on tax cuts. A Premier who was prepared to sacrifice those principles of Government that the Liberal Party has put before the people—honesty, probity and equity. A Premier who is part of the same Labor Cabinet which for the 1989 election paid the State Bank money to artificially hold down interest rates. This Government has sacrificed those principles.

Mr McKee interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: Well may the member for Gilles again interject. It is an indisputable fact. It is on the record. This

labor Government effectively bribed the State Bank to keep down interest rates before the last State election. That sacrifices those basic principles.

Members interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: For the benefit of the interjecting Labor members, those basic principles are honesty, probity and equity. Members opposite seem to have forgotten what those words mean.

The Hon. R.J. Gregory interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: It is interesting that the Minister, of all people, ought to interject. The Minister's time will come.

An honourable member: He will pay the price, too.

Mr MATTHEW: He will pay the price. I am told that the polls for the seat of Florey are not looking very good for the Minister.

Mr Brindal: Is he one of the five?

Mr MATTHEW: Indeed, he is one of the five. The vision statement continues:

6. Ensuring that Parliament is effective in holding the Government accountable at all times to the people it serves.

That is another important principle that this Government has failed to uphold. It has failed to remain accountable to the people—it failed in that miserably. This Government lost in excess of \$3.15 billion in one financial disaster, not to mention the financial disasters caused through SGIC and the unfunded superannuation liabilities from the State Government Superannuation Fund. If the Government has told the people of the State the true extent of its indebtedness—and that remains to be seen—we could be facing a debt as at the end of this financial year in excess of \$13 billion, if we take into account unfunded liabilities. That is a tragic indictment. It is tragic mismanagement that has been forced on the people of this State.

Mr McKee interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: I am surprised that the member for Gilles continues to interject. I would have thought that he would want to take this to his Leader and say, 'Look, Mr Premier, you have failed me because some of these basic principles of government have not been adhered to, and because of the factional infighting of the ALP I have been done out of a job'.

Mr McKee interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: The member for Gilles of all people has no reason to interject in this Parliament.

Mr Quirke interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: I am surprised that the member for Playford wants to interject after his disgraceful performance in this House. There are a number of other things that we need to look at, beyond the six principles of Government—

Members interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: Just listen to them, Mr Acting Speaker. The natives are bellowing

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Quirke interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: The member for Playford is still going! He has a problem. Perhaps he has seen the polls for the seat of Playford. Perhaps even the money that went into the schools in the Playford district is not enough for him to retain his seat. It is important—

Mr Quirke interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: There he goes again.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Playford to order.

Mr MATTHEW: The member for Playford really does have a problem this evening. It is important in any vision for our State's economic future that we look at principles for promoting economic growth. I refer the member for Playford to page 18 of the vision statement. If he does not have a copy of the vision statement—and, judging by his speech I doubt that he has—he is welcome to have my copy. I am sure he might learn something from it. The statement outlines 10 principles, as follows.

1. Encourage a competitive outward looking South Australian economy.

2. Recognising that businesses are best run by people and not by the Government—

the member for Playford seems to have forgotten that—

allowing the Government to concentrate on serving people in education, health, community safety, environmental protection and the other responsibilities which provide the foundation for community growth and rising living standards.

3. Minimal Government regulation of business consistent with the public interest including much simpler and swifter procedures for development approvals.

4. The lowest possible Government taxes, charges and fees consistent with the obligation to provide necessary standards of essential services and certainly lower business taxes and charges in the Australian average—

that is something this Government has failed miserably to deliver—

5. World class education and employment training institutions and programs.

6. To ensure that institutes of vocational education are real alternatives to universities.

7. To work on an industry by industry basis to support improved standards of production. . .

8. In partnership with specific industries, to develop plans for their growth which remove Government impediments to that growth.

That is a vision. That is something on which our policies have been built, and that is something that this Government does not have. Its members do not even know what a vision statement is. This Government does not have a vision or a plan for the future of South Australia. The sooner this Government goes to the polls and gives the people a chance to throw it out once and for all, the better. And the member for Playford, the Minister (the member for Florey) and the member for Gilles will all be gone, to the benefit of the State.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I rise in support of this motion with a great deal of pleasure, after hearing some of the drivel tonight. I fully support my Leader (Dean Brown) and his recently released statement 'Make a change for the better'. I ask whether some members opposite have read it. They have referred to it but obviously have not read it. 'Make a change for the better' is the Liberal call to South Australians—'Freedom to grow', the Liberal vision for South Australia. What a relevant issue this is to be discussing right now in the dying throes of this Government—and it is dying, because it is well and truly on the nose. We are talking about a new tomorrow for South Australia; we are offering a change for the better.

It is a very timely statement and a very timely document to be released by the Liberal Leader (Dean Brown). At the moment it is very fitting to be discussing this because, as the Government knows, it has been failure upon failure, and the final straw was the Federal budget last night. South Australia has come to a complete halt, and for all intents and purposes it is bankrupt. The Liberal versus Labor philosophy can be summed up as achievement versus failure. This Government is no longer governing at all, apart from the Minister of

Primary Industries, who is doing an admirable job. I do not think any other Ministers are doing anything at all but waiting for the election to be announced. Only they know when that will be.

If you check the Government's record, any fair minded person, anyone with average intelligence, any person with any knowledge of economics, money or success would have to say that it is absolutely abysmal. Ten years of this Government and it is absolutely abysmal. Individual members opposite know that, and they often wonder who will be back with them after the election. Of the members here tonight, just one would be re-elected. I will leave them guessing who that member is, because it is a game of Russian roulette for members opposite.

Certainly, some lowly backbenchers at the moment will have some very high positions after the next election, because there will be only enough to fill the front bench. Certainly, it will be interesting to see who does survive. As the days go by, the Government backbenchers are becoming more worried. As the pendulum swings into the traditional Labor heartland, areas such as Albert Park and others, members opposite are becoming very worried indeed. If they only had the brains to go to an election after the Federal election, they might have had some chance.

Debate adjourned.

MOTOR VEHICLES (DRIVING WHILST DISQUALIFIED—PENALTIES) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Business and Regional Development): 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.

This Bill seeks to establish two penalty levels for the offences of 'drive while licence suspended' and 'drive while disqualified from holding or obtaining a licence'.

A person's licence may be suspended as a result of incurring 12 or more demerit points, under the Points Demerit Scheme, or a person may be disqualified for a breach of learner or probationary conditions. Alternatively, the person may be disqualified by order of a court.

At the present time the *Motor Vehicles Act 1959* makes no distinction between a first time offender and a person who repeatedly and deliberately drives while suspended or disqualified.

The use of suspensions and disqualifications as a sanction is intended as an aid in the enforcement of road law.

A person who drives while his or her licence is suspended or while disqualified undermines this system.

Persons who repeatedly and deliberately disobey a suspension or disqualification should be subject to a greater penalty.

The need for a greater penalty for a second or subsequent offence was expressed in a recent decision of the Supreme Court.

Therefore, the two penalty levels proposed by this Bill are division 7 imprisonment (six months), which corresponds with the present penalty, and division 5 imprisonment (two years) for a second or subsequent offence.

Clause 1. Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2. Amendment of s. 91—Effect of suspension and disqualification

Section 91(5) prohibits a person from driving a motor vehicle on a road while the person's licence is suspended or while the person is disqualified from holding or obtaining a driver's licence and prescribes a maximum penalty of division 7 imprisonment (six months). This clause increases the maximum penalty for a second or subsequent offence to division 5 imprisonment (two years).

Mr BRINDAL secured the adjournment of the debate.

LEADER'S STATEMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Meier (resumed on motion).

Mr VENNING: I was just saying how dismal the record of this Government has been and why the document 'Make a change for the better' is so relevant at this time. The Labor Government's achievements are listed as follows: State debts of over \$8 000 million; State Government liabilities of over \$13 000 million; a State budget deficit of \$600 million over the past three years alone; State taxes up 173 per cent in real terms under the Labor Government; and the State's credit rating down from AAA to AA-. That is an abysmal record.

The State Government blunders include the State Bank loss of \$3 150 million, costing \$300 million per annum in interest alone; the SGIC bail-out of \$350 million; the Scrimber loss of \$60 million; Marineland losses of \$20 million; the Entertainment Centre, which is a \$55 million white elephant (and the Government drew it out for three elections) Cabinet projects worth \$1.7 billion disappeared; and the State Bank bail-out blow out as a result of retirement packages. Unemployment is at record levels: 30 000 longterm unemployed, plus or minus 12 months; and hospital and housing waiting lists are at record levels. It is an abysmal record for any Government.

The people of South Australia just cannot wait to judge this Government, and they surely will. As I move around my electorate it is extremely hard to find anybody who voted Labor. Last Saturday morning a person in my hometown—and I never thought I would hear him say this—said to me, 'I will never vote for the bastards again'. This person has always voted Labor and been immensely proud of it. He said, 'I will never vote for the bastards again'. I will give members opposite his name if they want to know, because this person is so rotable that he does not mind who knows about it.

Out in the rural communities the Government is closing E&WS depots and ETSA depots and all the rest of it; and then there is the condition of our schools and roads. Every minute of the day people know the failures of this Government. It is a disgrace. We are making a change for the better. Even members opposite know that they have been members of a Government that has been the worst performer that this State has ever seen and, I hope, is ever likely to see. The Government's record will go down in the history books as the black decade, the decade of Labor, when everything it touched went down and when every project went black. It will take us years and years to get out of this.

What worries me is the inability of this Parliament to do anything about it. It absolutely annoys me, frustrates me and saddens me to think that, with three Independents in the Parliament, and given the consequent majority of one, this Government remains. And it will stay there, I am sure, until the last day, because members opposite know they will not be returning. They want to hang onto their white cars; they want to hang onto the perks of office to the very last second.

An honourable member: You bet!

Mr VENNING: That interjection is true. It looks like it will be 31 March 1994 before we see any hope of making a change for the better and giving people the freedom to grow. This whole issue is a disgrace to the Parliament because, if democracy ruled in this place, if this Parliament was accountable to the people, this Government would have gone a long

time ago. We are going to be dragged out to the last second. I hope that this Government goes in early November; it would do that if it had any honour left at all, but it obviously has not.

I would have thought that the member for Semaphore would say, as he has been saying for the three years that I have been here, that he would put this Government out when the time came—when the royal commission handed down its report. It has been a litany of whens and whens and whens, and ifs and ifs and ifs, and they are still there. It would appear that this Government is going to be there till the last second and that is a disgrace, because not only has this Government stopped governing but the State of South Australia has stopped functioning. Everything is in complete disarray. The public servants have never been in a worse situation. Their morale is at rock bottom.

For the sake of South Australia, I hope that this Government is out of the way before Christmas so that over the festive season people can at least have some hope for the future—some hope that in 1994 we will start the long climb, or at least stop the decline and start the slow climb out of this morass that South Australia is in. We have had 10 years of hard Labor, 10 years of failure and 10 years of absolute disgrace. Individually, members opposite are going to pay the price, because I know that many of them have been reasonable members of Parliament, but they have let these things happen and they will pay the price. They will go out of this place: I would say that between six and 10 of them will be left. It is going to be very difficult for the Government to function in that way.

If members want to see where we ought to be, they should just check Queensland. Why is Queensland doing so well? It is not because of the Goss Government: it is because Joh Bjelke-Petersen put down the roots, and we are losing all our industries to Queensland at the moment.

I have much pleasure in supporting this motion. The document Making a Change for the Better is very relevant right now. It is the Liberal call to South Australians, it is the freedom to grow and it is the Liberal vision for South Australia. I pay credit to my Leader for having a great part to play in terms of that document and its delivery, and I to look forward to serving under him as the next Premier of South Australia.

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): It is a pity that we are having this debate this evening: there are so many more important issues facing the State at the moment. Nevertheless, since the member for Goyder has moved this motion, presumably because he wishes to ingratiate himself to his colleagues in the House and particularly to his Leader so that he will advance himself, we are debating the document called the Liberal vision statement. It is almost a contradiction in terms: members opposite would be lucky to have the vision of a rhinoceros in a snow storm. Since we are debating that document tonight, the one thing we can be sure of, when members opposite are debating issues, is that they will never tell us exactly what their policies are.

We heard a little bit of it earlier tonight from the member for Bright, who cited a few of his principles. The member for Bright gave us some very grand sounding principles which the Liberals are supposedly offering but, of course, there were no policies; they did not say what they will do. It reminds me of the skit in *Monty Python* when a children's program was being sent up: if you want to play a flute, you blow in one end and move your fingers up and down on the outside. That is a bit like the Liberal policy. Members opposite say, 'Our

policy is to get into government. We will do wonderful things and all will be lovely and sweet and light and beautiful in the morning when you wake up.' That is their policy, but the trouble is that no-one in this State will believe them.

What we heard during the debate from members opposite were all the old clichés and the old rhetoric that we have been hearing for 2½ years. It is incredible when you think that it is more than 2½ years since the losses of the State Bank were announced; it is coming up for three years. These people are locked into the past and all they can see is the State Bank. It is not this Government that is suffering from the State Bank syndrome: it is members opposite. They would not know what to do. The State Bank has become such a crutch for them and they are so dependent on talking about the State Bank that they have not thought about anything else.

Suppose what the member for Culance says will happen comes true; suppose by some accident they fall into government tomorrow. What would they do? Would they talk about the State Bank for the next four years? That is all they have been doing for the past 2½ years. Meanwhile, this Government has got on with the job and the bank is now profitable. Just yesterday we saw in the *Australian* that the budget of this State came in with a surplus. Employment figures released recently showed that the level of unemployment in this State is now the third lowest on the mainland. Employment has been growing for three months and things are happening.

The level of exports in this State has been growing over the past 10 years. This State's economy has been transformed. While members opposite have spent the last 10 years in this place thinking and dreaming of the past, and while they have been talking about the State Bank, the real world out there has changed. Companies in this State have got on with it; they are actually exporting. The level of exports in this State has grown by a factor of three over the past decade.

The real solution was given away by the member for Kavel in a debate just before the dinner adjournment. He said that we have to be competitive with overseas nations, and he mentioned the Philippines, Korea and so on, but what he and other members opposite really want to do is to cut the wages of workers in this country to third world levels. That is the Liberal vision of the future; it is to have us competing with Bangladesh and the Philippines and to reduce our wages to those levels so we can compete with those countries. That might be their vision but it is certainly not mine or that of members on this side of the House.

If we want to know the Liberal vision, we need only look interstate to see what Mr Kennett and Mr Court have done. Believe me, the results are not particularly good. We all know what has happened under Jeff Kennett in Victoria. His vision for education was outlined in the *Australian* and it is to give principals salary packages whereby they take 50 per cent in salary and the other 50 per cent as perks, such as cars. That is Mr Kennett's policy on education. We know his policy on transport—to get rid of it all. We know that his industrial relations policy is to take away all the rights enjoyed by people in other States.

Then, of course, we have the Kennett clone in Western Australia, Mr Court, who spent about six months trying to work out what to do. He was just like members opposite: he was too frightened to say anything. He had spent the past three years gazing at his navel and the situation in that State, but he could not come up with any policies, so he has been fishing around for six months but he has not produced anything of any value, except cuts, of course. Perth previous-

ly had the cheapest public transport system of all the capitals, but it has now become one of the dearest. Indeed, it is this city that has the cheapest public transport in Australia. That is the Court view on these policies. What members opposite have been doing is to raise expectations in their electorates that, if only they could somehow get into government, everything would be rosy; all the problems of the world would go away.

Mr Venning: It couldn't be worse.

Mr HOLLOWAY: That is the sort of hope that members opposite have. The member for Culance says, 'It couldn't be worse.' That is his whole philosophy towards it, but what the member for Culance has been doing is to raise expectations that all they have to do is get into power and suddenly all this money will come flowing into country areas; suddenly all these services will be restored. Of course, all the city members opposite have been doing the same thing. The member for Bright, who was in the Chamber earlier, has been sending circulars to his constituents asking them questions such as, 'Do you need a police station in your electorate?' and raising expectations, as if money grew on trees and that it is just a matter of their getting in and suddenly it will all be produced and the problems will be solved.

The suggestion that really showed up the policies of those opposite for what they are was that of the member for Culance: his model, his vision, was Joh. That was the model that the member for Culance referred to. He said that we should was follow Queensland, that Joh in Queensland had it all right; he said that all we have to do is to follow Joh and everything will be all right. That might be his vision, but it is certainly not mine.

Members interjecting:

Mr HOLLOWAY: As the member for Gilles says, most of those Ministers in the Joh Government ended up in gaol. The level of services in that State was appalling under that Government, and it has only been in more recent years that the people of Queensland have been provided with an education system, under the Goss Government, that was up to the standard of that in other States. The services in parts of Brisbane were absolutely appalling under the Joh Government, and we all know what happened to Joh in the end with his push for Canberra. We also know what he did to the colleagues of members opposite. I suppose the one thing for which we can all be grateful to Joh was that his actions led to the re-election of the Hawke Government for the fourth time. I guess he at least made that contribution to this country: he certainly did not contribute much else.

What has happened in this State over the past 10 years and what has happened in this country is that there has been a great change in the world economy, and this State has grown with it. The changes that have been made in this State towards improvement of manufacturing practice have produced the advances that are necessary for us to have world best practice. The Government has also achieved an industrial structure incorporating minimal disruption: the other achievement of this Government is the low level of industrial disputes. The level is now at the lowest for many years. We have seen what has happened in Victoria: under the Kennett Government, unemployment is now around the 12½ per cent mark, wages have fallen and the industrial relations situation is appalling. Jeff Kennett has put Victorian against Victorian. It is the old story—pit one group against another—and the tragedy is that that has been Victoria's loss, which in turn has dragged back the economic growth of this country. That has

to be the great fear: if this Liberal vision statement and the policies—

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

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I find this debate both interesting and at the same time a little sad. If you look around the House this evening, you see that the state of the House tonight reflects very much the state of the Government opposite and the state of this State in general. As I look on my side of the House, I see—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Has the member for Culance made a contribution tonight?

Mr Venning: Yes, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The member for Hayward.

Mr BRINDAL: As I look around my side of the House I see some intelligence, some wisdom, a little humour, some courage and certainly a degree of longevity. As I look opposite I see nothing but a few tired members who are desperately trying to cling to the last vestiges of power which they no longer deserve to have. I was particularly moved by the contribution of the member for Playford. It was something that I will remember for a long time because it reminded me much of that Shakespearian quote: 'It is a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.'

All the member for Playford seemed to be able to do was bellow and try to drive some sort of divisive wedge between members on this side of the House. I can assure members opposite that this side of the House is preparing itself for Government and that, unlike them, it is not riven by the factionalism that we see opposite and is in fact the united team that this vision statement presents for the people of South Australia. It is definitely worth noting that for several weeks the Government sought to make much of this statement but, when it comes to debating a substantive motion, its contributions at best are lacklustre and wanting.

You, Sir, were in the Chair and would have heard them refer to the 'vision statement that the Leader had to shred which was rewritten next time'. All sorts of astounding accusations were made about the genesis of this vision statement and I think it deserves to be put on the record what exactly happened. What happened was this: unlike the Party opposite, we have a democratic Party in which we discuss things from their beginning to their end. The Leader informed the Party and discussed with the Party the need for a vision statement, and the Party jointly worked on a vision statement and produced a document that I think every member on this side of the House is proud to own.

These spurious accusations about shredded documents and rebuffs to the Leader are nothing more than a malicious tissue concocted by desperados, because there was no shredding; there was a cooperative effort by all members on this side of the House; there was lots of discussion, and there is joint ownership of this document. Unlike members opposite, we do not cling to the coat tails of one Leader, praise and hail him as a sort of king emperor so long as he is Mr 75 per cent and then dump him and run away from him the minute a mistake is made.

Never in my life have I had the privilege of the acquaintanceship of so many blind mutes as exist opposite. For 10 years they sat around the Cabinet table and saw and heard nothing. For 10 years many of the members opposite sat around the Caucus room and saw and heard nothing. When this State fell into such a parlous situation they said, 'Not me,

I didn't know.' They have done the one thing that I never thought I would see a Labor Party do: they have dumped on their mates, and that is absolutely one thing I thought the Party opposite had over our Party—

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Yes; it was absolute and total loyalty to the defence of their colleagues, and I no longer hold that view. What they have done to the member for Ross Smith I have never seen done by any Liberal to a member of the Liberal Party. Members opposite think it is funny, but I do not—

Mrs Hutchison: Come back to the real world.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker—

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

Mr VENNING: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Twice you have named me and twice I have not uttered a word.

The SPEAKER: I point out to the member for Culance that he has not been named. If he were named, he would not be here. It is difficult to see members on the back bench and I may have named the wrong member inadvertently. I admit the error. Perhaps it is the member for Mount Gambier that I should be speaking to. The member for Hayward.

Mr BRINDAL: If the Government benches do not recognise a vision statement, the reason is clearly understandable. South Australia had a vision once. It had a vision under Sir Thomas Playford and I venture to say it also had a vision under Don Dunstan but, in the intervening years, it has lost that vision. It had good solid management, the hand on the tiller, sailing in the right direction, but the trouble was they did not see the shift in the wind, and they lacked the vision.

I cannot blame members opposite for not recognising that this Party has vision and has a direction in which it wants to take South Australia. The member for Mitchell can say, 'They are promising everything to everyone.' But, when we talk to people in the street or talk to expert economists who know, they say that the one thing that people need is a bit of hope and vision and a bit of belief in the people who are supposed to lead them. Members opposite can do what they want: in the end there is going to be a reckoning, and the reckoning will be taken on election day. I note the Minister has come into the Chamber. He interjected last night, 'You don't fit into Unley.' He is perfectly entitled to hold that opinion, but on election day it will be—

The Hon. M.K. Mayes interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: —for the electors of Unley to decide and they will make that decision. Either I or the Minister will be the member for Unley. I am happy to place on the public record that whatever the electors of Unley decide is their decision, and that is how this place works. If they wish the Minister to continue being their member, he will be; if they wish me to be their member, they will choose me. It is not for me to presume to make their judgment for them and, I put to the Minister, it is not for him to do that either.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: As to the vision statement, I commend the member for Goyder for putting forward this motion. It is a good statement. As my colleagues have said, it is not a blueprint for the detail of the future direction in which we are

going to take South Australia: it is a general vision for the future. The Leader has said that in the proper course of time we will release detailed policies, and I know all of my colleagues who are shadow Ministers are working hard on those policies so that in every portfolio area, from the first day we get into Government, every Minister will be working hard to take South Australia in the right direction and to reform those areas which need reforming.

This document is part of that plan but is not a detailed part of it. When members opposite say, 'Where are your policies?' they will just have to wait until the Opposition decides it is time to release its policies, for they have no more right to seeing those policies than have the people. We have an obligation to the people to present policies with which we will go to the election. We have no obligation for this Government to judge us on those policies: those policies will be judged by the people—not by the Government or any members opposite. We will tell them, but we will tell them in our own time—

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

The Hon. H. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 17 August. Page 318.)

Clause 12—'Membership of authority.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I move:

Page 13, lines 10 and 11—Leave out all words in these lines and insert 'nominated by the Minister after consultation with the Local Government Association of South Australia'.

The Opposition feels that, rather than be in a position where a request is made of the Local Government Association to provide a panel of three such persons from which the Minister can select a person for this position, and recognising the responsibility that the members of this authority and the members of boards and committees have now, it is more appropriate that the Minister be given the opportunity to select the person that he or she feels is most appropriate.

We believe, however, that it is absolutely essential that there be adequate consultation with the body so that they feel that they have had the opportunity—and, indeed, they do have the opportunity—to express any views they may have about the person who would represent them.

I do not think it is necessary for the Opposition or me to indicate the support that we have on this side for the Local Government Association. It is an excellent organisation, a very sound organisation, and one with which I have had a very long association. It is strongly felt by this side of the House that it is appropriate for the Minister to have the say after consultation, hence the amendment, and I would seek the support of the Committee.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: There has been extensive negotiation in our process of consultation with regard to establishing this clause. As indicated to members last night, there is a reason behind this in the sense that we recognise local government as a level or tier of government, and as a consequence we have provided for a particular representation.

I think that by accepting the amendment I would be breaching that agreement negotiated with the LGA in relation to their capacity to nominate three persons for the appointment of the Minister. The existing provision more strongly

reinforces that matter and, by adopting the amendment, I would be watering down that relationship that local government has in terms of the Act.

It also complies with the Development Act, to which we brought the same wording and, given the discussions and consultations we had, there was a clear understanding that there would be a compatibility between the two measures. As the honourable member pointed out, we had intended that that would come in time, in other words, considering the measures together through this House.

I feel committed to maintaining the original clause, although I have sympathy for the honourable member's amendment. However, as much as I might personally feel inclined to accept it, given the background I am committed to maintaining the original clause.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I understand what the Minister is saying as a result of consultation that has taken place but I would hope that he may on future occasions consider this situation. I really do believe that it is more appropriate and I know that it is a pattern that has been adopted over a period. Indeed, when we were in Government we tended to go to an organisation and ask for three names to be put forward and then to select, but my concern is particularly now, with the extreme responsibility which these people and people in high positions in Government have, that the Minister needs to be absolutely sure, as the person who is responsible overall, that the appropriate person is selected.

While I understand because of the consultation that has taken place that the Minister may not be able to accept this amendment at this stage, I hope it is something that consideration will be given to in the future.

Amendment negated; clause as amended passed.

Clause 13—'Functions of authority.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I move:

Page 13, line 26—Before 'implement' insert ', where appropriate,'.

As I indicated in my second reading contribution last evening, I support the State EPA's involvement at an appropriate level in preparing and implementing national environment protection measures. It is something that I have always supported very strongly and, with the establishment of the EPA in this State in line with the authorities in other States, it will be important for there to be appropriate involvement.

I am worried about the present wording in the Bill: 'to contribute to the development of and implement national environment protection measures', because I believe that there will be times when it is not appropriate to implement national environment protection measures. If the State feels very strongly, for one reason or another, that it wants to go further than has been recommended as a result of discussion with other States, I think that it is totally appropriate for this State to take a different line.

It concerns me that under clause 13(1)(c) we are tied into the implementation of national environment protection measures whether we like it or not. I believe that it is important for the Minister to consider this amendment, and I seek the support of the Committee.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It is important to put this in a proper context. I understand what the member for Heysen is driving at. There are two aspects to be considered. The first is the inter-Government agreement. If we introduce the words in the honourable member's amendment 'where appropriate' before 'implement', we would be in breach of that agreement between the Heads of Government. All the other States have

agreed with this. The conservative States have agreed with it, and the strongest advocate has been New South Wales. We would be out of time with what is happening in the Eastern States particularly, but also at national level. The honourable member has raised a valid issue. If we believe that there is a standard or policy that we need to set through the EPA which is above the national standard, we can do that, so we can accommodate the honourable member's concern in that respect. However, I think that we need to maintain that clause for the basis of our relationship with the other States and the Federal Government with respect to the inter-Government agreement.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I can only reiterate what I said before. I understand what the Minister is saying. I presume there has been adequate debate on this measure at national level. However, the other concern I have is that, by being tied under this arrangement, we may have to bypass the State Parliament and South Australia may have to wear these laws, even if they are not in the overall interest of the State. That is of concern to me. I think it is important, particularly in a number of the areas that we are looking at in this legislation, that this State should be in control of its own destiny and its legislation. That is why I have expressed concern. The Minister has already determined on that basis and I see little point in continuing on that line.

I want to refer to clause 13(2). Again, in my opinion, the terminology in this clause is much too loose. I think it is important that the authority 'must' not 'should' consult with the groups listed. We are not producing this Bill to provide a glasshouse for these people to live in. I should have thought that it was essential that it be firmer and that the authority 'must', not 'should', consult. I would appreciate a comment from the Minister.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It is important to point out that the basis of this Bill has been constructed around a consultative model. However, the advice that I take in terms of whether we have 'must' or 'should' is that we could place the authority in some difficult legal situations if it must consult a certain range of bodies. It might not be appropriate for certain bodies or organisations to be consulted. However, they may think that they should have been, and that could lead to litigation involving the authority. My advice is that the most appropriate wording is 'should consult'. A variety of organisations, covered in clause 13(2)(a) and (b), would be involved in consultation with the authority.

Amendment negated; clause passed.

Clause 14—'Powers of authority.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I have some concern with clause 14(a) because it is obvious throughout this legislation that the authority is allowed to employ consultants 'on such terms and conditions as the authority thinks fit'. While I recognise the need for the authority to be able to engage consultants, I think that this wording is a bit loose in regard to the authority's ability to employ consultants 'on such terms and conditions as the authority thinks fit'. I think there is a need for a tighter arrangement under this legislation. I should hate to suggest that I did not see the importance of the authority being able to engage consultants, because it is an important part of the authority's administrative powers. However, I feel that the legislation should be tighter in this regard than is the case. I ask the Minister for his comment.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I appreciate the honourable member's concern. Obviously, in this contemporary environment, it is popular to bring this matter forward. I am sure that every member of Parliament and Minister is conscious that

this has to be given careful and close scrutiny. I am not sure what the honourable member is suggesting we should consider. If I had a form of words before me, I would certainly consider it. I accept the general thrust of what the honourable member said: that we need to maintain close scrutiny to ensure that there is no wasteful use of our resources in that sense when we have the experts, and I hope that the EPA will be so gifted. I am sure that we will use those people in preference to bringing in outside bodies. If the honourable member wants to put something before me, I shall be more than happy to consider it. It may have escaped us now, but it can be considered in another place.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I would be pleased to do that. As I indicated on a number of occasions during the second reading, one of the problems has been the lack of opportunity that the Opposition has had to deal with this Bill. Because of the shortness of time, I think it will be necessary for us to spend a significant amount of time in Committee questioning the Minister and taking specific action in another place. We would certainly like to provide the Minister with a specific recommendation.

It has been put to me fairly strongly—I am not necessarily suggesting that this is my own opinion—that the EPA should be a separate authority rather than a division of the central agency—the Department of Environment and Land Management. I know that the debate has revolved around the establishment of the authority in this State over a period of time. It has also been suggested that the authority should employ all of its own officers rather than seconding officers from other departments. I am aware that this matter has been put before the Minister, and it is probably an important factor in the overall development of the authority. Having had the opportunity to discuss this earlier, I wonder whether the Minister might indicate why he determined that the authority should be formulated in this way rather than as a separate authority with the power to have its own staff.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I think this fits in with the overall Government reform program, and a number of examples have preceded this example where we have a separate statutory authority that is serviced from the main department and is involved in the same portfolio area. I can cite numerous examples but I will not bore the Committee with that. There are certain economies of scale, which benefit both the department and the statutory body.

There is no way that the statutory authority can be influenced or in any way usurped by the activities of officers who are attached from the main department but it fits in that they have the career structure and the opportunities, the department has the flexibility, the statutory authority has the flexibility and there are certain economies that we would enjoy by having the independent statutory body serviced from the department. That is the model that we followed, and from my experience I believe that it should happen to a few more statutory bodies operating in this State.

I will not go on to name them but I refer to such organisations as the TAB, although it is not under my portfolio. I have a very strong view about my experiences as Ministers responsible for that area in the past; it could perhaps have been better serviced by the Department of Recreation and Sport, but I will not embark on that argument. This is the best possible model that we have seen operating. The honourable member would have seen it himself when he was a Minister. There are various opportunities in the planning portfolio, in particular.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Can the Minister give a rough idea of the number of staff involved? I understand that the Minister will not be able to be accurate, and I do not seek names, but how many people will be seconded from each department.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The total will be 83 and there will be a transfer: the office and the person will move into the EPA, the Waste Management Commission and the E&WS. We can probably provide a more detailed profile, but generally that will be the likely number of secondments, as the member has termed it, with people moving from those areas. People will move lock, stock and barrel, so they will not be seconded: they will not go back to the departments at any stage but will be part of the EPA.

Clause passed.

Clause 15 passed.

Clause 16—'Proceedings of authority.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am sure that the Minister would be aware that the conservation movement has made representation in regard to the availability for public scrutiny of minutes of the committees or subcommittees of the authority. I have some difficulty with the representation that has been made because of the need for some confidentiality regarding the minutes. I would be concerned that, if all the information was available, it could tend to become almost a political document where the authority would be ensuring that those minutes were of a political nature and did not cause any concern to the Government of the day, or whatever the case might be, rather than being absolutely factual. It is vitally important that these minutes, which will be kept for further reference, be full and frank and contain information that may cause difficulty if it was provided to the public.

Because of the concern that has been expressed, will the Minister indicate what recognition has been given to that representation and whether he feels that the minutes of any of the committees or subcommittees could be made available for public scrutiny?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: In the consultation that I have had—and I guess we dealt with the major issues in those discussions—there has been no mention of or concerns expressed about that aspect at all. I am advised by the officer that in those discussions—and a great deal of detail has been dealt with, certainly over the past six months—there has been no heavy pressing from the point of view of the council in particular about access to the minutes. The forum minutes will be made available; because of the statutory nature of the authority making the decisions, its being a quasi judicial body, there is some limitation on what can be made available in the way of information.

Obviously, there would have to be communications and decisions, and reasons for that will be upon the authority. The Freedom of Information Act would apply, and that would give access in terms of those things that are, appropriately and properly, to be available for the public. They are the only matters raised at any length with the officers, I am advised, and it seems that most people are reasonably happy with the response that was given.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Earlier representations that I received from the Conservation Council and some of the other organisations within the conservation movement indicated that they were keen to see the contents of all minutes available to the public, and I would be surprised if the Minister has not received that same representation. That is why I raised this matter.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: This issue is dealt with later in the Bill in terms of the public register; an extensive list of information must be provided via the public register. Under that clause the Committee will be able to explore what is provided and, if there are any shortcomings that the honourable member feels we ought to be addressing, I will be happy to look at it.

Clause passed.

Clause 17—'Committees and subcommittees of authority.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: This clause refers to the establishment of committees and subcommittees but it says nothing about payment, although the second reading explanation referred to the meeting of expenses. Can the Minister confirm that these committees will receive any payment or expenses?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Yes, in accordance with the directions given from time to time by the Commissioner for Public Employment under an admin instruction issued from the Commissioner's office.

Clause passed.

Clauses 18 and 19 passed.

Clause 20—'Membership of forum.'

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I move:

Page 17, line 8—Leave out '18' and insert '20'.

The amendment is self-explanatory because of the following amendments. After consultation with the various interest groups, I propose that we expand it to accommodate those areas that have been advocated to me, that is, a local community environment group and community health and associated community services.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I move:

Page 17, lines 22 and 23—Leave out ', of whom one should represent a local community environment group'.

The amendment is self explanatory. I am endeavouring to expand the representation of the forum so that it accommodates those interest groups.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I move:

Page 17, line 22—After 'of whom' insert 'one must be a person nominated by the Conservation Council of South Australia Incorporated and'.

We are in exactly the same position as we were in when looking at the establishment of the authority. I can only reiterate what I said then: whilst I recognise that the amendment that the Minister has brought before the Committee is an improvement on what was there before, the Opposition would want to go further than that and stipulate that one of those persons should be a person nominated by the Conservation Council of South Australia. I do not think I need to go into the reasons why we would want to see that other than to recognise that the Conservation Council is the peak body representative of conservation organisations in this State.

I believe it is totally appropriate that the council itself be represented on this forum. I recognise and support the representation that has been invited to participate in this forum and the way that it is set out. I have some query about the seven people representing industry, but I do not think it appropriate at this time to express that concern further. As far as the Opposition's amendment is concerned, while recognising that the Minister has improved the situation, we would want to specify the involvement of the Conservation Council of SA Inc.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Before I call the Minister, for the guidance of the Committee let me explain that, as circulated, the member for Heysen's amendment read, 'after "of whom" insert "one must be a person nominated by the Conservation Council of South Australia Incorporated and".' However, 'of whom' has disappeared as a result of the Minister's previous amendment, so the honourable member is now moving after the word 'conservation' to insert 'of whom one must be', and the words then follow. The Minister.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The honourable member and I had this debate earlier on. It is important for me to restate. I have in a sense a great deal of sympathy with the honourable member's amendment. However, what we have endeavoured to do is not to single out any individual organisation. We have not singled out the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Trades and Labor Council, the Employers Federation or the Farmers Federation. What we have done in our discussions with that interest group representing a collective of some 63 conservation interests is to broaden it with our amendment to reach what they believe is an appropriate and suitable representation in the broad sense from those groups.

Just over the page, subclause (3) refers to (and we have, in fact, singled out the UTLC—I apologise) 'relevant Ministers and organisations'. I will seek nominations of persons for appointment. It is important that we look at that in terms of those individual groups, and the discussions I have had with conservation interests have come to a resolution that this is the wording that best suits their needs in a broad and general sense because of the number of organisations that are part of that broad movement.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I think the Minister has answered satisfactorily the question I put, but I remind him that there is an opportunity for the Minister to select a person representative of the Local Government Association. As I said in the debate previously, regarding the establishment of the authority, if it is good enough to have a representative of the Local Government Association, I believe that it is good enough to have a representative of the Conservation Council. Particularly with the emphasis being placed on environmental issues and recognising the reputation of the Conservation Council in this State, I think it would be totally appropriate for that body to be singled out.

Under this clause we have a person nominated by the UTLC. If we are to have somebody nominated from the UTLC, somebody from the Local Government Association, and if we have the peak environmental body in this State, the Conservation Council, left out on a limb, I think it is a slap in the face to the Conservation Council. As I said earlier, I know that the action the Minister has taken has improved the situation somewhat, but that does not take away from what I see as a need to recognise the responsibility and the standing of the Conservation Council in this State.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It is not intended at all as a slap in the face for the Conservation Council, and it would certainly be consulted as part of that process. As the honourable member rightly points out, it is the peak body, although there are other organisations which have a national focus and which I guess would probably dispute whether it is the peak body. I can give this undertaking that it would certainly be consulted as part of that process. I did stumble in my response earlier. We seek representatives from those peak bodies.

In several cases there is not just one single body. Quite often the industry representatives overlap, as I am sure the

honourable member knows. If there was one single body, we would be quite comfortable in naming that organisation in the clause.

Quite often, as we know, there is an overlap of particularly industry organisations and representation. For example, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the Employers Federation have an overlap in respect of membership and industrial organisation. It is important that we do not name an individual group. Again, the member refers to the Local Government Association. The LGA has a special position, and I am somewhat surprised—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: What about the UTLC?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: That is a single peak body, because no other organisation represents employees in this State. As I am saying, if the Chamber of Commerce and Industry was the only body representing the mining industry, for example, that would be fine. However, the Chamber of Mines, the Employers Federation and a number of other small organisations have interests in that area. That is the problem we have. If we had a perfect world, I guess we could name them all and that would be the end of it.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I make the point that if we recognise the status of the Conservation Council—and it represents some 60 organisations in this State—I cannot imagine that any other conservation organisation in this State would feel put out or would not approve of the Conservation Council's being recognised in this clause as part of the forum. I think it is a bit hollow for the Minister to say that that recognition should not be given to the Conservation Council. If the Committee is not prepared to accept my amendment, I sincerely hope that, as the Minister has said, there will be consultations with the Conservation Council. I express my disappointment again that the Minister is not prepared to accept this amendment.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I move:

Page 17, after line 23—insert paragraphs as follows:

- (ba) one will be a person representing a local community environment group; and
- (bb) one will be a person with experience in community health and associated community services; and.

I think the amendment is self-explanatory but, from the discussions that we had with the Conservation Council, this is its preferred option. I guess it gives the council the catch-all that allows representations from the groups with a particular speciality or background that it wants to see involved. As a consequence, I am more than happy to move this amendment, and I might say it is unanimously supported by my Caucus subcommittee.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 21 to 23 passed.

Clause 24—'Environment Protection Fund.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: There is concern on this side of the Committee in respect of subclause (4). It is felt that there should be appropriation and that it should not be at the behest of the Minister or the authority. This is something that the Opposition feels fairly strongly about. Depending on the answer that the Minister provides, further action will be taken in another place.

Obviously, we are looking at a considerable amount of money that will be held by this fund. It needs to be properly appropriated, and we are most dissatisfied with this clause in its present form. Depending on the response from the Minister, it would be our intention to move in another place to ensure that there is further appropriation of the fund.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Clause 24 outlines basically the direction of funds in relation to the establishment of the fees under regulation, and the prescribed percentage of fees would be designated. The general appropriation comes into the fund through the department and is allocated in accordance with the regulations and the fees structured therefrom. The clause refers to the prescribed percentage of fees other than expiation fees paid under this Act, and expiation fees and the prescribed percentage of penalties recovered in respect of offences against this Act, and so on, and it sets out the division of those funds as they occur within the overall EPF.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am not really convinced by the Ministers's response to the questions I asked in this regard. I repeat that I would imagine that once the authority gets going there will be a considerable amount of money in this fund. I think it needs to be properly appropriated, and I am not satisfied, even from what the Minister has said, that that is the case. If the Minister is not able to provide us with any further information we will seek to take further action in another place.

Once again, with the limited response that we have had to requests we have made for involvement from organisations and individuals and their concerns about this matter, one of the issues that has been raised concerns subclause (2), which provides that the fund must be kept as directed by the Treasurer. It has been put to me that the EPA should manage its own financial affairs and be totally responsible for its own affairs, and that all moneys collected (we are referring to the petrol levy, waste levy, etc.) should be paid directly into the EPA, so providing the opportunity for industry, local government, the community and so on to know exactly how the money coming in from these levies is being spent.

We are told on a continuing basis that these levies have been introduced for environmental purposes. There is a lot of cynicism in the community about just how these funds are spent. I think there is a need. I understand why people in the conservation movement particularly, in the community generally and in local government (because local government would have an input into this) should be made aware of how the money is being spent, so that, if we are being told that our taxes or a levy or whatever is being used for environmental purposes, that is what it is being used for. If it is going into the EPA we should be able to clearly indicate how that money is spent. So, why was it determined that the EPA should not have the greater responsibility for its own funding?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The EPA has already benefited from the decision on how funds will be provided to it, by its very establishment. It has already enjoyed funding. It went through last year's appropriation via the budget, and I think it will benefit from that process. The honourable member drew the Committee's attention to subclause (2), which provides that the fund must be kept as directed by the Treasurer. That is a standard provision that is required and, I guess, given events of more recent times, it provides a very strict regime that must be adhered to. It is a matter of control of the funds. What happens as a consequence involves the consideration of matters in this place as we go through the budget process, which will very clearly identify and account for funds both gathered and spent—gathered through the fuel levy, for example (in time, the waste levy), and of course then expended as part of that appropriation.

Treasury requires the funds to be dealt with in terms of being held for banking, and really that is an important part of Government operations. However, what we are looking at is

the benefits that flow from this, and the accountability will be in this very Parliament as we examine the budget.

Clause passed.

Clause 25—'General environmental duty.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am a little concerned about the question of financial implications, as it appears that we are being asked to accept that, if a polluting activity is conducted by a number of small under-financed groups, their lack of finance will set the standard of what is acceptable. Similarly, if a large company is able to adopt the most expensive current technology, similar kinds of small industries will be expected to follow suit. Can the Minister explain what this means in terms of activities which are emitting a similar level of pollution but which are of different financial standing? It is important that that should be made clear. I question the logic of telling industry it has a duty, yet limiting the authority's response when that duty is deliberately being ignored by not allowing a prosecution. I refer especially to those industries which have an environmental authorisation and which might therefore be expected to know their environmental duty. Will the Minister also agree that the authority should be able to prosecute an industry that has an authorisation for a breach of the duty of care?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I appreciate the general thrust of the honourable member's remarks. However, I am not quite clear where in clause 25 the honourable member is suggesting we should revise, review or improve the provisions. I am happy to deal with it; it does come up later in the Bill in a more specific way, and I am more than happy to accommodate that matter.

Clause passed.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Environment and Land Management): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Clauses 26 to 30 passed.

Clause 31—'References of policies to Environment, Resources and Development Committee of Parliament.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I move:

Page 28, lines 4 and 5—'Leave out ', within 28 days,' and all words in line 5 and insert:

- (a) within 14 days, refer the policy to the Environment, Resources and Development Committee of the Parliament; and
- (b) within 14 sitting days, cause the policy to be laid before both Houses of Parliament.

The second part of the amendment is consequential. In its present form the Bill stipulates that policies must go through a procedure. The Bill indicates that policy matters need to be addressed by the Minister and by the Cabinet. Policies need to go to the Environment, Resources and Development Committee and, if there is a disagreement with the policy on the part of that committee, the matter should then be referred to the Parliament.

I know that it is not appropriate to deal with clauses that have already been dealt with by the Committee, but clause 27 deals with the nature and contents of environment protection policies, and subclause (2)(b) provides:

set out controls or requirements ('mandatory provisions') to be enforceable as offences under division 2;

They are enforceable as offences. For that reason, the Opposition strongly believes that these policies should be

subject to legislative review and, indeed, to disallowance. It is important that that should be the case. I am not sure about the flow of policies and how many policies will come out of the authority but, whatever the case may be, I believe my amendment is appropriate. The Opposition feels strongly about this matter. The amendment is appropriate for the reasons I have outlined. If these policies are to be enforceable as offences, the amendment is appropriate, and, as is in the case with regulations that are now brought before the House, they should be brought before both Houses of Parliament and be subject to disallowance.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I understand the general direction of the amendment, but within this clause we arrive at the same result. My Bill deals with this matter in a way that recognises the committee structure of the Parliament and provides for the Environment, Resources and Development Committee to deal with it. The clause sets out the procedures to be followed if the ERDC resolves to object to a policy: copies of the policy must be laid before both Houses of Parliament.

We are not in any way trying to circumvent the activities or authority of the Parliament, and under subclause (6), if either House of Parliament passes a resolution disallowing a policy, the policy ceases to have effect. In essence, we achieve the same result and, if there is a concern about the policy, clearly it would be expressed through either House and it could be achieved at the committee level. What the Government is proposing in this Bill recognises the functions and roles that these committees have.

We had an extensive debate in this Parliament about the amendments to the parliamentary committee system, and we enshrined increases in the power, function and role of those committees. This clause recognises those committees appropriately and establishes them within the appropriate context as this Parliament resolved they should be when that matter was before the House and another place and was put into law. I think we have achieved a proper balance here, and it certainly gives an opportunity for the Parliament to consider any of those policies.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am not satisfied with the Minister's response. I am supportive of the committee system that has recently been introduced through this Parliament, but my point is that if we look at the Environment, Resources and Development Committee—and I have been particularly pleased with much of the work that has come out of that committee—the Government will always have the numbers thereon, and I believe that, as these policies are enforceable as offences, it is not good enough just for the ERDC to say, 'Yes, we approve the policy,' or 'No, we do not.'

Mr Hamilton: Have you put in a minority report?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I believe it is totally appropriate for all members who represent the community to be able to put a disallowance motion before the House if they feel that it is inappropriate to support these policies. I am very dissatisfied with the Minister's response and, if he is not prepared to consider this situation further, I can assure him that we will be raising it in another place.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I support the amendment. The Minister may recall that in my second reading speech I canvassed this issue as being one that the Opposition regarded as critical. There are basically two ways of making law: one is through the statutes and the other is through subordinate legislation. As far as I am aware, what the Government proposes with this clause is an as yet

untested and untried way of making law. Of course, a third way of making law is by proclamation, but this clause provides another way for which, as far as I am aware, there is no precedent on the statute book.

In effect, the Minister is proposing to enshrine in subordinate legislation policies in the form of laws which have not been subjected to the normal subordinate legislation procedures of the Parliament. The Opposition does not think that that is good enough. If the Government thought about it to any great extent, it would realise that what is being proposed is unorthodox and not in line with the normal accountability of Parliament for the laws that it makes. I have no objection whatsoever to the notion of policy development and the adoption of policies, provided those policies are accepted by the Parliament because in effect they are going to become law. If we bypass the normal procedures, we deny ordinary citizens the rights that they presently enjoy in respect of subordinate legislation.

The Opposition views this prospect with great concern. I cannot see that there is anything for the Government to lose with respect to the amendment. On the contrary, it has everything to gain. The proper scrutiny by Parliament of any policy which is to become law ought to be the preserve of Parliament and not just the preserve of a single parliamentary committee. That does not seem to me to be an unreasonable position. I hope that in the time taken for reflection between the passage of the Bill in this place and another place that the Minister will see the reasonableness of this position and will accept it. I support the amendment.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I wish to make a brief response. This reflects what occurred in the Development Bill. With respect to the Development Bill, my recollection is that the Opposition accepted that regulations under the Planning Act would be established through this same committee. It is very similar. In effect, it is giving the same outcome in terms of how the Development Bill was dealt with. I recall in the debate members saying they would not see individuals having the right of veto in regard to the application of this legislation, and I recall that in the Development Bill as well. I think that would be the outcome of the member's amendment. So, I believe this is an appropriate way to go. I guess the Development Bill has opened new ground. I can think of similar situations with the formation of laws with respect to regulations. It certainly has opened new ground, but with this Bill we are covering ground that has already been broken.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I did not participate in the debate on the Development Bill so I am not in a position to refute or agree with what the Minister says. However, if the Minister's logic of adopting consistent approach between this Bill and the Development Bill were carried through, we would be having third party appeals and we would be giving standing, but that is not proposed in this Bill. So, on that basis I think the Minister himself must acknowledge that the Government has adopted differences in approach. One cannot use the Development Bill as the precise model for this Bill although, as a general matter of principle, the Opposition would like to do so, particularly when it comes to the question of rights of standing and third party appeals.

Even if one were to use the Development Bill as a precedent in terms of form for this, as far as I am aware it is not a precise analogy simply because of the nature of offences which are created under this Bill and which ought to be subject, along with their penalties, to the scrutiny of Parliament before they become law.

Mr MEIER: I support the amendment moved by the member for Heysen, and I speak as a member of the Legislative Review Committee. I believe that, because of the importance of this Bill and particularly this clause, it should be referred to the Legislative Review Committee rather than the Environment Resources and Development Committee. As a serving member of the Legislative Review Committee, I recognise that we seek to obtain evidence from both sides and we weigh up the evidence to the best of our ability. In this case it would be seeking to ascertain the correctness or otherwise of an environment protection policy. However, on occasions where our committee has agreed to something Parliament or a member of Parliament has said, 'No, I cannot agree with it.' Therefore, I believe that the Government should accept the member for Heysen's amendment. It would make Parliament the ultimate authority, rather than a committee being the ultimate authority.

It is very easy to put things off to committees. We see it happen far too often, and this Government has many examples where that has occurred. I believe that too often we take the responsibility away from Parliament. As the member for Heysen and the member for Coles have detailed, this is an area, despite what is in the Development Bill, that we should seek to refer to the Legislative Review Committee in the same way as we do so many other regulations. I support the amendment.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I do not want to delay the Committee; I just want to draw the members' attention to the Development Act, which passed this place some months back. Section 27 of that Act is a tentacle in the operation of this clause. I recall that debate, and members opposite supported that provision. They said they did not want individual members of this Chamber or the other place to have the right of veto. I am a little confused as to what is going on. My colleague the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations made it very clear that they are going in time.

I accept the criticism of the member for Heysen in regard to the fact that this Bill has been dragging the chain, but it has been in the process of consultation and negotiation. We made it quite clear at the outset, in all the discussions, that there was going to be compatibility. Third party rights are recognised before the court. This Bill flows into that court, and of course that is where they are recognised. I want to make it clear for the record so that we know where the Government stands. It has been consistent and it will continue to be consistent.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 32—'Interim policies.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I refer to clause 32(3)(c). If an interim policy is introduced without delay by the Minister on the advice of the authority and that policy, after costing industry a significant sum to comply, is discarded after a year, does industry have redress against the authority?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: No.

Clause passed.

Clauses 33 to 47 passed.

Clause 48—'Criteria for grant and conditions of environmental authorisations.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am not sure whether this is the appropriate place to bring this up. The relationship between the Development Act and the Environment Protection Bill is crucial in relation to works approvals. Where a pollution contravention approach requires input from the EPA at the same time as development authorisation is being

considered, this enables technical input into the project design before works are commenced. In order for this to occur, a referral of development authorisation applications must be made by the relevant planning authority to the EPA. The procedure for such referrals must be spelt out in detail by the relevant regulation under the Development Act. At present, as I mentioned in my second reading contribution, there is no such provision. The penultimate draft of the development regulations, dated 15 July 1993, schedule 8, reiterates the existing arrangements for developments having primary and secondary impact air pollution potential be referred to the Minister of Environment and Land Management.

As I mentioned previously, on 11 August an officer of the EPA advised that schedule 1 of this Bill will be inserted in the draft of the development regulations but that until the EPA is created referral will be to the Minister. First, which Minister are we talking about in the interim? I suggest it should be the Minister of Environment and Land Management. Secondly, will referrals of schedule 1 give rise to a regard, concurrence or direction situation? Again, I suggest it should be direction pursuant to section 37(4)(a)(ii) of the Act, as this is the only means by which the EPA can assist on a refusal or specific conditions. Thirdly, will other development proposals not covered by the first schedule to this Bill be required to be referred either for concurrence or regard? For example, it may be appropriate to take into account the former category of secondary impact air pollution potential proposals. There is a lot of confusion about this area. I hope that the Minister can throw some light on the specific questions relating to this clause.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The honourable member is correct. This is complex. We thought we had problems last night on clause 5, but there are some complexities here which warrant a detailed and careful response. I shall endeavour to give a very careful and clear response not only for the record but for future reference for interested parties and members of our community. One has to take together clauses 48 and 58 and in time read them with the Development Act. The two pieces of legislation have been designed so that certain development applications of environmental significance are to be referred to the EPA for its direction to the development assessment body. Under the Development Act it is section 37(1). The EPA conditions for a potential veto can be applied to unacceptable development at that stage. That is section 37(4) of the Development Act. Public notice and consultation takes place according to the category of development, in accordance with section 38 of the Development Act. Any third party appeals allowed by the Development Act occur at that stage, not subsequently under the Environment Protection Bill. That is a reference to section 86(1)(b) of the Development Act.

This is how it works, and I hope we can cover it adequately because this is one of the complex areas. I have to give notice that, through discussions with my colleague, we will have to make some amendments to the development regulations. Schedule 1 to the Environment Protection Bill, listing prescribed activities of environmental significance which subsequently require an EPA licence, will be inserted into the next draft of the development regulations, to be released shortly. We shall have to prepare the exact wording and reach agreement with my colleague. We have agreed in principle. It means that schedule 1 activities, which are the subject of development application, must be referred to the prescribed body.

The honourable member asked which Minister it would be. Until the EPA is established, the relevant body will be the Minister of Environment and Land Management. Referral will be for any direction to impose conditions or to refuse approval. Once the EPA is established, the development regulations will be amended to substitute a referral to the EPA. In the interim, reference will be through the Minister of Environment and Land Management, as the honourable member has correctly questioned. Until that is done applicants will not have the benefit of the guarantee given in clause 48(2) that they will then receive an EPA licence. My colleague, the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations, and I have indicated that we intend to make a change to these regulations when the EPA comes into operation. Hopefully we will address this problem, and I am sure that we will correct it in a way which will resolve it so that it is clear and certain.

Section 38(2)(b) of the Development Act provides that category 3 developments which are to be the subject of public notice and potential third party appeals will be any development other than those assigned to category 1 or 2. I expect that most, if not all, of the schedule of this Bill will refer to category 3 developments. In any event, any change shifting developments between categories via development plan or regulations must undergo scrutiny in Cabinet and the Environment, Resources and Development Committee of Parliament and must undergo any potential parliamentary disallowance.

It is important to spell out where we stand with third party appeals. Submissions from the Conservation Council and the National Environmental Law Association have highlighted one matter in the Development Act which needs to be amended to give effect to the intention of the EPA. Matters which are part of the Development Act decision-making on applications will be dealt with with a single appeal system under the Development Act.

The amendments relate to section 86(1)(b) of the Development Act and I can foreshadow that section 86(1)(b) will be amended by a further provision in schedule 2 of this Bill to ensure that any third party appeal under the Development Act covers EPA matters and EPA considerations under this Bill. This will, as specified in clause 58, include the objects of this legislation, the general environmental duty and any relevant environment protection policies. I think it is clear that this was always our intention. However, we have not achieved that and we will have to amend the regulations to do so. I hope that has spelt out where we stand in regard to clauses 48 and 58.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: As members on this side have said on so many occasions, particularly during the second reading stage, this just brings to the attention of the Committee yet again the problems that are now being experienced as a result of our not being able to deal with both pieces of legislation concurrently. I know that that was always intended and the Minister has given a reason why that was not possible but, when we are now talking about having to amend the Development Act, which is now proclaimed, as a result of problems associated with this legislation, the difficulties that arise as a result of that situation are indicated clearly. I think it is regrettable, to say the least, that that has to happen. It would have been beneficial for the Committee, and I believe it would have resulted in improved legislation, had both bills been dealt with concurrently, as was originally suggested.

There is a consequential question that arises from what the Minister has just said, and that is whether criteria for the giving of a direction by the Environment Protection Authority should be spelt out in the Environment Protection Act as applies to licences under clause 48. Given that licences must be granted where a project has received development authorisation under the Development Act, it would seem even more critical that statutory criteria be prescribed in relation to the exercise by the Environment Protection Authority of its powers to direct, concur and so on in a development authorisation under the Development Act. Such criteria could then also apply to proposals not covered by the Development Act in requiring separate works approvals from the EPA under clause 40.

At present the Bill provides for such criteria to be spelt out in environmental protection policies, and I refer to clause 27(2)(a), but we realise that this could take considerable time given the process for development of such policies (and we have already dealt with that matter) and it also seems inconsistent with the approach taken by the Bill to licences. It could be made clear in prescribing statutory criteria that the objects of the legislation should be considered. I would ask that the Minister provide some response to that issue as well, and again I reiterate and recognise that it is a very complex area but I believe it is important that it be dealt with in this Chamber.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I think there has been some misunderstanding, certainly given the discussions that my officers have had, with the interest groups, and I refer the Committee to clause 58—I know that is not permitted under Standing Orders, but as part of my explanation I refer the honourable member to the last sentence of clause 58, which picks up the issue in relation to the activities. That interest group raised the issue with us; it had not been picked up in the legislation.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The Minister, in answering the member for Heysen, has several times referred to the general environmental duty, which is referred to in clause 48(1)(d). I see no definition of 'the general environmental duty' and I would like the Minister to define what is a general environmental duty and also to indicate why it is not defined when other relevant terms such as 'environmental harm' are defined. It seems to me that without a definition this could be a cause for considerable litigation or, at the very least, argumentation and confusion. So, a definition at this point would be helpful.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I refer the honourable member to clause 25 which spells out in great detail 'general environmental duty'.

Clause passed.

Clause 49—'Annual fees and returns.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Paragraphs (a) and (b) of subclause (2) provide for the payment of a fee and the supply of information for an authorisation that can extended for what could be a considerable period. How will this benefit the environment and what will the authority will be doing in exchange for this fee? It seems rather strange that a fee should be charged. I would like the Minister to explain what responsibilities the authority will have in this regard and what action will be taken for the fee charged.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am not quite sure what the honourable member is driving at, because to me it is obvious that it relates to the pollution and to the operation of the authority in regard to those fees collected. Perhaps the honourable member might give me some more detail. I am

not quite sure how to answer that question. It picks up the thrust of the legislation.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The whole clause is not terribly clear. The provision might apply to contaminated sites, for example. What type of activities which are not of a prescribed class will require authorisation? As I said, paragraphs (a) and (b) of subclause (2) refer to 'an annual return containing the information required by the authority by condition of the authorisation or by notice in writing' and 'in each year (other than a year in which the authorisation is due to expire) pay to the authority, before the date prescribed'. What is that payment actually for?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It involves those organisations that require either a licence or an exemption. That is what this clause is about.

Clause passed.

Clauses 50 to 65 passed.

Clause 66—'Interpretation.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister explain to the Committee just where we are with this beverage container legislation? There has been considerable rumour over a period about what might be happening to the legislation. As I indicated during the second reading debate, the Opposition is committed to the support of this legislation, although we and, I understand, the Government have some frustrations regarding its actual implementation. I have attended public meetings recently where it has been suggested that the Government is looking to extend the legislation to include flavoured milk containers, fruit juice containers and all sorts of things.

I think all members of the Committee have probably received representation from Mothers Opposed to Pollution (MOPS), the Greenhouse Association and other organisations, expressing considerable concern that as a result of this legislation we are looking to put deposits on plastic milk containers. We are told by the industry that it is anticipated that our milk will be delivered in two litre and one litre plastic containers before Christmas. I will have discussions with members of the industry tomorrow regarding this matter, but there seems a fair bit of confusion about where the Government sits with this legislation, whether there is any intention to extend it and what has happened as a result of the High Court ruling.

I think we are all aware of the complexities and problems with this legislation as a result of that finding. So, I guess at this stage I am asking the Minister to give us a bit of a rundown on just where the Government is in regard to this overall legislation.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I do not want to confuse the matter before the Committee with the general industry issue, since we want this matter to proceed and to be dealt with primarily by regulation, in any event. We have had discussions with industry about beverage container deposits. I have put a number of options to all sectors of the industry. I have met with soft drink manufacturers, the milk industry, liquid paper carton manufacturers, plastic manufacturers and glass manufacturers, as I am sure also has the honourable member. I have put to them that we want to increase recycling; we want to make sure that there is a reduction in atmospheric waste; we want to improve the recyclability and reuse of all those containers; and we wish to improve the energy usage, reduce loss of energy in that process, and reduce the litter stream.

That is a very potted version of what I put to industry representatives. I put to them that the first option I would

prefer is to see the industry address these issues and to have a comprehensive recycling program. There are a few myths around. A study about to be released by the German Government suggests that in many ways it is probably more efficient and less environmentally hazardous actually to burn a number of these plastics rather than put them through any sort of recycling—which I think will turn a few theories on their head. They say that it costs more and takes more energy to recycle some of these plastics and that, in fact, more could be gained through exposure to generated energy from burning them, with less pollution in the atmosphere. That is an interesting aspect that I would also ask the industry to take on board.

My first option is for them to improve recycling and reuse of these containers. That might involve voluntary deposits. The second point is that, if the beverage container industry does not respond properly and collectively, I would have to consider the necessary legislative steps.

The preferred option is to get recycling and reuse lifted enormously. For example, we should get out of the litter stream these liquid paper cartons and flavoured milk and other containers. The industry has told me that it believes it is more efficient to go for this new plastic that it will be using for bulk milk. It is not a major problem in our litter stream. White milk in the homes tends to be recycled, if recycling is offered. I certainly do it in our home: our council now offers us that opportunity.

It is those products used in the general environment that are flicked out the car window or dropped in the street that form the litter problem, as shown in surveys and on such occasions as Clean Up Australia Day. I am waiting for industry to respond. When I have that response—and I hope it is comprehensive and deals with those issues in a very dedicated and specific way—I will be able to react to that as well.

Clause passed.

Clause 67 passed.

Clause 68—'Exemption of certain container by regulation.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Taking into account what the Minister has just said, it seems to me that the whole thing is in a state of flux at present. When are we likely to see the regulations to determine which containers are to be exempted under this clause?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: We will stay with the existing ones at this time. I reiterate: when I get a response from industry. I know that the honourable member is seeing industry representatives tomorrow, and they will probably give him some indication before they give me one, because I am not sure what stage my officers have reached. I know they are in ongoing discussions and I would imagine that, if they can respond in the next week or so, we can probably consider that issue.

As I say, my preferred option is to see industry deal with it. Personally, I think that is the best way. Certainly, it is a way that will involve more reuse and recycling. The question we have to ask industry is: why do we have so many differently shaped glass bottles? Why is it that Coca-Cola, Woodroffe's, Bols or whoever have their own bottle? I know it is for marketing purposes: Coke has a unique pattern and people are accustomed to the Coke bottle. But in terms of reuse, if we had a standard glass bottle that went through a process and was handled in a general way by marine dealers, the cost of handling would be significantly less.

That is what I have been asking industry, and it causes a few coughs, I might say, but it is time we had a think about this. There is an enormous cost in reusing these products. Recycling is even more expensive. Until we have that response, I cannot answer the honourable member definitively in terms of any proposed regulations, but I can say that the existing regulations will be absorbed under clause 68.

Clause passed.

Clauses 69 to 74 passed.

Clause 75—'Interpretation.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: As I understand it as far as ozone protection is concerned, this is a straight lift from the Clean Air Act. Given the interest in the debate on that legislation and the changes that have been made since then, can the Minister indicate the effectiveness of the legislation regarding the phase-out?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It is working very well.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: If we had a little more time, I would like the Minister to be more specific and to obtain more information, because it is important legislation.

The Hon. M.K. Mayes interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I would be delighted to be briefed. Do not let it be said that I refused a briefing.

Clause passed.

Clause 76 passed.

Clause 77—'Authority may prohibit sale or use of certain products.'

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I move:

Page 56, line 21—Leave out 'Minister' and insert 'authority'.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: My concern is that this provision should be effected by regulation and I wonder why that is not the case.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It has been picked up from the Clean Air Act. I will have to research it to find out the history of it, but it is there and it has been operating. I am happy to do that for the honourable member.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I would appreciate more information regarding that matter.

Clause as amended passed.

Clauses 78 and 79 passed.

Clause 80—'Offences of causing serious environmental harm.'

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: My questions relate to this clause and the next three clauses. These clauses deal with general offences and provide penalties. The top range is \$1 million for a body corporate that causes serious environmental harm by polluting the environment intentionally or recklessly and with the knowledge that serious environmental harm will or might result. The offences are then graduated, depending on the gravity of the nature of the offence. The sum of \$1 million is a very great deal of money and, if the offender is a natural person, \$.25 million is a great deal of money. However, as we go on down the scale and find a penalty of \$120 000 for a person who pollutes the environment causing material environmental harm, we are getting to the stage where for some corporations the fine is not a large price to pay for the convenience of engaging in unsound environmental practices and for the profit that might result in the short term.

I make that point, which can be assessed always in the light of the size of the fine, as a preface to my question to the Minister. Why is there no penalty—or indeed is there elsewhere in the Bill a penalty that I have not seen—which

simply states that if these things occur or if there is a second offence then the licence is withdrawn? If my memory serves me correctly, such a provision was inserted by way of an Opposition amendment to the Heritage Bill, so that, if a heritage building was demolished, the demolisher would lose the right of redevelopment. That removal of the right to operate is a far greater deterrent than any fine could possibly be. Has the Minister considered that as an option and, if he did consider it, why did he not choose to adopt it? Going out of business is the worst penalty that can befall any company.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I draw the honourable member's attention to clause 56, where there is a provision for a continuing penalty and to revoke. There is also provision for suspension. We have a comprehensive provision in regard to the honourable member's concerns, and section 124 for continuing offences. I have a brief statement which I would like to put on the record and which I think will help members in regard to the application of clause 80. It relates back to the collective difficulty we had last night with clause 5 and its interpretation. I freely acknowledge that I have some difficulty with that as well. Probably as we get more familiar with the Bill we can be more accurate in using and understanding it.

I want to take this opportunity now to explain to the Committee that we have reached that section, that is, general offences, to give a more detailed explanation of the concepts of material and serious environmental harm. As members will recall, concerns were expressed about the intent and meaning about the provisions in clause 5 dealing with these matters. Clause 5 is only a definition provision and, in order to understand its effectiveness, it is necessary to study it in the context of the provisions in which the definitions are used. All that has been said before, but it is worth putting it on the record.

The definitions of material and serious environmental harm are used in a significant way only in this part of the Bill, that is, part 9. This part creates a series of general offences of decreasing levels of seriousness. The first such offence in clause 80 is a very serious offence indeed in terms of penalty. It fixes a maximum penalty of \$1 million (to which the member for Coles has referred) for a body corporate and a maximum of \$250 000 or division 4 imprisonment for four years for a natural person. The offence requires proof of intent or recklessness on the part of the offender. It is also necessary for the court to be satisfied that the pollution resulted in serious environmental harm.

The next offence, under subclause 80(2), is one of causing serious environmental harm by pollution that in effect results from negligence. Imprisonment is not available as a penalty under this offence. The next subclause, 81(1), which again flows from this general part and which helps to explain the interpretation of part 9 that flows from clause 80, relates to causing material harm by polluting the environment intentionally or recklessly. Subclause 81(2) covers causing material harm by polluting the environment as a result of negligence. As for the negligence offence above, imprisonment is not available as a penalty. The final, least serious offence, which comes up in clause 83, is one of causing an environmental nuisance by polluting the environment intentionally or recklessly.

This may seem elaborate, but the offences cover a range of maximum fines from \$30 000 to \$1 million. These measures are also not unique. For example, the ordinary criminal law provides for a similar hierarchy of offences, ranging from ordinary assault to murder, and there is a similar

scheme in relation to damage of property. The dividing lines between the various environmental harm offences necessarily depend in part on imprecise tests. They are partly based on the monetary costs of the clean-up and property damage, but of course not all environmental harm has a monetary cost or one that can be calculated with sufficient precision. This has meant that to give guidance to the court, words of degree such as 'environmental harm', 'of high impact' or 'on a wide scale' are used to provide an alternative to the monetary test.

I emphasise that the tests are alternatives. This is just because the monetary cost that might be calculated is less than the \$5 000 limit, for example, and that will not mean the harm is trivial and hence not material harm. The courts will make a judgment as to whether particular offences fall into one category as opposed to another in the same way as the courts decide whether an assault is just a common assault, assault occasioning actual bodily harm or an assault causing or creating a risk of grievous bodily harm. The Bill does allow for offences that will depend on objective measurements of levels of pollution, and these will be offences under clause 35, contravening a mandatory provision or an environmental protection policy. However, these offences cannot be entirely comprehensive in their coverage, and some forms of pollution are not really measurable.

It is necessary to have general offences. In some jurisdictions this has been dealt with merely by creating an offence of polluting the environment, with a maximum penalty of about \$1 million. This approach is open to strong criticism that it is far too all-encompassing and absurd in its literal meaning. I hope that helps members with the explanation. I had some difficulty last night as well as other members in getting the—

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I had the problem—

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: That is not a problem. I hope that has helped members; when people refer back to this Bill they will have that there on the record for their benefit.

Clause passed.

Clauses 81 to 86 passed.

Clause 87—'Identification of authorised officers.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: As I understand clause 87(3), the authorised officer must produce identification when asked to do so. I think the authorised officer should have to produce the ID and not wait to be asked to produce it. Why did the Minister not recognise the need for that?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Commonsense would apply. An officer would have responsibility for a significant industrial or commercial organisation such as a refinery or a large manufacturing establishment in Adelaide or in the country and, as a regular visitor to that organisation, it would seem pointless to require the officer to exhibit authorisation on each visit. I am sure there would be an understanding well established between the management, the officer and the authority as to how that would operate, and that is the basis for this provision.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Opposition does not agree with the response that the Minister has provided and we will further consider the matter before we have the opportunity to debate it in another place.

Clause passed.

Clause 88—'Powers of authorised officers.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Subclause (1) provides:

an authorised officer may—

- (a) enter and inspect any place or vehicle for any reasonable purpose connected with the administration or enforcement of this Act;

There is a need for a warrant, which must be provided by a justice. There is some concern about that, but I do not intend to refer to that matter this evening. Paragraph (a) is too wide and it should be allowed in regard to entry only if there is reasonable suspicion that an offence has been committed. The usual practice adopted in this type of legislation is that there has to be reasonable suspicion that an offence has been committed before entry is provided. Why does the Minister consider that that is not necessary in this case? If the answer is not satisfactory, it is a matter that we will consider in another place.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The qualification in subclause (2) stipulates:

An authorised officer may not exercise the power of entry under this section in respect of premises where. . .

Several limitations then follow concerning the authority of the officer.

Clause passed.

Clauses 89 to 93 passed.

Clause 94—'Environment protection orders.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I referred earlier to the submission made by the Credit Union Services Corporation, and that submission has been made available to the Minister. This matter relates to subclause (8) and also clause 94(4). The corporation asks whether it can assume that an EPA ceases to be binding on a person when occupation or ownership is terminated as a consequence of the wording in clause 95(4). If so, how does it sit with clause 94(8)?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I have a lengthy response to that whole question asked by the corporation. I am more than happy to have it tabled for members.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mrs Hutchison): The Minister cannot table it now, but he can summarise it.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The best way is to provide members with copies later.

Clause passed.

Clauses 95 to 99 passed.

Clause 100—'Clean-up orders.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Again, I raise the issue referred to the Minister by the Credit Union Services Corporation, and I presume that the Minister has another lengthy explanation. If this one is not so lengthy, he might be able to indicate to the Committee his response to the concerns expressed by the corporation on this clause.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It is all contained in the comprehensive response that will be provided to members in a few minutes.

Clause passed.

Clauses 101 to 104 passed.

Clause 105—'Civil remedies.'

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I move:

Page 80—

Line 22—Before 'loss' insert 'injury or'.

Line 24—Before 'loss' insert 'injury,'.

Line 25—Before 'loss' insert 'injury,'.

Amendments carried.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I move:

Page 81—

Line 24—After 'court' insert 'in respect of an application made under subsection (7)(a) or (b).

Lines 30 to 32—Leave out paragraph (b) and insert—
(b) by any person whose interests are affected by the subject matter of the application; or

(c) by any other person who has, in the opinion of the court, a proper interest in the subject matter of the application.

The reason for the amendments is simple. In the legislation the right to take civil enforcement proceedings has been restricted to the authority or a person with common law standing. The Opposition believes that a person should have such a right and I cannot understand, as I said during the second reading debate, why the same provisions that apply in the Development Act are not repeated in this legislation. As I have said on a number of occasions, Opposition members believe that the two should work concurrently.

Quite simply we believe that there is a need, recognising that there are plenty of checks and balances in the legislation, and I will refer to some of those. First, a person would have to satisfy a judge in chambers. There would be the matter of the security of costs and there are, in the opinion of the Opposition, significant safeguards to ensure that matters of a frivolous or vexatious nature are not taken to the court. Again, because of the lack of opportunity for appropriate consultation, and the fact that it was determined by the Opposition late today that this matter should be addressed in this place, I regret that we have not had the opportunity to consult.

I understand that the Chamber of Commerce and Industry has been contacted tonight by an officer of the EPO and has been advised that the Opposition intends to go wider than the amendment would suggest. I regret that that has happened. I do not believe it was appropriate for that action to be taken, and there have already been discussions this evening with the chamber since that contact was made to indicate exactly what the situation is. The Opposition feels quite strongly about this piece of legislation and the amendment that is before the Committee.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It is quite extraordinary to see the level of uncertainty that is being constructed into this Bill. Anybody who is breathing can take an action on a major development—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: You are quite wrong, and I can tell the honourable member that the reaction will be extraordinary. I have some sympathy with this, but we have negotiated this clause very carefully with industry, the community at large and interest groups so that it gives those persons whose interests are affected by contravention of this Bill or who would otherwise have standing a general right to have access to the ERD court to have their case decided. I can assure the honourable member that it was not an officer of the EPO who contacted the Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Who was it?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: That is my business, but it was one of my officers. I am staggered. I will be interested to see what happens upstairs. Will the Opposition move this upstairs? Will Opposition members in another place support this?

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I will be staggered to see it.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The member for Coles said I will be staggered. The member for Coles is often out of tune with the rest of her Party. I do not criticise her for that because there are good reasons. We will see. This has been a carefully negotiated package with the whole of the community. Members opposite talk about representing the interests of industry in this State, but this amendment would throw open every level of uncertainty. Members opposite have been arguing that the Government must give this to industry in this State, but it would expose it to any—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: That's not wrong.

The ACTING CHAIRPERSON: Order! I remind the Minister to address the Chair.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: My apologies, Madam Acting Chair. That is not wrong. I can assure members that the reaction from the chamber tonight was that it is staggered. More than that, it is outraged.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Because it has been given the wrong information.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I hope that it does not rely on the member for Heysen's advice, because my advice comes much better qualified. We will see what happens in another place. Whatever assurances have been given, I hope they are guarantees, because I can assure members that the Opposition in the other place will not support this amendment. In fact, I assure members opposite that, when Opposition members in the other place see what they have done, they will be staggered.

I leave it at that because I have a lot of sympathy with this concept—I always have had, but I am in a position where I have had to negotiate. I have to deliver as a Minister. I do not have the luxury of being able to promise and not have to deliver. I have to deliver, and this package was put together after extensive consultation and negotiation with the whole community. For me to concede to such an amendment at this point would mean throwing the whole package out.

This is very important, because we have an arrangement we are putting in place with the support of industry, and we need its support. For this Bill to succeed and for the impact in the community to succeed will require the support of the industry as a whole, as good corporate citizens. They are indicating that through their peak councils.

As I say, I have a lot of sympathy for this amendment. I have been a third party appeal person for a long time. I have had a lot of actions. As an individual and as a resident I have taken large corporations to the planning appeal courts, and succeeded I might add, but there was a degree of certainty under that provision.

If I accepted what the member for Heysen proposes, it would throw out the package and the confidence that my officers and I have built up in our negotiations with industry in this State. It creates a degree of uncertainty that I have never seen before. Only an Opposition that does not have to deliver would put such an amendment forward. Only an Opposition would do that. I put this on notice because I will watch with interest what occurs in another place.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am very interested in the response of the Minister. The negotiations that we have had this afternoon with members of the legal profession suggest that the Minister is way out of kilter in this regard. If that was not the case, it would be necessary for us to reconsider, but we totally understand the amendment that we have moved and we believe that the Minister is totally out of kilter as far as this matter is concerned.

I can say that because I have already indicated to the Committee that it was only late this afternoon that this matter was determined after consultation with members of the legal profession. I believe that is appropriate and if it is necessary to reconsider the matter we will do so. Again, I make the point that one of the impossibilities that the Opposition has faced in dealing with the Bill has been the insufficient time allowed for these matters to be addressed appropriately.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Well, let any member of this Committee consult the people we have asked for comment on this legislation and they will find that by far the large majority of those organisations and individuals have not yet responded and are not in a position to respond. So how is the Opposition supposed to deal effectively with legislation such as this?

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The comment made by the member for Mount Gambier is appropriate. The debate that has taken place tonight and last evening has proved conclusively that the Minister does not understand his own legislation. I reiterate what I have already said: the advice that we have received suggests that we are comfortable with this move. If further advice is received to the contrary, we will reconsider the situation. I do not intend to say any more about that.

The Minister is aware of the representation that has been made to him. He has indicated that there has been considerable consultation—his words, but I doubt that—with industry. As I said, I doubt whether that is the case. There has been very little, if any, consultation until the last couple of days with the conservation movement which, quite rightly, is concerned about this matter, and others who have been brought to the attention of this Committee. Again, I say it is disappointing that that has been the case. I shall seek further advice on this amendment. The Minister sits there grinning like a Cheshire cat because he and members on the other side of this Committee recognise that there has not been an adequate opportunity for the Opposition to consult properly on this legislation.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: He is losing his cool.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I have every right to lose my cool.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mrs Hutchison): Order!

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: If the member for Napier is going to carry on like an idiot, I will refer to him as such. This is a very serious matter. It is a matter that the Opposition has attempted to address because of the concern that has been expressed. I believe it is a genuine concern. As a result of the consultation that we have had today, very brief though it might have been, the Opposition believes it is appropriate to move in this direction.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The Minister's reply to the member for Heysen when he moved this amendment would, I believe, stagger and horrify anyone who had a concern not only for the environment but for civil liberties in this country. The Minister said, 'I have to negotiate; I have to deliver.' It sounds to me very much as if the Minister is into deals. He is not concerned with legislating: he is concerned with negotiating and doing deals, and the reason for that is very clear.

This Government has lost all credibility with commerce and industry in this State. It is desperate and, because it is desperate, it is trying to scramble together some semblance of an accord or relationship with the Chamber of Commerce and Industry over a particular aspect of this Bill. That is not satisfactory and, what is more, it will not convince anybody at all. The Minister's concern about the attitude of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry is a new-found concern. The Labor Government in South Australia has brought commerce and industry to their knees. Now, suddenly, the Minister says, 'Well, we have to negotiate; we have to

deliver.' From where we sit, we consider we have to legislate, and that is what we are doing. We are legislating not in the interests of a narrow section of the community: we are legislating in the public interest. That is why we are concerned that people who have a legitimate interest in the environment have a right to appear before the courts to represent the public interest. Heaven knows, we could not rely on this Government to do it as past events have proven.

This Government is prepared to pre-empt the High Court of Australia by legislating to prevent people from having their proper standing in the courts and their proper recourse to law. There is very little conviction in what the Minister says, and he certainly does not convince me. I support the amendment, and I think that what the Minister has revealed in his statement tonight is an indictment of his attitude to legislation, to his role as a Minister and to the protection of the environment.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I am staggered and shattered by the comments of the member for Coles, I can assure her. Quite frankly, sometimes the hypocrisy exhibited by the Opposition staggers me. I am here, I am responsible and I will act responsibly in regard to this matter. The officers and I have negotiated with the community as a whole. I can see quite clearly that the member for Heysen is seeking an escape hatch. He has now indicated that he will be prepared to reconsider the matter if there is other advice.

I can assure him that he ought to seek that urgently, because I am sure he will find that the advice he will receive is that this will cause a huge level of uncertainty for industry in this State. It is all very well to sit in Opposition and feel warm and have a glowing feeling about putting such an amendment forward. As I said, I have some sympathy for this provision as well, but we must look at the message we are sending out to industry in this State. The message from the Opposition in this amendment is one of uncertainty; it would undermine any opportunity for recovery during any recession or any other period. We must provide certainty, and the importance of that is reflected in the clause. I must make one correction: an officer of the EPO did contact the chamber.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Too right they did.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: And so did one of my officers—just to make the record complete. I do not see why the member for Heysen is so indignant in that regard, because it is very proper, since we have negotiated and will continue to negotiate a package. I refute this continual harping from the Opposition about consultation. The fact is that we have been in consultation since July 1991 in regard to this Bill, and we have consulted everyone in the community. Every interest has been consulted, and we will continue to do so. It is useless words from the Opposition to constantly accuse us of not doing so. We have done so and we will continue to do so. I just want to put that on the record. I will wait and see what comes up when the other place deals with this matter; I will watch with interest.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Does this provision exist in this form in New South Wales and Victorian jurisdictions? If it does, how many times has it been invoked? My understanding is that it has been invoked rarely. I understand that it is invoked only when an order has been made and that order has been breached; it gives the right to a third party—if the EPA is not doing its job—to say, 'We would like to be heard on this matter.'

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: This is extraordinary. This is your amendment; I am not going to explain your amendment to you.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRPERSON: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It's your amendment; you explain it.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRPERSON: Order! The Minister will address the Chair.

The Hon. H. Allison: You're an ignorant devil.

The ACTING CHAIRPERSON: Order! The Deputy Leader.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The facts of life are that, if the Minister is moving legislation, there should be an understanding, if not by him because he is a new boy on the block—and I can understand the Minister not having a full comprehension of his portfolio. Even if he were a decent Minister, there would be no way that you expect that person to have 100 per cent coverage and understanding of his portfolio. So, I can understand why the Minister is ignorant of this matter, but I expect that the Minister does have advisers.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRPERSON: Order! The Deputy Leader has the call. Would the Deputy Leader please sit down. Would the Minister and the member for Mount Gambier cease talking across the chamber. The Deputy Leader has the call.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister has advisers and I would presume those advisers have a very strong comprehension of legislation that exists in other jurisdictions because we always talk as far as possible about being at least uniform with our interstate counterparts; we do not take too many steps further or we do not hang back too far from where they are so that we are complementary to a certain degree. I was simply putting those questions because it was my understanding that whether they are put in the form of a question or a statement all three items were, in fact, true. I asked the question knowing what I believe are the answers and I had the extraordinary response from the Minister, 'I do not know.' The Minister's advisers do not know.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I know, and it is not my place to explain the Opposition's amendment so you can explain your own amendment. I will leave it to the Opposition to make its own assessment.

Amendments negatived

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I move:

Page 83, lines 1 and 2—Leave out 'to provide security for'.

This comes from a man I had to deal with some years back. I sat down for three hours trying to explain to him what section 108 of the Public Service Act meant and he leant across to his advisers and asked. This is the man who accuses me of not knowing things. I can give you a few stories about the member for Heysen's incapacity. I had a position that allowed me to judge the activities of both the member for Mount Gambier and the member for Heysen, and I will keep those for my memoirs because I will not waste this Committee's time.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I move:

Page 83—

Line 3, before 'the payment' insert 'to provide security for'.

Line 5, before 'the payment' insert 'to give an undertaking as to'.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 106—'Emergency authorisations.'

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I move:

Page 84, after line 14—Insert subclause as follows:

(4) A person who would, but for an authorisation under this section, be guilty of an offence of contravening a provision of this Act is, despite the authorisation, to be taken to have contravened that provision for the purposes of—

- (a) any civil proceedings under this Act in respect of the contravention; and
- (b) the issuing or enforcement of a clean-up order or clean-up authorisation under this Act in respect of the contravention.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 107—'Appeals to court.'

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I move:

Page 85, lines 17 and 18—Leave out subparagraph (ii) and insert—

- (ii) varying or imposing a condition of the approval or licence or determining a matter in relation to such a condition (including a matter relating to a financial assurance lodged with the Authority); or

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 108 to 114 passed.

Clause 115—'Waste facilities operated by authority.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: This clause relates to waste facilities operated by the authority. I ask the Minister: why should the authority carry on operations when it is also the regulator? Surely there is a conflict of interest if that is the case—that the authority should be given the opportunity to carry out a business when it is supposed to be regulating that business.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: This was established through the operation of what were the Waste Management Commission depots, such as Dry Creek, where waste chemical containers and waste chemicals arising from domestic or rural use are collected for storage and treatment, and it is where this activity is not run on a commercial basis. As such it would impose significant fees on people bringing in chemicals and containers and would act as a disincentive for them to do so. That is the theme behind clause 115. I hope that explains the matter to the member.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am certainly not satisfied with that response. I think it is a ludicrous situation. Is Caesar judging Caesar? The Government would not permit that under other circumstances. I imagine that industry would be concerned about that situation. The activities of industry are to be monitored by the EPA, as they should be, yet hear we are saying that the authority can carry out a waste management business—because that is what it is—and it has the responsibility of regulating its own activities. That is totally unacceptable.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I will again endeavour to explain to the member. This is a situation, I guess, where we find an interim structure. We want to see these chemicals collected. There may not be a commercial organisation offering a service, and let me say in summing up that local government, particularly in the country areas—and I would have thought the member would have been alert to that—is very anxious to have this provision in the Bill (and I stress that) because they want to see the opportunity for these types of wastes to be collected.

Clause passed.

Clauses 116 to 133 passed.

Clause 134—'Orders by court against offenders.'

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I move:

Page 97—

Line 1—Before 'loss' insert 'injury or'.

Line 3—Leave out ',such loss' and insert 'such injury, loss'.

Line 4—Before 'loss' insert 'injury.'

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 135 to 140 passed.

Clause 141—'Regulations.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Why has the power been removed from the Legislative Review Committee under clause 141(8)?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: It reflects the provisions considered under the Development Bill and places the relevant powers under the one committee. That was the intent outlined by my colleague when the Development Bill came before this place, and he indicated that that would be followed with this Bill as well.

Clause passed.

Schedule 1—'Prescribed activities of environmental significance.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: In relation to paragraph (w), page 104, I should have thought that the Stony Point indenture would be included in this area. Why is that not the case?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: In discussions with the industry there has been no particular request for a specific dedication or spelling out of Stony Point within the provisions of the Bill under paragraph (w).

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: On page 106 of the schedule, clause 6(10) provides:

Woolscouring or Wool Carbonising Works:
the conduct of works for the commercial cleaning or carbonising of wool.

When I held the shadow portfolio of environment and planning I received a number of complaints about pollution by wool scourers in South Australia and the failure of certain companies to comply with the conditions of their licence. I indicated to one of the Minister's officers last night that I would be asking questions about the number of wool scouring companies in South Australia, the relative size of each company and whether every company complies precisely with the conditions of its licence; if not, what action has the Government taken and what action would the Government propose to take under this Act?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for the prior notification of her question. The company that was brought to my attention was Michell's Adelaide plant, and I have a specific answer for the honourable member. As to whether all companies are complying with their licence or what their status is at this time, I do not have that specific information, but I will take the question on notice and provide a response for the honourable member.

In regard to the question raised about Michell and Sons, involving the two manufacturing plants here in South Australia (at Salisbury and Thebarton), both discharge trade waste to the Bolivar treatment plant. I am sure members know that the Salisbury plant is a wool scouring, carbonising and combing operation, whereas Thebarton is hide dehairing and tanning.

The Salisbury plant is the largest of its type in the southern hemisphere. I think about 320-odd people are employed there. The waste water characteristics are as follows: volumetric flow, 3 million litres per day; organic loading—the biochemical oxygen demand—is 7 to 10 tonnes per day; the suspended solids is about 10 to 14 tonnes per day; the grease is 7 to 10 tonnes per day; the salinity is 8 to 9 tonnes per day.

The legal arrangements are as follows: the above discharge conditions are covered by an indenture agreement struck between the then Minister of Industrial Affairs, the

Hon. Dean Brown, in 1982 and were based on a plant expansion and the employment of an additional 60 full-time employees in lieu of complying with regulation 10 of the Sewerage Act, and exemption from payment of any future trade waste charges until 2002.

The Salisbury plant contributes—and I heard this from one of my colleagues previously—something like 20 per cent of the pollution load at the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Plant. A supplementary agreement was made with the then Minister, the Hon. Jack Slater, in 1984, when an increase in discharge levels was sought by Michells. An annual charge comprising capital and a small recurrent component for the additional discharge loading was commenced. In 1991-92 the trade waste charge paid by Michells was approximately \$137 000. I guess on a user-pays basis we can make a rough calculation of about \$1.7 million per annum. Monitoring of the waste water discharges to the sewerage system is conducted by both the E&WS and Michells. Apart from the organic loading-type parameters, other hazardous substances have not been detected above normal levels at the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Plant.

The Thebarton plant employs 180 people and its waste water characteristics are as follows: volumetric flow is 1.1 million litres per day; suspended solids 1 000 to 3 000 milligrams per litre; sulphides are 10 to 120 milligrams per litre; and chromium is 5 to 12 milligrams per litre. Michells has outlaid approximately \$800 000 in 1992 to address the non-complying sulphide problem and a further \$300 000 has been allocated and will be spent in 1993-94 to achieve full compliance with the provisions. The E&WS is working closely with Michells to achieve full compliance and implement numerous waste minimisation initiatives at the plant. Michells has achieved a significant improvement in its sewer discharge profile over the past 18 months. Monitoring of sewer discharged waste water is conducted by E&WS and Michells. That is the specific answer to the honourable member's question that was put to my officers last night and I will take the other more general question on notice and provide that to the honourable member as soon as I can.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: That was a lot of information, much of it technical, to absorb very quickly. However, I would like to ask some supplementary questions in the light of the information that the Minister has given. If I heard correctly, 10.4 tonnes per day of suspended solids is discharged from the Thebarton plant or was it the Salisbury plant?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: From the Salisbury plant—suspended solids, 10 to 14 tonnes per day.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: The obvious question that arises concerns the impact on the gulf of these discharges. I would like the Minister to tell me, if he can, to what extent these discharges are treated at the sewage treatment works before they are discharged into the gulf? What is the opinion of the department about the impact on the gulf waters, notably the fish spawning grounds?

The Minister said that Michells was attempting to reach compliance in respect of sulphide and I do not recall by what date that compliance was required, but I would like to know what other chemicals, if any, are being discharged in not meeting with the compliance. Are there any others than sulphide? When does the indenture expire or has it already expired? When it does expire, does the Government intend to negotiate a fresh indenture or will the authorities or the authorisations and licences under this Act take the place of previous indentures?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I do not have the detail in regard to the impact that this waste disposal is having on the gulf. Obviously as part of the waste disposal problem from the sewerage treatment plant it forms part of that problem, and I think it is fair to say that I have acknowledged, and the Government has acknowledged, that we need to address that. I can get further detail for the honourable member. Given the quantity of organic loading that is going into the sewerage system and into Bolivar particularly from the Salisbury plant—that is causing I think 20 per cent of the loading—that would obviously be causing some part of it and that flows on to cause a problem in the gulf. I will give the technical detail of that. I guess the general answer is, yes, it is causing some problem. I am not able to say to what extent but I will definitely undertake to get the honourable member a clear answer.

In relation to the 2002 indenture there is a requirement for licensing under this Bill for Michells. My view would be that in the process leading up to the expiry of that indenture in 2002 there would be negotiations between the EPA, the statutory body under the Act, and Michells to put in place a proper arrangement which would lead to, I believe, better practices occurring with regard to the disposal of wastes. I would see that as being a very important part of the environment protection body in its discussions. As to other wastes, I can only reiterate what I have said from the advice I have received. There appears to be no other significant waste products that have not been addressed by me in that answer, when I talked about the suspended solids, the sulphides and the chromium. I will again recheck that for the honourable member's information and the information of the House.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I want to ask some questions in regard to animal husbandry. The logic of limiting the registration of piggeries to the water catchment area while including feedlots escapes me. Piggeries are a definite source of odour, and there are many of them. Apart from the problems with the Clare cattle feedlot that I have brought to the attention of the Minister previously, there cannot be many of those in this State. Will the Minister explain the logic of leaving piggeries and perhaps chicken broilers out of animal husbandry? For the past few years the Department of Environment and Planning and the E&WS Department have been undertaking a program for controlling odour from wineries. Will the Minister explain why wineries are not therefore considered to be of environmental significance?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The general approach regarding the Bill, and particularly under this schedule, is that we are focusing on those activities that warrant attention in terms of potential pollution. The focus is on those activities that are the subject of schedule 1. That gives us the power to address those matters directly with the authorities contained in the Bill. Piggeries are listed. Of course they are of concern, they are cited, and if need be we can address the matter and give greater clarity or control by regulation under the Bill.

I guess that is what the honourable member is alluding to. If we need to address this matter to spruce it up or to improve the provisions in order to protect the environment, we can do so under the regulations. This has picked up basically existing practice through negotiation with the Farmers Federation and the Conservation Council. That issue has not been highlighted as a major concern. If there are areas of concern from interest groups, in due course I am sure that will be reviewed by the EPA and recommended to me, as Minister, for review.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Clause 2(1) of schedule 1 refers to manufacturing and mineral processing, abrasive

blasting. While I understand the need to register an abrasive blast cleaner using air as the conveying medium—and that would be mainly because of the dust involved—I cannot understand why the same should be true for a liquid medium. As I understand it, this is a change from the Clean Air Act, and it may be because of the incorporation of waste or water pollution, but I am not sure about that. As most of this section is lifted, as I understand it, from the Clean Air Act, will the Minister explain why liquid is included in this area?

I refer to clause 3(1)(e). Whilst I understand the sensitivity of not destroying a human body when other things are destroyed in an incinerator, will the Minister explain why placing solid trade waste in an incinerator will only dispose of it?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I will have to take advice on that, because it has been picked up from the Clean Air Act. Regarding clause 2(1), abrasive blasting, where the honourable member has referred to a liquid medium, I will take that question on notice and provide the honourable member with a comprehensive technical answer.

Schedule passed.

Schedule 2 and title passed.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Environment and Land Management): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I want to take this opportunity again to put on the record, particularly as in the latter moments of this debate the Minister referred to the consultation process, that, while the Bill that has come out of Committee is supported by the Opposition, regrettably, as I said during the second reading debate, most of the debate over specific action and amendments to the Bill will occur in another place. I think that is a great pity, and I believe that it is totally unacceptable. The Minister is in this House. He has indicated that he does not have a knowledge of the Bill which has just been before the Committee and which is now at the third reading stage. I understand; I realise that it is a very complex piece of legislation. However, I would hate to think what would have happened if the Minister had not been able to refer to officers during the Committee stage, because I do not think he would have had a clue about what the legislation does or how it will be implemented when it becomes law.

It is unsatisfactory that most of the time of this Committee has been taken up with questioning to enable us to take further action in another place, and that has come about as a result of the lack of consultation. The Minister said again tonight that this matter has been under consultation since 1991. Let me reiterate what I said yesterday in this place. I understand that the white paper was released in 1991, and I understand that a draft Bill was prepared and circulated in 1992. The fact that concerns members on this side of the House is that the Bill that is currently before the House came out of Parliamentary Counsel, went to Cabinet and was immediately brought into this House without organisations or individuals which will be affected by or which have an interest in this legislation being able to comment on it.

That is what the concern is all about. I understand the concern, and I reiterate again that less than one third of the people, the organisations and the individuals that the Opposition has contacted about this legislation have been in a position to comment on the Bill that is now at the third reading stage. That is totally unsatisfactory, and I want to place the Opposition's concern on the record in this the third reading debate.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION (SEA
DUMPING)(CONSISTENCY WITH
COMMONWEALTH ACT) AMENDMENT BILL**

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.53 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 19 August at 10.30 a.m.